The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME EIGHT

Infamy—Lapparent
THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY
CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, Ph.D., LL.D.
EDWARD A. PACE, Ph.D., D.D.  CONDÉ B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D.
THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D.  JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.
ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

FIFTEEN VOLUMES AND INDEX
VOLUME VIII

New York
THE ENCYCLOPEDIA PRESS, INC.
Contributors to the Eighth Volume


AHERN, MICHAEL JOSEPH, S.J., INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA: Innsbruck University.


ALBERT, P. X., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCULPTURE, ST. JOSEPH'S SEMINARY, DUNWOODY, NEW YORK: Lebanon.

ALDÁSY, ANTON, PH.D., ARCHIVIST OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM, BUDAPEST: Ipolyi, Arnold; Kalocsa-Bacs, Archdiocese of; Kisfaludy, Sándor.

ALSTON, CYPRIAN, O.S.B., DOWNSIDE ABBEY, BATH, ENGLAND: Itinerarium; Jubilate Sunday; Judica Sunday; Jumièges, Benedictine Abbey of; Letare Sunday of.


ATTERIDGE, ANDREW HILLIARD, LONDON: Irish (In South Africa).

BAGSHAW, EDWARD G., ARCHBISHOP OF SELKIRK, HOUNSLOW, ENGLAND: Joseph, Sisters of Saint, of Peace.

BALETTE, JUSTIN, MISSIONARY APOSTOLIC, TOKYO, JAPAN: Japan (Area and Population; Laws Concerning Religion and Schools).

BANCAERT, JULIAN, S.J., PREFECT APOSTOLIC OF KUNDGO, BELGIAN CONGO: Kwango, Prefecture Apostolic of.


BAUR, CHrysostom, O.S.B., PH.D. (LOUVAIN), SANT' ANSELMO, ROME: John Chrysostom, Saint.


BENIGNI, UMBERTO, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, FONTO, COLLEGO URBANO DI PROPAGANDA, ROME: Intendencia Oriental and Llanos de Sam Martín, Vicariate Apostolic of; Icchia, Diocese of; Ischia and Venafro, Diocese of; Italo-Greeks; Itria, Diocese of; Josi, Diocese of; Lacedonia, Diocese of; Lambruschini, Luigi, Giambattista, and Raffaele; Lanciano and Ortona, Archdiocese of.

BERTRIN, GEORGES, LL.D., FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY, PROFESSOR OF FRENCH LITERATURE, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, PARIS: La Bruyère, Jean de; Lamartine, Alphonse de.

BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., LECTOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, COLLEGO SAN BONAVENTURA, QUARACCHI, FLORENCE: Isabel of France, Blessed; Julian of Spyer, Ladislaus, Saint.


BLÜTZER, JOSEPH, S.J., MUNICH: Inquisition.

BOTTERO, H. M., BISHOP OF KUMBHIKONAM, INDIAN KUMBHIKONAM, Diocese of.

BOUDINHON, AUGUST-MARIE, S.T.D., D.C.L., DIRECTOR, "CANONISTE CONTEMPORAIN"; PROFESSOR OF CANON LAW, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, PARIS: Infidels; In Partibus Infidelium; In Petto; Interdict; Inventory of Church Property; Laicization; Laity.

BOYLE, PATRICK, C.M., SUPERIOR OF THE IRISH COLLEGE, PARIS: Irish Colleges on the Continent.

BREEN, MICHAEL JOSEPH, QUINT, IRELAND: Killaloe, Diocese of.

BRÉHIER, LOUIS-RENÉ, PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF CLERMONT-FERRAND, PUT-DÉ-DÔME, FRANCE: Jacques de Vitry; Jerusalem (III. The Latin Kingdom); Joinville, Jean, Sire de.

BROWN, CHARLES FRANCIS WEMYSS, LONDON CASTLE, PERTHSHIRE, SCOTLAND: John Buckley, Venerable; John Rochester, Blessed; John the Almsgiver, Saint; Jones, Edward, Venerable; Keeatin.

Cambiér, Emeri, Prefect Apostolic, Upper Kasrai, Belgian Congo: Kasrai, Prefecture Apostolic of Upper.

Camerlynck, Achille, S.T.D., Member of the "Société belge de Sociologie", Professor of Sacred Scripture and Sociology, Episcopal Seminary, Bruges, Belgium: James, Epistle of Saint; James the Greater, Saint; James the Less, Saint; Jude, Epistle of Saint.

Campbell, Thomas J., S.J., Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York: Jogues, Isaac; Lalemant, Charles, Gabriel, and Jerome.


Cardauns, Hermann, Bonn: Jörg, Joseph Edmund.


Coffey, Peter, Ph.D., S.T.L., Professor of Philosophy, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland: John of Salisbury.


Condon, Peter, New York: Irish (in the United States); Knownothingism.

Constantitus, Brother, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., Member of the American Mathematical Society, Member of the Circolo Matematico di Palermo, Professor of Philosophy and Philosophy of History and Literature, Christian Brothers' College, St. Louis, Missouri: John Baptiste de la Salle, Saint.

Crivelli, Camillus, S.J., Professor of General History, Instituto Cientifico, City of Mexico: Ixtlixlxohitl, Fernando de Alba.

Cunningham, Joseph Andrew, Chaplain, First Peshawar Division, Peshawar, India: Kafiristan and Kashmir, Prefecture Apostolic of.


Delacy, William Henry, Judge of the Juvenile Court, Associate Professor of Common Law, Catholic University of America, Washington: Juvenile Courts.

Delamarre, Louis N., Ph.D., Instructor in French, College of the City of New York: Jamin, Jacques; Joubert, Joseph; La Fontaine, Jean de; La Harpe, Jean-François; La Moricière, Louis-Christophe-Léon-Juchault de; Lapparent, Albert-Auguste de.


Devitt, E. J., S.J., Professor of Psychology, Georgetown University, Washington: Lalor, Teresa.

Donovan, Justin Foley, M.D., M.Ch., Port Health Officer, Port Royal, Jamaica: Jamaica.


Driscoll, James F., S.T.D., New York: Jansen, Johann Hermann; Jehu; Jephthe; Jeroboam (2); Jessabel; Joab; Jonas; Jonathan (4); Joseph, King of Juda; Juda; Judas Machabeus; Lamb, Paschal; Lamuel; Lamy, Bernard.

Drum, Walter, S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture, Woodstock College, Maryland: John, Epistles of Saint; Josue (8); Judges, Book of; La Haye, Jean de (Jesus); Laines, James.

Drummond, Lewis, S.J., Associate Editor, "America", New York; Lec, Sterislaus du.

Dubray, Charles A., S.M., S.T.B., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Marist College, Washington: Jaccot, Joseph; Joufroy, Jean de; Knowledge; Laforté, Nicholas-Joseph.

Dunn, Joseph, Ph.D., Professor of Celtic Language and Literature, Catholic University of America, Washington: Kells, Book of.

Durand, Alfred, S.J., Professor of Scripture and Eastern Languages, Our Place, Hastings, England: Inspiration of the Bible.

Fanning, William H. W., S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri: Intrusion; Irregularity; Irremovability.
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FAULHABER, MICHAEL, PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, UNIVERSITY OF STRASBURG: Jeremias (The Prophet); Joel.

FAYEN, ARNOLD, PH.D., LITT.D., MEMBER OF THE BELGIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE, ROME: Lambert Le Bègue.


FISHER, J. H., S.J., WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Jouin, Louis; Keller, Jacob.

FLAHERTY, MATTHEW J., M.A. (HARVARD), CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS: Kavanaugh, Julia.


FORD, JEREMIAH D. M., M.A., PH.D., PROFESSOR OF FRENCH AND SPANISH, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS: Jámogui, Juan de; Joyellos, Caspar Melchor de.

FORGET, JACQUES, PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY AND THE SYRIAC AND ARABIC LANGUAGES, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Janssenius and Jansenism.

FORTESCUE, ADRIAN, PH.D., S.T.D., LETCHWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE, ENGLAND: Istroit; Idaire of Thessalonica; Ite Missa Est; Jerusalem (II. From A.D. 71 to A.D. 1099; IV. From the End of the Latin Kingdom to the Present time); Jerusalem, Liturgy of; John of Antioch (4); John Scholasticius; John Talai; John the Faster; Julius Africanus; Justinian I; Kyrie Eleison.

FOX, WILLIAM, B.S., M.E., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Jolly, Philipp Johann Gustav von; Jouffroy, Claude-François-Dorothee de; Kreil, Karl; Lamont, Johann von.

FRANZ, HERMANN, PH.D., KARLSRUHE, GERMANY: Joseph II (German Emperor).

FUENTES, VENTURA, B.A., M.D., INSTRUCTOR, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Lafuente y Zamarros, Modesto.

GARDNER, EDMUND GARRETT, M.A. (CAMBRIDGE), LONDON: Italian Literature; Joachim of Flora; Juliana of Norwich.


GHETTANN, GERARD, S.J., TEACHER OF CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND AESTHETICS, ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Knabl, Joseph; Krafft, Adam; Lanzi, Luigi.

GIGOT, FRANCIS E., S.T.D., PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE, ST. JOSEPH'S SEMINARY, DUNWOODIE, NEW YORK: Introduction, Biblical; Isaac; Israel; Israelites; Issachar; Jacob; James of Edessa; Jason (4); Jews and Judaism; Joseph; Joseph of Arimathea; Josias; Justinian, Benedict; Kabbala.

GILLET, LUIS, PARIS: Ingres, Jean-Auguste-Dominique; Jouvenet, Jean; Juste.


GOYAU, GEORGES, ASSOCIATE EDITOR, "REVUE DES DEUX MONDES", PARIS: Joyeuse, Henri, De; Ketteler, William Emmanuel, Baron von; Lamignon, Family of; Langres, Diocese of.


GREY, J. C., NEW YORK: Kandy, Diocese of.

GURDON, EDMUND, O.CART., BARCELONA, SPAIN: Lanspergius (John Justus of Landsberg).


HANDLEY, MARIE LOUISE, NEW YORK: Kessels, Matthias.


HARTIG, OTTO, ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN OF THE ROYAL LIBRARY, MUNICH: John of Montecorvino.


HEALY, JOHN, S.T.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A., ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM: Iona, School of; Kells, School of; Kildare, School of; Killala, Diocese of.


HEARN, EDWARD L., NEW YORK: Knights of Columbus.

HEIBER, KARL, PH.D., EDITOR, "VOLKSSPRACHLICH", AND "AKADEMISCHE MONATSBLÄTTER", COLOGNE: Ingolstadt, University of; Josephus Flavius; Jouvenaux, Joseph de; Jovianus, Flavius Claudius; Julian the Apostate; Kaufmann, Alexander and Leopold; Kellner, Lorenz.

HONTHEIM, JOSEPH, S.J., PROFESSOR OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY, ST. IGNATIUS COLLEGE, VALKENBURG, HOLLAND: Job.
HUNTER-BLAIR, D.O., BART., O.S.B., M.A., Fort
Augustus Abbey, Scotland: Ingulf, Abbot of
Croyland; Jedburg; Jocelin; Kennedy, James;
Kentigern, Saint; Kilwinning; Kinloss; Kirkwall;
Knox, John; Kremmaminster.

HUONDER, ANTHONY, S.J., Editor, "Katholische Missionen", Bellevue, Luxemburg, Luxemburg: Jarric, Pierre du; Jenningen, Philip, Venerable; Kino, Eusebias; Kigler, Ignas; Kon-
sag, Ferdinand.

HYDE, DOUGLAS, LL.D., LITT.D., M.R.I.A.,
Frenchpark, Co. Roscommon, Ireland: Irish
Literature.

Hynernat, HENRY, S.T.D., Professor of
Semitic Languages and Biblical Archeology,
Washington: James of Sarugh; John of
Epheusus; John of Malalas; John of Nikit.

Jennings, BRENDAN, O.F.M., S.T.B., Professor
of Theology, St. Isidore's College, Rome:
John of Ripella.

Jones, ARTHUR EDWARD, S.J., Corresponding
Member of the Minnesota, Ontario, and
Chicago Historical Societies; Hon. Member of
the Missouri Historical Society; Member of
the International Congress of Americanists;
Archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal:
Lagrené, Pierre.

Jouve, ODORIC-M., O.F.M., Candiac, Canada:
Jamy, Denis.

Joyce, GEORGE HAYWARD, S.J., M.A. (Oxon.),
St. Bonos's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Keys,
Power of the.

Kaufmann, KARL MARIA, Editor, "For-
schungen zur monument. th. und verglei-
chenden Rel.-Wiss.", Frankfort-on-the-Main:
Inscriptions, Early Christian.

Keiley, Jarvis, M.A., Grantwood, New Jer-
sy: Joliet, Louis; Keon, Miles Gerald.

Kelly, BLANCHE M., New York: Ippolito Ga-
lantini, Blessed.

Kennedy, JOHN W., Dunedin, New Zealand:
Jennings, Sir Patrick Alfred.

Kennedy, Thomas, B.A. (R.U.I.), London:
John Colombini, Blessed; John of Fécamp.

Kent, W. H., O.S.C., Baywater, London: Judas
Iscariot; Langton, Stephen.

Kernan, Thomas P., B.A., Utica, New York:
Kernan, Francis.

Kirsch, JOHANN PETER, S.T.D., Domestri-
prelate, Professor of Patrology and Christi-
an Archeology, University of Fribourg:
Infessura, Stefano; Innocent I, Pope; Innocen-
tius, Saints; Joan, Pope; John X, John XI,
John XII, John XIII, John XIV, John XV,
Pope; John XVI, Antipope; John XVII, John
XVIII, John XIX, John XXI, John XXII,
Pope; John XXIII, Antipope; John and Paul,
Saints; John Nepomucking, Saint; John the Dea-
con; Juliana, Saint; Juliana Falconieri, Saint;
Julius I, Saint, Pope; Jungmann, Bernard; Ka-
lend Brethren.

Klaar, Karl, Government Archivist, Inns-
bruck, Austria: Jungmann, Josef.

Krmpotić, M. D., Kansas City, Kansas: Karin-
thia; Krain.

Labourt, Jérôme, S.T.D., Litt.D., Member of
the Asiatic Society of Paris, Paris: Isaac of
Seleucia.

Langouët, A. O.M.I., Kimberley, South Africa:
Kimberley in Orange, Vicariate Apostolic of.

Lauchert, FRIEDRICH, Ph.D., Aachen:
Janner, Ferdinand; Kilian, Saint; Kraus, Franz
Xaver; Kuhn, Johannes von.

Lebreton, Jules, S.J., Litt.D. (Sorbonne),
Professor of the History of Christian
Origins, Institut Catholique, Paris: Justin
Martyr, Saint.

Leclercq, Henri, O.S.B., London: Invitator-
ium; Isidore of Pelusium, Saint.

Lejay, Paul, Fellow of the University of
France, Professor, Institut Catholique,
Paris: John of Hauteville; Juvenec, C. Vettius
Aquilinus; Lutos, Pomponius; Lambin, Denis.

Ligneul, FRANCOIS, Tokio, Japan: Japan,
Christianity in.

Limbrock, Eberhard, S.V.D., Prefect Aposto-
tolic, German New Guinea: Kaiserwilhelms-
land, Prefecture Apostolic of.

Lindsay, Lionel St. George, B.Sc., Ph.D.,
Editor-in-Chief, "La Nouvelle France",
Quebec: Lafléche, Joseph-François; Lafléche,
Louis; Lamberville, Jacques de and Jean de.

Linehan, Paul H., B.A., Instructor, College
of the City of New York: Inghirami, Gio-
vanni; La Hire, Philippe de.

Lins, Joseph, Fribourg, Germany: Königrätz,
Diocese of; Laibach, Diocese of.

Löffler, Klemens, Ph.D., Librarian, Uni-
versity of Byelorussia: Investitures, Conflict of;
Lamormain, Wilhelm; Langen, Rudolph von.

Lortie, Joseph Francis Albert, O.M.I.,
B.L., B.Sc., B.A., Professor of English Lit-
erature and Rhetoric, St. Patrick's Col-
lege, Jaffna, Ceylon: Jaffna, Diocese of.

LOYOLA, MOTHER MARY, St. Mary’s Convent, YORK, ENGLAND: Institute of Mary.

MAAS, A. J., S.J., RECTOR, WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Jehovah; Jesus Christ; Kenosis; Knowledge of Jesus Christ; Labbe, Philippe.

MACAULEY, PATRICK J., BELFAST, IRELAND: Jeremias (8); John of Beverley, Saint; Kimberley (Australia), Vicariate Apostolic of; König, Joseph; Langley, Richard; Laco, Vicariate Apostolic of.

MCCLOSKEY, JAMES P., ILOILO, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS: Jaro, Diocese of.

MACERLEAN, ANDREW A., NEW YORK: Ives, Saint; Knight, William, Venerable.


MACNEILL, CHARLES, DUBLIN: Irish Confessors and Martyrs; Kearghalty, Maurice.


MARIQUE, PIERRE JOSEPH, INSTRUCTOR IN FRENCH, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK: Kervyn de Lettenhove, Joseph-Marie-Bruno-Constantin; La Fayette, Marie-Madeleine-Pioche de La Vergue.

MARKVYĆ, JOSEPH J., C.S.B., INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA: Josepht Kuncevyć, Saint.


MARY GERTRUDE, SISTER, LORETTO COLLEGE, DUBLIN: Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Irish.


MEEHAN, JOSEPH, C.C., MULLAGH, CO. CAVAN, IRELAND: Kilmore, Diocese of.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., NEW YORK: Irene, Sister; Irish (In Australia; In South America); Ives, Levi Stillman; Johnston, Richard Malcolm; Kansas City, Diocese of; Keyes, Emmanus Darwin; Kohlmann, Anthony; Kocciusko; La Crose, Diocese of.

MEISTERMANN, BARNABAS, O.S.F., LECTOR, CONVENT OF S. SALVATOR, JERUSALEM: Jerusalem (I. Before a. d. 71).


MONTANAR, VALENTINE HILARY, MISSIONARY APOTOLIC, NEW YORK: Kan-su, Prefecture Apostolic of Southern; Kan-su, Vicariate Apostolic of Northern; Kiang-nan, Vicariate Apostolic of; Kiang-si, Vicariates Apostolic of Eastern, Northern, and Southern; Kwang-tung, Prefecture Apostolic of; Kwei-chow, Vicariate Apostolic of.

MOONEY, JAMES, UNITED STATES ETHNOLOGIST, BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON: Iroquois; Isleta Pueblo; Jemez Pueblo; Jibaro Indians; Kalispel Indians; Kaskaskia Indians; Kickapoo Indians; Kiowa Indians; Kutenai Indians; Lake Indians.

MULLANY, JOHN I., DUBUQUE, IOWA: IOWA.

MÜLLER, ADOLF, S.J., DIRECTOR OF THE PRIVATE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY ON THE JACUZIUM, PROFESSOR OF ASTRONOMY, GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY, ROME: Joannes de Sactobosco; Kircher, Athanasius.

OBRECHT, EDMOND M., O.C.R., ABBOT OF GETHSEMANI ABBEY, KENTUCKY: Janauschek, Leopold; Langheim.

O’CONNOR, DENIS, KILLARNEY, IRELAND: Kerry and Aghadoe, Diocese of.

O’CONNOR, D. MONCRIEFF, MANCHESTER, ENGLAND: Irish (In Great Britain).


OLIGER, LIVARIUS, O.F.M., LECTOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, COLLEGIUM S. ANTONIO, ROME: Jacobone da Todi; James of the Marches, Saint; John of Parma, Blessed.
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O'SHEA, JOHN J., EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, "STANDARD AND TIMES", PHILADELPHIA: Kenrick, Francis Patrick and Peter Richard.

OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., Ph.D., PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, COLLEGEVILLE, MINNESOTA: Innocent III, Innocent IV, Innocent VII, Innocent X, Innocent XII, Innocent XIII, Popes, Intercession, Episcopal; Irnerius; Isidore the Labourer, Saint; Jacob of Juterbog; Jacobus de Teramo; Jacopo de Vorgia; John of Segovia; Jordanus of Giano; Joseph's, Saint, Society for Coloured Missions; Joseph's, Saint, Society for Foreign Missions; Julius II, Julius III, Popes; Justin de Jacobis, Blessed; Kaunitz, Wenceslaus Anton; Kehrein, Joseph; Knoblocher, Ignatius; Kreiten, William; La Chaise, Francois d'Aix de; Lambert of Hersfeld; Lamy, Francois; Lang, Matthew.

OTTEN, SUSAN TRACY, PITTSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA: Jean-Baptist-Marie Vianney, Blessed.

OUSSANI, GABRIEL, Ph.D., PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY, ST. JOSEPH'S SEMINARY, DUNWOODIE, NEW YORK: Islam; Jubilee, Year of (Hebrew); Jubilees, Book of; Koran.


PERNIN, RAPHAEL, O.S.F.S., ALBANO-LAZIOLE, ITALY: Jane Frances de Chantal, Saint.

PETRIDES, SOPHRONE, A.A., PROFESSOR, GREEK CATHOLIC SEMINARY OF KARD-KEUI, CONSTANTINOPLE: Lagadia; Lamps; Lampsacus; Lamus; Laodicea.

PHILLIPS, EDWARD C., S.J., PH.D., WOODSTOCK COLLEGE, MARYLAND: Koller, Marian.

PIETTE, FRANCOIS XAVIER, CHANCELLOR OF THE DIocese OF JOLIETTE, CANADA: Joliette, Diocese of.

PLASMAN, THOMAS, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D., FRANCISCAN CONVENT, LOUVAIN: James Prima- dieci; La Haye, Jean de (Franciscan).


POLEN, MARIA M., LONDON: Lace.

PONCELET, ALBERT, S.J., BRUSSELS: Irénées, Saint.

POOLE, THOMAS H., NEW YORK: Jones, Inigo; Juan Bautista de Toledo; Labyrinth; Lantern.


REINHOLD, GREGOR, FREIBURG, GERMANY: Jacek, Diocese of; Jelen, Diocese of; Karlikowski, Stanislaw; Lamego, Diocese of; La Pas, Diocese of; La Plata, Archdiocese of (Bolivia); La Plata, Diocese of (Argentina).

REMY, ARTHUR F. J., M.A., PH.D., ADJUNCT-PROFESSOR OF GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK: Konrad, der Pfaffe; Konrad of Lichterau; Konrad von Würzburg; Lamprecht.

ROBINSON, PASCAL, O.F.M., WASHINGTON: John of Fermos, Blessed.

ROCCA, F., SAIDPUR, BENGAL, INDIA: Krishnagiri, Diocese of.

ROMPEL, JOSEPH HEINRICH, S.J., PH.D., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Jesuits' Bark; Jussieu; Kaiser, Kajetan Georg von; Konrad of Megnberg; Lacroix, Jean-Théodore; Lamarck, Jean-Baptiste-Pierre-Antoine de Monet.

RUDGE, FLORENCE MARIE, M.A., YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO: Javouhey, Anne-Marie, Venerable; Jesus, Daughters of; Jesus and Mary, Sisters of the Holy Childhood of; John of God, Saint; John of Roquevaire; Joseph Calasanctius, Pious Workmen of Saint; Knights of the Cross.


SÄGMÜLLER, JOHANNES BAPTIST, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF TÜBINGEN, GERMANY: Judge, Ecclesiastical; Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical; Kober, Franz Quirin von.

SALAVILLE, SÉVÉRIEN, A.A., PROFESSOR OF LITURGY, GREEK CATHOLIC SEMINARY OF KARD-KEUI, CONSTANTINOPLE: Ionian Islands.

SALTET, LOUIS, PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY, INSTITUT CATHOLIQUE, TOULOUSE, FRANCE: Jerome, Saint.


SCANNELL, THOMAS B., CANON, S.T.D., EDITOR, "CATHERAL DICTIONARY", WETBREDGE, ENGLAND: Intercession (Mediation); Irvingites; Larcodaire, Jean-Baptiste-Henri-Dominique.
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SCHIEID, N., S.J., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Ilsa, Jose Francisco de; Klinkowstrom, Friedrich August von; Joseph von; and Max von; Kpbler, Andreas.

SCHETS, JOSEPH, EISEN NEAR BREDA, HOLLAND: Kings, Third and Fourth Books of.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, O.F.M., ST. LUDWIG'S COLLEGE, DALHEIM, GERMANY: Jansen, Cornelius, the Elder; John of Bicallo; John of Vlce; John of Winterthur; Jordanis; Jovius, Paulus; Kaiserchronik; Kerensenbroch, Hermann von; Kloppe, Onno; Königshofen, Jacob; Lambeck, Peter; Lambert of St. Berti.

SCHREINER, CHRYSTOSTOM, O.S.B., NASSAU, BAHAMA ISLANDS: Jackson, Henry Moore.

SCHROEKER, JOSEPH, O.P., DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: John of Falkenberg.

SHELDEN, THOMAS EDWARD, Ph.D., ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON: Instinct.

SHIPMAN, ANDREW J., M.A., LL.M., NEW YORK: Kiehe, Dioecese of; Kromer, Martin.

SHORTER, JOSEPH A., LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS: Kansas.

SLATER, T. S., ST. BENOIT'S COLLEGE, ST. ASAPH, WALES: Justice.


SMITH, IGNATIUS, O.P., DOMINICAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, WASHINGTON: John of Avila, Blessed; Labat, Jean-Baptiste.


SORTAIS, GASTON, S.J., ASSISTANT EDITOR, "ETUDES", PARIS: Kaufmann, Angelica.


SPAHN, MARTIN, Ph.D., PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY, STRASBURG: Jacke, Karl Ernst; Kulturkampf.

STEEL, FRANCESCA M., STRoud, GLOUCESTERSHIRE, ENGLAND: Joseph, Sisters of Saint (English Branch); Joseph, Sisters of Saint, of Cluny; Joseph, Sisters of Saint, of the Apparition; Joseph, Sisters of Saint, of the Sacred Heart.

STE. EUPHÉMIE, MOTHER, NEW YORK: Jesus-Mary, Religious of.

TACCHI VENTURI, LOUIS, LL.D., COMMANDARE OF THE ORDER OF THE CROWN OF ITALY, ROME: Italy.

TARNOWSKI, COUNT STANISLAUS, PRESIDENT OF THE IMPERIAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, PROFESSOR OF POLISH LITERATURE, UNIVERSITY OF CRACOW, AUSTRIA: Kalinka, Valerian; Kiesak, Julius; Kochanowski, Jan; Kochowski, Vespasian; Konarski, Stanislaus; Konstanin, Stanislaus and John; Krasicki, Ignatius; Krasinski, Sigismund; Krzycki, Andrew.

THADDEUS, FATHER, O.F.M., LONDON: John Forest, Blessed.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., LONDON: Januarius, Saint; Joan of Arc, Blessed; Jubilee, Holy Year of; Kiss: Lamp and Lampadarii; Lance, The Holy.

TIVAN, EDWARD P., S.J., PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY AND GEOLOGY, FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK: Jacquier, Francois.

TOOHEY, JOHN J., S.J., INNSBRUCK, AUSTRIA: Kleutgen, Josef Wilhelm Karl.

TRACY, FRANK M., B.A., LL.B., COVINGTON, KENTUCKY: Kentucky.

TURNER, JOSEPH OSWALD, C.J., PRESIDENT, ST. GEORGE'S COLLEGE, WETWIDGE, ENGLAND: Josephites.


VAILLÉ, SIMEON, A.A., MEMBER OF THE RUSSIAN ARCHEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF CONSTANTINOPLE, PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY, GREEK CATHOLIC SEMINARY OF KADI-KEUI, CONSTANTINOPLE: Ionopolis; Ipsi; Irenopolis; Isaac of Armenia; Isauro; Isonada; Ispahan; Issus; Jaffa; Jassus; Jassy, Dioecese of; Julipolis; Justinianopolis; Kerkuk, Dioecese of; Kharput.

VAN HOVE, A., D.C.L., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY AND CANON LAW, UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN: Installation; Institution, Canonical; Investiture, Canonical; Lancelotti, Giovanni Paolo.

VAN ORTROY, FRANCIS, S.J., BRUSSELS: John Francis Regis, Saint.

VERMEERSCH, ARTHUR, S.J., LL.D., DOCTOR OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, PROFESSOR OF MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW, ST. JOHN BERCHEM'S COLLEGE, LOUVAIN: Interest.
CONTRIBUTORS TO THE EIGHTH VOLUME

VIETER, HEINRICH, P.S.M., TITULAR BISHOP OF PARESTONIUM, VICAR APOSTOLIC OF KAMERUN, AFRICA: Kamerun (Cameroons), Vicariate Apostolic of.

WAINEWRIGHT, JOHN BANNERMAN, B.A. (OXON.), LONDON: Inglesby, Francis, Venerable; Ingram, John, Venerable; Ireland, William, Venerable; James Thompson, Blessed; John Felton, Blessed; John Houghton, Blessed; John Larke, Blessed; John Nelson, Blessed; John Payne, Blessed; John Stone, Blessed; John Story, Blessed; Kemble, John, Venerable; Lambert, Joseph, Venerable; Langhorne, Richard, Venerable.

WALLAU, HEINRICH WILHELM, MAINZ, GERMANY: Koberger, Anthony.

WALSH, JAMES J., M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., DEAN OF THE MEDICAL SCHOOL, FORDHAM UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK: Infanticide; Insane, Asylums and Care for the; Kneipp, Sebastian; Laennec, René-Théophile-Hyacinthe.


WILHELM, BALTHASAR, S.J., STELLA MATUTINA COLLEGE, FELDKIRCH, AUSTRIA: Lada, Francesco.

WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, LITT.D., LONDON: Iriarte, Ignacio de; Itenbach, Frans; Janssens, Abraham; Jesurut, Edmond; Joest, Jan; Kager, Johann Matthias; Kalcker, Jan Stephanus van; La Fosse, Charles de; Lanfranco, Giovanni.

WITTMAN, PIUS, PH.D., BÜDINGEN, GERMANY: Lapland and Lapps.

WOLFSGRUBER, COELESTINE, O.S.B., VIENNA: Kiel, Melchior.


ZIMMERMAN, BENEDICT, O.D.C., ST. LUKE’S PRIORY, WINCANTON, SOMERSETSHIRE, ENGLAND: John of the Cross, Saint.

ZIMMERMAN, OTTO, S.J., BELLEVUE, LUXEMBURG, LUXEMBURG: Infinity.
Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of The Catholic Encyclopedia in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article Abbreviations, Ecclesiastical.

I.—General Abbreviations.

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

tr. translation or translated. By itself it means "English translation", or "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.

tr., tract. tractate.

v. see (Lat. vide).

Ven. Venerable.


II.—ABBREVIATIONS OF TITLES.

Acta SS. Acta Sanctorum (Bollandists).


Hast., Dict. of the Bible Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.

Kirchenlex. Wetzer and Welte, Kirchenlexicon.

P. G. Migne (ed.), Patres Graeci.

P. L. Migne (ed.), Patres Latinæ.

Vig., Dict. de la Bible, Vigouroux (ed.), Dictionnaire de la Bible.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontispiece in Colour</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent X—Velazquez</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription of Abercius</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland—Ross Castle, Killarney, etc</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland—The Cathedral, Thurles, etc</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moore and others</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convent of St. Catherine, Mt. Sinai</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy—Plate I</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy—Plate II</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivories</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Januarius</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuji-san (Peerless Mount), Volcano of Japan</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jerome</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Head of Christ in Art</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan of Arc</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed John Fisher</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Evangelist—Domenichino</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Judgment—Michelangelo</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith with the Head of Holofernes—Allori</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page of the Book of Kells</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adoration of the Lamb—Brothers Van Eyck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christendom at the Death of Innocent III</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Infamy (Lat. infamia, fame) is the name of a good thing. When this has been brought about by regular legal process, terminating in a conviction in a court of justice, no injury is done to the criminal by publishing the fact. The same thing can be said when the scandalous repute in which a person is held is matter of common knowledge. The canon law seems to require a pre-existing public opinion against an individual before the investigation in a judicial inquiry cannull it. The same is true in many particular cases. Infamy in the canonical sense is defined as the privation or lessening of one's good name as the result of the bad rating which he has, even among prudent men. It constitutes an irregularity, i.e., a canonical impediment which prevents one being ordained or exercising such orders as he may have already received.

It is twofold in species, infamy of law (infamia juris) and infamy of fact (infamia facti). Infamy of law is contracted in one of three ways. Either the law itself attaches this juridical Ineligibility and incapacity to the commission of certain crimes, or makes it contingent upon the decision of a judge, or finally connects it with the penalty imposed by him. This kind of infamy is incurred chiefly by those guilty of dwelling (whether as principals or seconds), rape (as likewise those who co-operate in it), attempt to marry during the lifetime of the actual consort, heresy, real simony, etc. Infamy of law may be removed either by canonical purging or by application to the Holy See. Infamy of fact is the result of a widespread opinion, by which the community attributes some unusually serious delinquency, such as adultery or the like, to a person. This is more of an unfitness than an irregularity properly so called, unless sentence in court has been pronounced. It ceases therefore when one has shown by a change of life extending over a period of two or probably three years that his repentance is sincere.

Infant Baptism. See Baptism.

Infanticide, child-murder, the killing of an infant before or after birth. According to the French Criminal Code the words are limited to the murder of the new-born infant. In English it has been used for the deprivation of life from the moment of conception up to the age of two or three years. Except under Hebrew and Christian law, the killing of very young children by their parents has almost invariably been either legally permitted or at least practised with impunity. Economic reasons more than any others had led to the killing of infants before or after birth and have continued to exert an unfortunate influence even down to our own day. In Oriental countries certain poetic and religious traditions were appealed to in justification of the custom of killing infants, but as a rule the economic basis for it is clear. In many countries it was the custom to get rid of many of the female infants because they were unproductive and generally expensive, members of the family. Sometimes usage required large dowries to be given with them. In India infanticide continued to be practised until far into the nineteenth century, notwithstanding the efforts of the British Government to put an end to it. In Greece and Rome, even at the height of their culture, the custom of exposing infants prevailed, and in China and Japan delicate or deformed children were abandoned, or even healthy females, where there were male children in the family. Missionaries have done much to break up the custom and many children have been saved by them in the last few generations to be reared in the light of Christianity. Christianity first opposed a formal and effective barrier to infanticide. Immediately after the Emperor Constantine's conversion he enacted two laws (about A.D. 320) directed against child-murder which are still found in the Theodosian Code (lib. XI, tit. xxvii). The first, to remove temptation, provided funds out of the imperial treasury for parents overburdened with children; the second accorded all the rights of property of exposed infants to those who had had the charity to save and nurture them.

In modern times even in Christian countries two causes have led to post-natal infanticide: one, the disgrace attendant upon illegitimacy; the other, an economic reason. Illegitimate children were sacrificed partly for the concealment of shame, but often to escape the burden of the child's support. The crime occurs most frequently where illegitimacy is most frequent and, according to statistics, is least common in Ireland. In countries where children are readily received without question into institutions, infanticide is rare. In France the law forbids inquiry into paternity, and arrangements are made for the state care of the children. In Russia even more liberal provision is made for the state care of any child whose parents cannot or will not care for it. The question of child-murder by mothers has always been a difficult legal problem. Under a statute of James I of England, the mother had to account for the death of her infant or be held responsible for it. In 1803 trials for infanticide were placed under the ordinary rules of evidence. The presumption now is that every new-born child found dead was born dead unless the contrary is proved. This rule of English law holds in the United States. Infanticide has been quite common in European countries during the nineteenth century for two sordid reasons: one was the neglect of infants in the process of what was known as baby-farming, the other was the desire to obtain insurance money. The latter has been regulated in various ways, but baby-farming and child-insurance still seriously increase the death-rate among infants.

Pre-natal Infanticide, the murder of an infant before birth. This is more properly called foeticide.

VIII.—1
Academy under Pomponio Leto (op. cit., II, 322 sqq.). He is particularly well known as the author of a work, partly Latin and partly Italian, the "Diarium urbis Romae" (Diario della Città di Roma), a chronicle of the city from 1294 to 1419. The work is not of special value until the time of Martin V and Eugene IV, or rather until the pontificates of Paul II (1464-71), Sixtus IV (1471-84), Innocent VIII (1484-1492), and the first part of the reign of Alexander VI. The antipapal and republican temper of the author, also Saint John of Colonna, and his personal animosity, led him to indulge in very severe charges and violent accusations of the popes, especially Sixtus IV. He put down in his chronicle every fragment of the most preposterous and malevolent gossip current in Roman society; even obvious falsehoods are attributed to him. He is therefore not considered a reliable chronicler. It is with the greatest caution and after very careful criticism that his work can be used for the papal history of his time.

The "Diarium" was first edited by Ecurd (Corpus historiæ medii evi, II, 1863-1916); afterwards, with omission of the most scandalous parts, by Muratori (Scriptores rerum Italianarum, III, ii, 1111-1232). A critical edition of the text is owing to Tommasini, "Diario della Città di Roma di Stefano Infessura scrissonato" (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, VI, Rome, 1880).

**Infedels** (Lat. in, privative, and fidelis).—As in ecclesiastical language those who by baptism have received faith in Jesus Christ and have pledged Him their fidelity are called the faithful, so the name infidel is given to those who have not been baptized. The term applies not only to all who are ignorant of the true God, such as pagans of various kinds, but also to those who adore Him but do not recognize Jesus Christ, as Jews, Mohammedans; strictly speaking it may be used of catechumens also, though in early ages they were called Christians; for it is only through baptism that one can enter the ranks of the faithful. Those however who have been baptized but do not conform to the teaching of the Catholic Church, whether from the heresies of diverse confessions, or not called infidels but non-Catholics. The relation in which all these classes stand to the Catholic Church is not the same; in principle, those who have been baptized are subjects of the Church and her children even though they be rebellious children; they are under her laws or, at least, are exempt from them only so far as pleases the Church. Infidels, on the contrary, are not members of the ecclesiastical society, according to the words of St. Paul: "Quid mihi de his qui foris sunt, judicare?" (I Cor., v, 12); they are entirely exempt from the canon law; they are presumed ignorant, not rebellious; they need to be enlightened and converted, not punished. Needless to say, infidels do not belong to the supernatural state; if they receive supernatural graces from God, it is not through the channels established by Jesus Christ for Christians, but by a direct personal inspiration, for instance, the grace of conversion. But their condition is not morally bad; negative infidelity, says St. Thomas (II-II, q. x a. 1), does not partake of the nature of sin, but rather of punishment, in the sense that ignorance of the Faith is a consequence of original sin. That is why the sentence of the Church of the Pope against Nicholas V (1453), which aimed at overturning the papal Government and making Rome a republic (Pastor, "Gesch. der Päpste", 4th ed., I, 555 sqq.). Infessura also belonged to the antipapal faction, formed among the paganizing Humanists of the Roman

**Infessura, Stefano:** b. at Rome about 1435; d. about 1500. He devoted himself to the study of law, took the degree of Doctor of Laws, and acquired a solid legal knowledge. He was for a while judge in Orte, whence he came to the Roman University as professor of Roman law. Under Sixtus IV (1471-84) his office was affected by the financial measures of that pope, who frequently withheld the income of the Roman University, applied it to other uses, and reduced the salaries of the professors. Infessura was also for a long time secretary of the Roman Senate. He was appointed by the Emperor Frederick III to the commission against Nicholas V (1453), which aimed at overturning the papal Government and making Rome a republic (Pastor, "Gesch. der Päpste", 4th ed., I, 555 sqq.). Infessura also belonged to the antipapal faction, formed among the paganizing Humanists of the Roman

**Infessura, Stefano:***
sin against faith, the most grievous of all sins, apostasy. Being endowed with reason, and subject to natural law, infidels are not excluded from the moral order; they can perform acts of natural virtue; and so the ecclesiastical authorities had to condemn proposition xxxv of Baius which declared that: "Omnia quae velint nescire velint esse aut cognoscere vel ignorare virtutes vitii" (all works of infidels are sinful, and all the virtues of the philosophers are vices; cf. St. Thomas, loc. cit., a. 4; Hurter, "Theol. dogm.", III, thee, cxviii and cxvii). Daily experience moreover proves incontestably that there are infidels who are really religious and pious, who have a devotion towards God in their business, and faithful to their family duties. One can say of them, as the Scriptures say of Cornelius the centurion, that their prayers and their alms are acceptable to God (Acts, x, 4). It was especially among such well-meaning infidels that the Church of Jesus grew up, and it is from their ranks that she gains her recruits at the present day in missionary lands.

The Church, mindful of the order of the Saviour: "Go, teach all nations" (Matt., xxviii, 12), has always considered the preaching of the Gospel among the infidels and their conversion by her apostolic missionaries as the supreme means of grace. This is the place to recall the history of the missions, from the labours of St. Paul, the greatest of missionaries, and those who gave the light of faith to the Greek and Roman world, and those who converted the barbarian peoples, down through the ages when the phalanxes of religious men rushed to the conquest of the Orient, the Far East, and America, to the present-day pioneers of the religion of Jesus Christ; the multitude of heroes and martyrs and the harvest of souls that have been won to the true Faith. Doubtless, we still are far from having but "one fold and one shepherd"; nevertheless, there is now today a province, or a mission so remote, but has heard the name of Him by whom all men shall be saved and has given children to the Church. The work of the missions is placed, as is well known, under the care and direction of the congregation of cardinals that bears the admirable name "De Propaganda Fide" (for the propagation of the Faith), instituted by Gregory XV in 1622. Ever encouraged and developed by the popes, it is the directing body on whom the evangelical labourers in infidel lands depend. It sends them forth and grants them their powers, it establishes the prefectures Apostolic and the vicariates, and it is the tribunal to whose decision the missionaries submit their controversies, difficulties, and doubts.

Though there is a general obligation on the Church to toil for the conversion of infidels, yet it is not incumbent on any particular persons, unless on those priests charged with the care of souls who have infidels within their territory. For the distant fields of labour of missionaries, priests, members of religious orders, both men and women, who voluntarily offer themselves for the apostolic work, are recruited in Catholic countries. Native Christians are not excluded from the ranks of the clergy, and it is a duty of the missionaries to provide themselves freely with pious and worthy auxiliaries in their missions. To draw the infidels to the Faith, the missionaries ought, like St. Paul, to make themselves all things to all men, to adopt the customs of the country, acquire the native language, establish schools and charitable institutions, preach especially by their example, and by living among them in order to make them see that the Church has come to teach is to be practised (cf. Instr. of the Prop. to the Vicars Apostolic of China, in the "Collectanea Sic. C. de Prop. Fide", n. 328). They and their catechists are to instruct with zeal and patience those who are anxious to know the true religion, admitting them to Baptism only after a long and thorough preparation, as was done in the case of the catechumens in ancient times. But the conversion of infidels must be free and without compulsion, otherwise it will not be genuine and lasting (cap. 9, tit. vi, lib. V, "De Judaeis"). It cannot be denied that at various epochs, notably under Charlemagne and later in Spain, there were forced conversions, which may be explained, though not excused, by the custom of the age; but the Church was not responsible for them, as it has consistently performed the same acts of baptism. On several occasions it expressly forbade the baptism of Jews and infidels against their will, and even the baptism of children without their parents' consent, unless they were in imminent danger of death (cf. Collect. cit., "De subjecto baptismo"). In the rite of administering baptism the Church asks this important question: "Quid petis ab Ecclesia Dei? Vis baptizari?"

Though ecclesiastical law does not affect the acts of infidels as such, yet the Church has to pass judgment on the validity of these acts and their juridical consequences when infidels come within the fold by baptism. No act of an infidel can have any value from the point of view of the spiritual society to which he does not belong; he is incapable by Divine law of receiving the sacraments, notably Holy Orders (evidently we are not speaking here of a purely material reception); nor can he receive or exercise any ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The acts of infidels should not be considered by the Church as acts of faith, but purely as mere human acts of natural law, to which they, like all men, are subject, and in accordance with the Divine law, in so far as it determines the secondary natural law. This applies principally to the case of matrimony. The marriage of infidels is valid as a contract under natural law, not as a sacrament, though at times this word has been applied to it (cf. Encycl. "Aurum"): it is subject only to the impediments of natural law and, at times, to those of the civil law also, but it is not affected by the impediments of canon law. However the Church does not recognize polygamy as lawful among infidels; as affirmative or strictly so called, it admits it only under the form of the "Custodia Amoris", an institution of the College of the Faith or the Pauline privilege; this consists in a convert being permitted to abandon his partner, who remains an infidel, if the latter refuse to continue the common life without endangering the faith of the convert (cf. Divos XIX, I, B, 1); under such circumstances the convert may marry a Catholic. As to acts which are prohibited or void in virtue of canon law alone, they are valid when performed by infidels; thus, the impediment of the remotest degrees of consanguinity and affinity, etc., does not affect the marriages of infidels. But the juridical consequences of the acts, performed by infidels, which exist at the moment of and in virtue of their baptism; consequently, a converted widower may not marry a relative of his late wife without dispensation; and again, a man who has had two wives before his conversion is a bigamist and therefore irregular.

Most of the laws passed by the Church refer to the relations between its subjects and infidels in not only religious but also civil affairs. Speaking generally, the faithful are forbidden to take part in any religious rites, considered as such, of pagans, Mohammedans, or Jews, and all the more to practise them through a sin of survival of their primitive superstitions. If this prohibition is inspired not so much by a fear of the danger of perversity as by the law forbidding the faithful to communicate in sacris with non-Catholics, aversion from false religions and especially from idol worship justifies the rigour of the law. To men who submit to the laws of Islam but the pharaohs, Moses is venerated by the infidels, they are venerated idols, not only in their temples, but also in private houses, to contribute to the building or repairing of pagan temples or of mosques, to carve idols, to join in pagan sacrifices, to assist at Jewish circumcisions, to wear idolatrous images or objects having an acknowledged religious significance, that is to say, images wearing them is looked upon as an act of pagan worship, and finally to make use of superstitious and especially idolatrous practices in the acts of civil or
domestic life. Some very delicate questions may arise in connexion with the last prohibition; for instance, we may recall the celebrated controversy concerning the Chinese rites (see CHINA). On the other hand, it is not forbidden to enter temples and mosques out of mere curiosity, or for religious reasons; food that has been offered to false gods, provided this be not done in a temple or as a sacred repast, and that it be done without scandal; or to observe customs or perform acts which are not in themselves religious, even though pagans join superstitious practices to them. Nor is it forbidden, but it is permissible and one might say obligatory to pray even publicly for infidel princes, in order that God may grant their subjects peace and prosperity; nothing is more conformable to the tradition of the Church; thus Catholics of the different rites in the Ottoman Empire pray for the sultan.

In this place mention may be made of the ecclesiastical law forbidding the faithful to marry infidels, a prohibition which is now a diriment impediment, rendering a marriage null and void unless a dispensation has been obtained (see DISPARITY OF WORSHIP). It is essentially a rule of the formal religious life of the Catholic party in the intimacy of married life and in the difficulties in the way of a Christian education of the children; and, if that party be the wife, in the excessive authority of the husband and the inferior condition of the wife in infidel countries, it is dispensed with difficulty and when the precautions dictated by prudence have been taken. The laws regulating the dealings between Catholics and infidels in civil life were inspired also by religious motives, the danger of perversion, and the high idea entertained in the state of the superiority of the Church to infidels. These regulations, of course, did not refer to all acts of civil life; moreover, they were not directed against all infidels indiscriminately, but only against Jews; at the present day they have fallen almost completely into desuetude. In the early Middle Ages, Jews were forbidden to have Christian slaves; the laws of the decretales forbade Christians to enter the service of Jews, or Christian women to act as their nurses or midwives; moreover, Christians when ill were not to have recourse to Jewish physicians. These measures may be useful in certain countries to-day and we find them renewed, at least as recommendations, by recent councils (Council of Gram, in 1570; Utrecht, in 1860; and Utrecht, in 1865). As for the Jews, they were ordinarily restricted to certain definite quarters of the towns into which they were admitted, and had to wear a dress by which they might be recognized. Modern legislation has given the Jews the same rights as other citizens and the intercourse between them and Catholics in civil life is no longer governed by ecclesiastical law. (See Jews and Judaism; Mohammed and Mohammadanism.)


A. BOUDINHOI.

Infinity (Lat. infinitas; in, not, finis, the end, the boundary) is a concept of the utmost importance in Christian philosophy and theology.

Definition.—The infinite, as the word indicates, is that which has no end, no limit, and therefore cannot be measured by a finite standard, however often applied; it is that which cannot be attained by successive addition, nor exhausted by successive subtraction; it is an abstract concept in itself a negative term, infinity has a very positive meaning. Since it denies all bounds—which are themselves negations—it is a double negation, hence an affirmation, and expresses positively the highest, unsurpassable reality. Like the concepts of quantity, limit, boundary, the term infinity applies primarily to space and time, but not exclusively as Schopenhauer maintains. In a derived meaning it may be applied to every kind of perfection: wisdom, beauty, power, the fulness, of the good, of the food that has been offered to false gods, provided this be not done in a temple or as a sacred repast, and that it be done without scandal; or to observe customs or perform acts which are not in themselves religious, even though pagans join superstitious practices to them. Nor is it forbidden, but it is permissible, and one might say obligatory to pray even publicly for infidel princes, in order that God may grant their subjects peace and prosperity; nothing is more conformable to the tradition of the Church; thus Catholics of the different rites in the Ottoman Empire pray for the sultan.

In this place mention may be made of the ecclesiastical law forbidding the faithful to marry infidels, a prohibition which is now a diriment impediment, rendering a marriage null and void unless a dispensation has been obtained (see DISPARITY OF WORSHIP). It is essentially a rule of the formal religious life of the Catholic party in the intimacy of married life and in the difficulties in the way of a Christian education of the children; and, if that party be the wife, in the excessive authority of the husband and the inferior condition of the wife in infidel countries, it is dispensed with difficulty and when the precautions dictated by prudence have been taken. The laws regulating the dealings between Catholics and infidels in civil life were inspired also by religious motives, the danger of perversion, and the high idea entertained in the state of the superiority of the Church to infidels. These regulations, of course, did not refer to all acts of civil life; moreover, they were not directed against all infidels indiscriminately, but only against Jews; at the present day they have fallen almost completely into desuetude. In the early Middle Ages, Jews were forbidden to have Christian slaves; the laws of the decretales forbade Christians to enter the service of Jews, or Christian women to act as their nurses or midwives; moreover, Christians when ill were not to have recourse to Jewish physicians. These measures may be useful in certain countries to-day and we find them renewed, at least as recommendations, by recent councils (Council of Gram, in 1570; Utrecht, in 1860; and Utrecht, in 1865). As for the Jews, they were ordinarily restricted to certain definite quarters of the towns into which they were admitted, and had to wear a dress by which they might be recognized. Modern legislation has given the Jews the same rights as other citizens and the intercourse between them and Catholics in civil life is no longer governed by ecclesiastical law. (See Jews and Judaism; Mohammed and Mohammadanism.)


A. BOUDINHOI.

Infinity (Lat. infinitas; in, not, finis, the end, the boundary) is a concept of the utmost importance in Christian philosophy and theology.

Definition.—The infinite, as the word indicates, is that which has no end, no limit, and therefore cannot be measured by a finite standard, however often applied; it is that which cannot be attained by successive addition, nor exhausted by successive subtraction; it is an abstract concept in itself a negative term, infinity has a very positive meaning. Since it denies all bounds—which are themselves negations—it is a double negation, hence an affirmation, and expresses positively the highest, unsurpassable reality. Like the concepts of quantity, limit, boundary, the term infinity applies primarily to space and time, but not exclusively as Schopenhauer maintains. In a derived meaning it may be applied to every kind of perfection: wisdom, beauty, power, the fulness, of the good, of the food that has been offered to false gods, provided this be not done in a temple or as a sacred repast, and that it be done without scandal; or to observe customs or perform acts which are not in themselves religious, even though pagans join superstitious practices to them. Nor is it forbidden, but it is permissible, and one might say obligatory to pray even publicly for infidel princes, in order that God may grant their subjects peace and prosperity; nothing is more conformable to the tradition of the Church; thus Catholics of the different rites in the Ottoman Empire pray for the sultan.

In this place mention may be made of the ecclesiastical law forbidding the faithful to marry infidels, a prohibition which is now a diriment impediment, rendering a marriage null and void unless a dispensation has been obtained (see DISPARITY OF WORSHIP). It is essentially a rule of the formal religious life of the Catholic party in the intimacy of married life and in the difficulties in the way of a Christian education of the children; and, if that party be the wife, in the excessive authority of the husband and the inferior condition of the wife in infidel countries, it is dispensed with difficulty and when the precautions dictated by prudence have been taken. The laws regulating the dealings between Catholics and infidels in civil life were inspired also by religious motives, the danger of perversion, and the high idea entertained in the state of the superiority of the Church to infidels. These regulations, of course, did not refer to all acts of civil life; moreover, they were not directed against all infidels indiscriminately, but only against Jews; at the present day they have fallen almost completely into desuetude. In the early Middle Ages, Jews were forbidden to have Christian slaves; the laws of the decretales forbade Christians to enter the service of Jews, or Christian women to act as their nurses or midwives; moreover, Christians when ill were not to have recourse to Jewish physicians. These measures may be useful in certain countries to-day and we find them renewed, at least as recommendations, by recent councils (Council of Gram, in 1570; Utrecht, in 1860; and Utrecht, in 1865). As for the Jews, they were ordinarily restricted to certain definite quarters of the towns into which they were admitted, and had to wear a dress by which they might be recognized. Modern legislation has given the Jews the same rights as other citizens and the intercourse between them and Catholics in civil life is no longer governed by ecclesiastical law. (See Jews and Judaism; Mohammed and Mohammadanism.)


A. BOUDINHOI.
The actually infinite, however, is now and at every moment complete, absolute, entirely determined. The immeasurable, omnipresent spirit does not advance from point to point without end, but is constantly everywhere, fills every "beyond" of every assignable point. Hegel calls potential infinity the improper (schlechtes), actual infinity the true infinity. The true concept of God—an omnipresent being in every respect is Catholic dogma. In accordance with Holy Writ (III Kings, vii, 27; Ps. cxiv, 3; cxvii; Is., xxxii, 29 sqq.; Luke, i, 37, etc.) and unanimous tradition, the Vatican Council at its Third Session (cap. i) declared God to be almighty, eternal, incomprehensible, omnipresent, and in every respect completely distinct from the world, infinitely blessed in Himself and through Himself, and inexpressibly above all things that can exist and be thought of besides Him. The infinity of God may also be proved from philosophy. God is the self-existing, uncreated Being, whose entire explanation must be in Himself, in whom there can be no trace of change; but if it would be mere chance, if God possessed only a finite degree of perfection, for, however high that degree might be, everything in the uncreated Being—His perfections, His individuality—is best admitted the possibility of His possessing a still higher degree of entirety. From outside of Himself God cannot be limited, because, being uncreated, He is absolutely independent of external causes and conditions. Limitation would be chance; the more so because we can maintain not only that any given finite degree of perfection may be surpassed, but also, in a positive way, that an infinite being is possible. Moreover, if God were finite, the existence of other gods, His equals or even His superiors in perfection, would be possible, and it would be mere chance if they did not exist. Of such a creative Being we can say nothing; on the other hand, God's infinity is suggested by various data of experience, and in particular by our unbounded longing after knowledge and happiness. The more man a man is and the more he follows his best thoughts and impulses, the less he is satisfied with merely finite cognitions and pleasures. That the essential cravings of our nature are not deceptive, is demonstrated at once by experience and speculation.

From the infinity of God it is easy to deduce all His perfections: His unity, simplicity, immutability, etc., though these may be proved also by other means. Man and angels are nothing else than the His infinity in a particular respect, e.g., His omnipotence is but the infinity of His power; His omniscience, the infinity of His knowledge. Whatever is known to be a pure unalloyed perfection, must be an attribute of God on account of His infinity. We say a pure unalloyed perfection; for God, just because He is infinite, does not possess all the parts in the same way. Only pure perfections—e.g., those which include in their concept no trace of imperfection whatsoever—are contained in Him formally. We must therefore ascribe to Him the attributes wise, powerful, amiable etc., without any restriction, because these are all pure perfections. Of the so-called mixed perfections, which include besides the positive reality also some imperfections, as, e.g., extension, contrition, courage, sound reasoning, and clear judgment, He possesses only the perfection without the connected imperfection. His is, for example, the all-pervading presence without concomitant limitation to the greater or permitted sin; power without having to overcome fear; knowledge without formal reasoning or formal judgment. He possesses therefore the mixed perfections in a higher form—eminently, i. e. in the only form which is worthy of the infinite. But even the pure perfections—e.g., a Manichean power, a God who is not outside the infinite God, because it would limit His absolute perfections. This is the time-honoured proof for analogically only, not univocally. The error of Anthropomorphism consists just in this, that it ascribes to God human perfections, without first refining them; whereas Agnosticism errs in its contention that, of all the pure and good qualities which are found in creatures, none can be ascribed to God. Those modern writers too are mistaken, who hold the best form of an intellect and will and every perfection, really and essentially distinct from the world, infinitely blessed in Himself and through Himself, and inexpressibly above all things that can exist and be thought of besides Him. The infinity of God may also be proved from philosophy. God is the self-existing, uncreated Being, whose entire explanation must be in Himself, in whom there can be no trace of change; but it would be mere chance, if God possessed only a finite degree of perfection, for, however high that degree might be, everything in the uncreated Being—His perfections, His individuality—is best admitted the possibility of His possessing a still higher degree of entirety. From outside of Himself God cannot be limited, because, being uncreated, He is absolutely independent of external causes and conditions. Limitation would be chance; the more so because we can maintain not only that any given finite degree of perfection may be surpassed, but also, in a positive way, that an infinite being is possible. Moreover, if God were finite, the existence of other gods, His equals or even His superiors in perfection, would be possible, and it would be mere chance if they did not exist. Of such a creative Being we can say nothing; on the other hand, God's infinity is suggested by various data of experience, and in particular by our unbounded longing after knowledge and happiness. The more man a man is and the more he follows his best thoughts and impulses, the less he is satisfied with merely finite cognitions and pleasures. That the essential cravings of our nature are not deceptive, is demonstrated at once by experience and speculation.
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the unity of God, the grand thought of Tertullian (Adv. Marcion. I. iii), "If God is not one, He is not at all." But that besides God there are creatures of His, reflections from His light, illumined only by Him and in no way diminishing His light, does not limit God Himself. God, on the contrary, would be finite, if His creatures were identical with Him. For creatures are essentially different from God; they are not self-determined: infinite is only that which is pure perfection without any admixture of imperfection. If, therefore, one wants to form the equation: infinite = all, it must be interpreted: infinite = everything uncreated; or better still: infinite = all pure perfections in the highest degree. Thus the thesis that there is a reality, viz. that there can be no reality besides the infinite, this equation is wrong. The identification, however, of "infinite" and "all" is very old, and served as a basis of the Eleatic philosophy.

Another very common objection of Monists against the theistic conception of God is, that being personal, He cannot be infinite. For personality, whether conceived as individuality or as self-consciousness or as resultant being, cannot exist without something else as its opposite; but, wherever there is something else, there is no infinity. Both premises of this argument are false. To assert that the modern Protestant conception of the God of the Church is destitute of divine perfection is to make of God the non-God—to use the expression of Fichte—necessary, and that of the self-consciousness of the Deity to a certain degree of the non-God, i.e. of something as not-myself. The subsistence of intellectual beings, i.e. personality in the strictest sense of the word, implies only that I am a being and for myself, separate from everything else and in no way part of anything else. This would be true, even though nothing else existed; in fact, it would then be truer than ever. Far from excluding personality God is personal in the deepest and truest meaning, because He is the most independent Being, by Himself and in Himself the most self-existent self (see supra). 

Hirnox—Concerning the philosophers before Aristotle, Suares pertinently remarks that they "sensed" the infinity of God (subodorationem Dei). In many of them we meet the infinity of God or of the First Cause, though in many cases it be only infinity in extension. Plato and Aristotle assert in substance the infinity of the Highest Being in a more adequate sense, though blended with errors and obscurities. The Stoics had various ideas that would have led them to admit the infinity of God, had not their Pantheism stood in the way. The conceptions of Philo's Jewish-Alexandrian mysticism must be said to a certain degree of the neo-Platonism of Plotinus, who was largely influenced by Philo. Plotinus originated the tense and trenchant argument: God is not limited; for what should limit Him? ("Enn. V," lib. V, in "Opera omnia," Oxford, 1888, p. 97) If God has a limit, however, it may be objected that true infinity is a little nearer to reality with his doctrine of emanations as with the more or less pantheistic tendencies of the Indian philosophy.

The Christian writers took their concepts of the infinity of God from the Bible; the speculative development of the Christian doctrine, however, is due to St. Augustine, being well acquainted with Platonic philosophy, recognized that whatever could be greater, could not be the First Being. Candidus, a contemporary of Charlemagne, perceived that the limitations of all finite beings point towards a Creator, Who determines the degrees of their perfection. Abelard seems to teach that God, being superior to everything else in the reason of His existence, must also be greater in His perfections. A book, which is sometimes ascribed to him, "De perfecta Dei" determines the degrees of the perfections which It has, in the highest possible degree and without any limitations, is developed in numberless text-books, and so far nobody has brought a serious objection against it." ("Gesammelte Schriften," II, Leipzig, 1893, p. 355). Kant's attempt to stigmatize the deduction of infinity from self-existence as a return to the ontological argument, was a failure; for our deduction starts from the actually existing God, not from mere ideas, as the ontological argument does. Among Christians, the dogma itself has been rarely denied, but the freer tendencies of the Thirty-Nine Articles etc., and the views of some champions of Modernism in the Catholic Church, are in fact, though not always in expression, opposed to the infinity of God.

INFINITY OF CREATURES.—The knowledge we have about the infinity of creatures leaves much to be desired. It is certain that no creature is infinite in every regard. However great it may be, it lacks the most essential perfection: self-existence, and whatever is necessarily connected with it. Moreover, philosophers and theologians are practically unanimous in declaring that no creature can be infinite in any essential predicated to the infinite. Thus an accident (e.g. quantity) is capable of infinity, whether the creation could be infinite in extension, whether there can be an infinite number of actual beings, or whether an infinite number is at all possible—as to these questions they are less in harmony, though the majority lean towards the negative answer, and in our time this majority seems to have increased. At any rate the infinite world, of which the old Greek philosophers dreamt and the modern Materialists and Monists talk so much, lacks every proof, and, as to the infinite duration of the world, it is contradicted by the dogma of the finite (see supra).

The mathematicians too occupy themselves with the infinite, both with the infinitely small and the infinitely large, in the treatises on infinite series, and infinitesimal calculus, and generally in all limit operations. The infinitely small is represented by the sign 0, the infinitely large by oo, and their relation is expressed by the ratio 1 = oo. All mathematicians agree as to the method of operating with the two quantities; but there is much division amongst philosophers and philosophising mathematicians as to their real meaning. The least subject to difficulties are perhaps the following two: The infinitesimal in mathematics may be taken as the potential infinite, i.e. that which can be increased or diminished without end; in this view it is a real quantity, capable of existence. Or one may take it as the actually infinite, viz. that by actual successive addition or division cannot be reached. In this view it is something which can never be expressed in any finite number of steps, the possibility of whose existence we at best asssume. It is a limit which exists only as a fiction of the mind (esse rationis). Or if the infinitely small is considered as an absolute zero, but connoting different values, it is really a limit, but as far as the quantity is regarded it connotes other than zero. Thus, at times Leibniz calls both the infinitely small and the infinitely large fictions of the
mind (mens' fictiones) and compares them to imaginary quantities. Cannot call the differential an être de raison; Gauss speaks of a façon de parler.

The value regarded as the infinitesimal of God and infinity in creatures is discussed by philosophers in treatises on general metaphysics, natural philosophy and natural theology, by theologians in the treatises on the One God (De Deo Uno), especially: St. Thomas, Summa Theol., I, q. vii; Centro got., 1, xiiii; Summa Metaphys., 1, xvi.; Grotefend, Das Universum, 4, 112.; Idem, Der Kosmos (Paderborn, 1868); Hohe, Das Problem d. Unendlich in Katholik (1880); Idem, Das Infinitum in der christlichen Weltanschauung (1888-1893); Forster, The Concept of the Infinite (Philadelphia, 1867); Rothe, The Concept of the Infinite in August Jour. (1902); Haen, Synthese d. Religion, 3, 23; Knebel, Religionsgesch., II (Berlin, 1900-1902), 1-5. See also literature under God; Fossil; World.

Otto Zimmerman.

INFRALEPSARIANS

Infralepsarians (Lat., infra lapsum, after the fall), the name given to a party of Dutch Calvinists in the seventeenth century, who sought to mitigate the rigour of Calvin's doctrine concerning absolute predestination. As already explained (see Calvinism), the system evolved by Calvin is essentially supralepsarian. The fundamental principle once admitted, that all events in this world proceed from the eternal decrees of God, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the fall of man was not merely foreseen and permitted, as the Catholic doctrine teaches, but positively decreed, as a necessary means to the Divine end in creating man, the manifestation of God's power in condemning, as well as of His mercy in saving, souls. It was this corollary of Calvinism, viz., that God created some men for the express purpose of showing His power through their eternal damnation, that brought on the troubles associated with the name of Arminius (see ARMINTIANISM). In their controversies with opponents, within and without the pale of Calvinism, the Infralepsarians had the advantage of being able to use, or abuse, for the purpose of argument, the texts of Scripture and the Fathers which establish the dogma of original sin. But since, to remain all, they were obliged to reason even if they did not insist upon it, the principle that God's decrees can in no wise be influenced or conditioned by anything outside of Himself, the difference between them and the more outspoken Supralepsarians seems to have consisted simply in a divergent phrasing of the same mystery. To the soul which is familiarized with eternal misery without any prevision of its personal demerits, it matters little whether the decree of condemnation date from all eternity or—

“Five thousand years 'fore its creation,
Through Adam's cause.'

James F. Loughlin.

Taghiromi, Giovanni, Italian astronomer, b. at Volterra, Tuscany, 16 April, 1779; d. at Florence, 15 August, 1851. He was of a noble family which produced two other distinguished scholars, Tommaso (1470-1518), humanist, and Francesco (1772-1846), archbishop, the brother of Giovanni. His education was received in his native city at the College of Saint Michael, conducted by the Friars, popularly called the "Scolopi." This order he joined at the age of seventeen, and later became professor of mathematics and philosophy at Volterra, where one of his pupils was the future Pius IX. In 1805 he travelled in the north of Italy, and was engaged for some months in scientific work at Milan. He was called to Florence to fill the twofold office of professor of mathematics and astronomy at the College of the Scolopi, known from the adjacent church as the College of San Giovanniino, now of Santa Maria Novella, conducted by the Jesuit, Leonardo Ximenes. His first publications were articles on hydraulics, statics, and astronomy, astronomical tables, and elementary text-books on mathematics and mathematical geography. In 1830, after observations extending over fourteen years, he published, with the patronage of the Grand Duke Ferdinand III, a "Carta topografica e geometrica della Toscana," on the scale of 1:200,000—a work of high merit. When the Berlin Academy of Sciences undertook the construction of an exhaustive astronomical atlas, he was assigned a portion. His performance of this task won great praise. He became successively provincial and general of his order, but his failing health and his love for scientific work caused him to resign the latter office, which had required his taking up residence in Rome, and to accept the position of vicar-general. He retired, though almost blind for some years, continued his teaching until a few months before his death. Simplicity and piety were dominant traits of his character. The scientific works of Inghirami include: numerous articles published in the "Astronomische Nachrichten" in Zach's "Monatliche correspondence der Erd- u. Himmelskunde" and in his own "Collezione di opuscoli e notizie di Scienze" (4 vols., Florence, 1820-23); and, especially, "Effemeridi dell' osservazione delle piccole stelle sotto la luna" (ibid., 1809-30); "Tavole Astronomiche universali portatili" (ibid., 1811), and "Effemeridi di Venere che serve ad uso di naviganti pel meridiano di Parigi" (ibid., 1821-24).

Antorelli, Sulla vita e sulla opere di Gio. Inghirami (Florence, 1852)."
INGRAM

on 26 June, 1472, and within the first semester 489 students matriculated. As in other universities prior to the sixteenth century, the faculty of philosophy comprised two sections, the Realists and the Nominalists, each under its own dean. Among the teachers of the University, it was noted that the Ladins and the Georgians for poor students in the faculty of arts, and other foundations for similar purposes were subsequently made. Pope Adrian VI and Clement VII bestowed on the university additional revenues from ecclesiastical property. At the height of the humanism movement, a movement that spread among its teachers a series of remarkable savants and writers: Conrad Celtis, the first poet crowned by the German Emperor; his disciple Jacob Lober, named Philomuseus; Johann Turmair, known as Aventinus from his birthplace, Abensberg, editor of the Annales Boiorum; and of the Bavarian "Chronicon," father of Bavarian history and founder (1507) of the "Sodalitas literaria Anglistidensia." Johannes Reuchlin, restorer of the Hebrew language and literature, was also for a time at the university.

Although Duke William IV (1508-50) and his chancellor, Christoph von Eck, did their utmost during thirty years to keep Lutheranism out of Ingolstadt, and though the adherents of the new doctrine were obliged to retrace or resign, some of the professors joined the Lutheran movement. Their influence, however, was counteracted by the tireless and successful endeavors of the foremost opponent of the Reformation, Dr. Johann Maier, better known as Eck, from the name of his birthplace, Egg, on the Guns. He taught and laboured (1510-43) to such good purpose that Ingolstadt, during the Counter-Reformation, did more than any other university for the defence of the Catholic faith. At the University in Southern Germany what Wittenberg was for Protestantism in the north. In 1549, with the approval of Paul III, Peter Canisius, Salmeron, Claudia Lejay, and other Jesuits were appointed to professorships in theology and philosophy. About the same time a college and a boarding-school for boys were established, though they were not actually opened until 1556, when the statutes of the university were revised. In 1568 the profession of faith in accordance with the Council of Trent was required of the rector and professors. In 1688 the teaching in the faculty of philosophy passed entirely into the hands of the Jesuits.

Though the university after this change, in spite of vexations and conflicts regarding exemption from taxes and jurisdictional autonomy, enjoyed a high degree of prosperity, its existence was frequently imperilled during the troubles of the Thirty Years' War. But its fame as a home of learning was enhanced by men such as the theologian, Gregory of Valentia (g.v.); the controversialist, Jacob Greiser (1588-1610); the mathematician and cartographer, Philip Apian; the astronomer, Christopher Scheiner (1610-1610), who, with the heliocipe invented by him, discovered the sun spots and calculated the time of the sun's rotation after the poet, Joachim Balde, from Enisheim in Alsace, professor of rhetoric. Prominent among the jurists in the seventeenth century was Kaspar Manz and Christopher Berold. During the latter half of that century, and especially in the eighteenth, the courses of instruction were improved and adapted to the requirements of the age. After the founding of the Bavarian Academy of Science at Munich in 1759, an anti-eclesiastical tendency sprang up at Ingolstadt and found an ardent supporter in Joseph Adam, Baron of Ickstatt, whom the elector had placed at the head of the university. Plans, however, were put in motion for the university to be transferred to Munich. Shortly after the celebration of the third centenary the Society of Jesus was suppressed, but some of the ex-Jesuits retained their professorships for a while longer. A movement was inaugurated in 1772 by Adam Weishaupt, professor of canon law, with a view to securing the triumph of the rationalistic "enlightenment" in Church and State by means of the secret society of "Illuminati" (g.v.), which he founded. The organization was suppressed in 1788 by the Elector Maximilian I, and Weishaupt was dismissed. On 25 November, 1799, the Elector Maximilian IV, later King Maximilian I, decreed that the university, which was involved in financial difficulties, should be transferred to Landshut; and this was done in the following May. Among its leading professors to close the college were the Church historian, Schrank the naturalist, and Johann Michael Sailer, writer on moral philosophy and pedagogy, who later became Bishop of Ratisbon.

INGRAM, John, Venerable, English martyr; b. at Stokes Edith, Herefordshire, in 1555; executed at Newcastle-on-Tyne, 26 July, 1594. He was probably the son of Anthony Ingram of Woldford, Warwickshire, by Dorothy, daughter of Sir John Hungerford. He was educated first in Worcestershire, then at the English College, Reims, at the Jesuit College, Pont-a-Mousson, and at the English College, Rome. Ordained at Rome in 1589, he went to Scotland early in 1592, and there frequented the company of Lords Hunity, Angus, and Erroll, the Abbot of Dumfries, and Sir Walter Lindsay of Balgavies. Captured on the Tyne, 25 November, 1593, he was imprisoned successively at Berwick, Durham, York, and London, in which place he suffered the severest tortures with great constancy, and wrote twenty Latin epigrams which have survived. Sent north again, he was imprisoned at York, Newcastle, and Durham, where he was tried in the company of John Boste (g.v.) and George Swainwell, a converted minister. He was convicted under 27 Eliz. c. 2 (which made the mere presence in England of a priest ordained abroad high treason), though there was no evidence that he had ever exercised any priestly function in England. It appears that some one in Scotland in vain offered the English Government a thousand crowns for his life.

INGRES, Jean-Auguste-Dominique, a French painter, b. at Montauban, 29 August, 1780; d. at Paris, 14 January, 1867. His father sent him to study at Toulouse at the age of 15. He came into the famous studio of David, in Paris. Steeped in the theories of Mengs and Winckelman, he had broken away from the conceits and libertinism of the eighteenth century and led art back to nature and the antique. In David's view the antique was but the "first expression of the human mind," a preliterate, transitory, and removed from the caprices of whim and fashion. Ingres accepted his master's programme in its entirety. But what in David's case made up a homogeneous system, answering the twin faculties of his vast and powerful organism, meant quite another thing in Ingres, whose mind was divided into the winter and the summer, with a wondrous sensibility for reality. No one has ever experienced such sharp, penetrating, cut-out impressions with an equal aptitude for transferring them in their entirety to paper or canvas. But
these exceptional gifts were handicapped by an extreme lack of inventiveness and originality. Unfortunately David's teaching filled him with the belief that high art consisted in imitating the antique, and that religion and poetry painted without historical subjects. Throughout his life Ingres did violence to himself to paint scenes of the order of his master's "Sabinus", as he succeeded in doing in his "Achilles receiving the messengers of Agamemnon" (Paris, Ecole des Beaux-Arts), which in 1801 won the "Prix de Rome". But instead of being a living historical or poetical painting, this painting is but a collection of studies, stitched together with effort, and without any real unity of result.

Thus it was that there was always in Ingres a curious contradiction between his temperament and his education, between his ability and his theories. And this secret struggle between his realist longings and his idealistic convictions explains the discords of his work. In the beginning, however, his youth was the main factor. Perhaps, too, his obscurity, the dearth of important orders, and the necessity of earning his living were all in his favour. Never was he greater or more praised during this period of his career (1800-1820). His absolute realism and his intransigence caused him to be looked on in David's school as an eccentric and revolutionary individual. Ingres had been friendly with a Florentine sculptor named Bartolini, and was strongly attracted by the works of the Quattrocento period, and by that art throbbing with life, and almost feverish in its manner of depicting nature, such as we find examples of in the works of Donatello and Filippo Lippi. He grew enthusiastic over archaic schools, over the weird poems of Ossian, over medieval costumes, in a word, over everything by being unconventional seemed to him to draw nearer to reality, or at least gave him new thrills and sensations. He was put down as "Gothic", as an imitator of Jean de Bruges (Jan van Eyck), and all the works he produced at this time bear the mark of oddity. This is especially true of his portraits. Those of "Madame Rivière" (Louvre, 1804), "Granet" (Aix-en-Provence, 1806), "Madame Aymon (La Belle Zélie)" (Rouen, 1806), "Madame Devaunay" (Chantilly, 1807), and of "Madame de Senones" (Nantes, 1810) are unrivalled in all the world, and take a place next to the immortal creations of Titian and Raphael. Never was there a more complete absence of "manner", forgetfulness of set purpose, of systematic or poetical effort, never did a painter give himself up more fully to realism, or submit more absolutely to his model, to the object before him. No work brings home to us more clearly the expression of something definite unless it be those little portrait sketchies drawn by this same artist in the days of his poverty and sold at twenty francs each, and which are now famous as the "Ingres crayons". The finest are to be seen at the Louvre and in the Bonnat Collection at Paris and Bayonne.

In 1806 Ingres set out for Rome, and in the Vatican he saw the frescoes of the greatest of the decorators, the master of the "Parmassus" and the "School of Athens". He at once persuaded himself that this was absolute beauty, and that these paintings held within them formulae and concepts revealing a full definition of art and of its immutable laws. And it is to this mistake of his that we owe not a few of his finest works; for had he not wrongly thought himself a classicist, he would not have felt himself bound to adopt the essential constituent of the classical language, namely, the nude figure. The nude, in modern realism, hints at the unusual; suggests something deep, and seems to take a place in the programme of the realists only as something exceptional. Whereas with Ingres, thanks to the classical idealism of his doctrine, the nude was always a most important and sacred object of study. And to this study he applied, as in all his undertakings, a delicacy and freshness of feeling, an accuracy of observation toned down by a slightly sensual touch of charm, which place these paintings among his most precious works. Never did the joy of drawing and painting a beautiful body, of reproducing it in all the glory and grace of its youth, mastered by a Frenchman to such an extent, nor in a way so akin to the art of the great painters. "Edipus" and the "Girl Bathing" (1808), the "Odalisque" (1814), the "Source" (1818)—all these canvases are in the Louvre—are among the most beautiful poems consecrated to setting forth the noblest meaning of the human figure. And yet they remain but incomparable "studies". The painter is all the while incapable of blending his sensations, of harmonizing them with one another so as to form a fresco.

This same taste for what is quaint led Ingres at this period to produce a host of minor anecdotal or historical works such as "Raphael and the Fornarina", "Francesca da Rimini" (1819, in the Angers Museum), etc., works that at times display the wit, the romance, and the caprice of a quattrocento manner, and more clearly the originality of the other. In work of this order nothing the artist has left us is more complete, the best balanced, the soundest piece of work the master wrought. At this time David, exiled by the Restoration, left the French school without a head, while the Romantic school, with the "Medusa" of Géricault (1818) and the "Dante" of Delacroix (1822), was clamouring for recognition. Ingres, hitherto but little known in his solitude in Italy, resolved to return to France and strike a daring blow. As early as 1820 he sent to the Salon his "Christ conferring the keys on Peter" (Louvre), a cold and restrained work which won immense success among the classicists. The "Vow of Louis XIII" (Montauban, 1824), a homage to Raphael, appeared opportunely as a contrast to Delacroix's "Massacre of Scio". Henceforward Ingres was looked up to as the leader of the Traditional School, and he proved his claim to the title by producing the famous "Apotheosis of Homer" (Louvre, 1827).

This marks the beginning of a new period, in which Ingres, absorbed in decorative works, is nothing more than the upholster of the classical teaching. Over and over again he did himself violence in composing huge mechanical works like the "St. Symphorin" (Autun, 1835), "The Golden Age" (Dampierre, 1843-49), the "Apotheosis of Napoleon", "Jesus in the midst of the Doctors" (Montauban, 1862), works that entailed most pernicious labour, and which after all are but groups of "Studies", monotonously carelessly pasted and lifeless. Some of Ingres's most beautiful portraits, those of Armand Bertin (Louvre, 1831), of Cherubini (Louvre, 1842), and of Madame d'Haussonville (1845) belong to this period. But gradually he gave up portrait-
painting, and wished only to be the painter of the ideal. Yet he was less so now than ever before. In his latest works his deficiency of composition becomes more apparent. His life was unhappy.

In 1820 he left Rome for Florence, and in 1824 he settled in Paris, which he never left save for six years (1836–1842) which he spent in Rome as director of the Villa Medici. He died at the age of 87, having continued to work up to his last day. Perhaps his prestige and authority counted for something in the renaissance of decorative painting that took place in the middle of the nineteenth century. But his undoubted legacy was a principle of quaintness or oddity and eccentricity, which was copied by artists like Signor and Jeanmot. Ingres was a naturalist who persisted in practice. He was the most idealistic of the age, which was ever attempted in the French School. Like his great rival Delacroix, he may be said to have been a lonely phenomenon in the art of the nineteenth century.

Gautier, Les Beaux-Arts en Europe (Paris, 1855); Delacroix, Louis David, son école et son temps (Paris, 1855); Delaborde, Ingres au vie, sa doctrine (Paris, 1870); Blanc, Ingres (Paris, 1870); Dupin, L'Atelier d'Ingres (Paris, 1875); Laprade, Les Dessins d'Ingres (Paris, 1901); 7 vols. in folio, and 1 vol. of printed matter; de Wenter, L'œuvre peint de J. J. Ingres (Paris, 1877); d'Agenès, Ingres d'après une correspondance inédite (Paris, 1909).

LOUIS GILLET.

Inglis, Abbé of Croyland, Lincolnshire; d. there 17 December, 1105. He is first heard of as secretary to William the Conqueror, in which capacity he visited England in 1051. After making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem he entered the Norman monastery of Fontenelle, or Saint-Wandrille, under Abbé Gerbert, who appointed him prior. The English Abbey of Croyland falling vacant, owing to the deposition by Lanfranc of Abbé Ulfvjetel, Inglis was nominated to the office in 1087 at the special instance of King William. He was not only an able but a kindly man, as was shown by his successful efforts to obtain his predecessor's release from Glastonbury, where he was confined, and his return to Peterborough (the house of his profession), where he died. Inglis governed Croyland for twenty-four years, and with success, though in the face of many difficulties, not the least being his own bad health, for he suffered greatly from gout. Another of his troubles was the partial desertion of his church by the monasteries, who neglected their services, vestments, and books. An event of his abbacy was the interment in Croyland church of the Saxon Earl Waltheof of Northumbria, who was executed by William's orders, and was a martyr as well as a national hero in the popular estimation.

Quintin, Inglis, Les Deux S. S. IV (ed. Moore, Paris, 1855), 364 [Obedeceus is the only extant authority for the few facts known about Inglis' life. The chronicle known as his Historia Anglicana, containing many autobiographical details, is a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century forgery; see also Freeman, Composer of England, IV (Oxford, 1871), 600, 601, 690].

T. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Ingoth (Ingewrte, Indewurde), Richard of, a Franciscan preacher who flourished about 1225. He was a friar in the order of the Agnellus to England in 1224, and is supposed to have been the first of the Franciscans to preach north of the Alps. He was already a priest and well on in years at the time of his arrival, and was responsible for the establishment of the first Franciscan house in London. The first convents at Oxford and Northampton were likewise indebted to his efforts, and he served for a time as custodian at Cambridge. In 1230 he acted as vicar of the English Province during the absence of Agnellus at a general chapter at Assisi, and was subsequently appointed provincial minister of Ireland by John Parem. In 1230, during the governorship of Albert of Pisa, he relinquished this position and set out as a missionary for the Holy Land, during which pilgrimage he died.

Eccleston, De Adventu Fratum Minorum in Anglican,
Slate, Manual of Moral Theology (New York, 1908); Ricke, Ethics and Natural Law (London, 1908); Genicot, Theologie morale (Louvain, 1955); Ballerini, Opus theologicum morale (Prato, 1890).

Joseph F. Delaney

INNOCENT, Proofs of. See Ordeals.

Innocent I, Pope; date of birth unknown; d. 12 March, 417. Before his elevation to the Chair of Peter, very little is known concerning the life of this energetic pope, so zealous for the welfare of the whole Church. According to the Liber Pontificalis he was a native of Ariminum; his father was called Innocentius. He grew up among the Roman clergy and in the service of the Roman Church. After the death of Anastasius (Dec., 401) he was unanimously chosen Bishop of Rome by the clergy and people. Not much has come down to us concerning his ecclesiastical activities in Rome. Nevertheless one or two instances of his zeal for the purity of the Catholic Faith and for church discipline are well attested. He took several churches in Rome from the Novatians (Socrates, Hist. Eccl., VII, ii) and caused the Photinian Marcus to be banished from the city. A drastic decree, which the Emperors issued from Rome (22 Feb., 407) against the Manicheans, the Montanists, and the Priscillianists (Codex Theodosianus, XVI, 5, 40), was very probably not issued without his concurrence. Through the munificence of Vestina, a rich Roman matron, Innocent was enabled to build and richly endow a church dedicated to SS. Victor and Protasius which had been the old Titulus Vetinae which still stands under the name of San Vitale. The siege and capture of Rome by the Goths under Alaric (408-10) occurred in his pontificate. When, at the time of the first siege, the barbarian leader had declared that he would withdraw his forces on condition that the Romans should arrange a peace favourable to him, as king of the Goths, and that the Romans went to Honorius, at Ravenna, to try, if possible, to make peace between him and the Goths. Pope Innocent also joined this embassy. But all his endeavours to bring about peace failed. The Goths then recommenced the siege of Rome, so that the pope and the envoys were not able to return to the city, which was taken and sacked in 410. From the beginning of his pontificate, Innocent often acted as head of the whole Church, both East and West.

In his letter to Archbishop Anysius of Thessalonica, in support of the latter of his own election to the see of Rome, he also confirmed the election of the patriarch of Illyria, which had been bestowed upon the archbishop by previous popes. When Eastern Illyria fell to the Eastern Empire (379) Pope Damasus had asserted and preserved the ancient rights of the papacy in those parts, and his successor Siricius had bestowed on the Archbishop of Thessalonica the privilege of confirming and consecrating the bishops of Eastern Illyria. These prerogatives were renewed by Innocent (Ep. i), and by a later letter (Ep. xii, 17 June, 412) the pope entrusted the supreme administration of the Eastern Illyria to Archbishop Rufus of Thessalonica, as successor to Siricius. By this means the papal vicariate of Illyria was put on a sound basis, and the archbishops of Thessalonica became vicars of the popes. On 15 Feb., 404, Innocent sent an important decretal to Bishop Victorius of Rouen (Ep. 35), who had laid before the pope a list of disciplinary matters for decision. The points at issue concerned the consecration of bishops, admissions into the ranks of the clergy, the disputes of clerics, whereby important matters (causes majoris) were to be brought from the episcopal tribunal to the Apostolic See, also the ordinations of the clergy, celibacy, the pretensions of the archbishops, the admission of clerics into the Church, monks, and nuns. In general, the pope indicated the discipline of the Roman Church as being the norm for the other bishops to follow. Innocent directed a similar decretal to the Spanish bishops (Ep. iii) among whom difficulties had arisen, especially regarding the Priscillianist bishops. The pope regulated this matter and at the same time settled other questions of ecclesiastical discipline.

Similar letters, disciplinary in content, or decisions of important cases, were sent to the bishops of Toulouse (Ep. vi), to the bishops of Macedonia (Ep. xvii), to Deccentius, Bishop of Gubbio (Ep. xxv), to Felix, Bishop of Nocera (Ep. xxxviii). Innocent also addressed shorter letters to several other bishops, among them a letter to two British bishops, Maximus and Severus, in which he decided that those priests who, while priests, had begotten children should be dismissed from their sacred office (Ep. xxxix). Envoy was sent by the Synod of Carthage (404) to the Bishop of Rome, or the bishop of the city where the emperor was staying, in order to provide for severer treatment of the Montanists. The envoys came to Rome, and Pope Innocent obtained from the Emperor Honorius a strong decree against those African sectaries, by which many adherents of Montanism were induced to be reconciled with the Church. The Christian East also claimed the pope's energy. St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, was persecuted by the Emperor Eudoxia and the Alexandrian patriarch Theophilus, threw himself on the protection of Innocent. Theophilus had already informed the latter of the deposition of John, following on the illegal Synod of the Oak (ad quercum). But the pope did not recognize the sentence of the synod, summoned Theophilus to a new synod at Rome, once more soleated the exiled Patriarch of Byzantium, and wrote a letter to the clergy and people of Constantinople in which he animadverted severely on their conduct towards their bishop (John), and announced his intention of calling a general synod, at which the matter would be sifted and decided. Theophilus was suggested as the place of assembly. The pope informed Honorius, Emperor of the West, of these proceedings, whereupon the latter wrote three letters to his brother, the Eastern Emperor Arcadius, and besought Arcadius to summon the Eastern bishops to a synod at Thessalonica, before which the Patriarch Theophilus was to appear. The messengers who brought these three letters were ill received, Arcadius being quite favourable to Theophilus. In spite of the efforts of the pope and the Western emperor, the synod never took place. Innocent remained in correspondence with the Eastern bishops. In the place of banishment the latter thanked him for his kind solicitude, the pope answered with another comforting letter, which the exiled bishop received only a short time before his death (407) (Ep. xxi). The pope did not recognize Arscacius and Atticus, who had been raised to the seat of Constantinople instead of the unlawfully deposed John.

After John's death, Innocent desired that the name of the deceased patriarch should be restored to the diptychs, but it was not until after Theophilus was dead (412) that Atticus yielded. The pope obtained through this bishop's intercession the revocation of the wrong done to St. John Chrysostom. The schism at Antioch, dating from the Arian conflicts, was finally settled in Innocent's time. Alexander, Patriarch of Antioch, succeeded, about 413-15, in gaining over to his cause the adherents of the former Bishop Eustathius; he also received into the ranks of his clergy the followers of Paulinus, who had fled to Italy and had been ordained there. Innocent informed Alexander of these proceedings, and as Alexander restored the name of John Chrysostom to the diptychs, the pope entered into communion with the East, and consecrated patriarchs for the first time in the name of a Roman synod of twenty Italian bishops, and one in his own name (Ep. xix and xx). Acacius, Bishop of Berea, one of the most zealous opponents of Chrysostom, had sought to obtain re-
admittance to communion with the Roman Church through the aforesaid Alexander of Antioch. The pope informed him, through Alexander, of the conditions under which he would resume communion with him (Ep. xxi). In a later letter Innocent declared that he was sent of God (Ep. xxiv).

The pope also informed the Macedonian bishop Maximian and the priest Bonifatius, who had interceded with him for the recognition of Atticus, Patriarch of Constantinople, of the conditions, which were similar to those required of the above-mentioned Patriarch. (Ep. xxvii, the author.) In the Orantian and Pelagian controversies, also, the pope's authority was invoked from several quarters. St. Jerome and the nuns of Bethlehem were attacked in their convents by brutal followers of Pelagius, a deacon was killed, and a part of the buildings was set on fire. John, Bishop of Jerusalem, who was on bad terms with Jerome, owing to the Orantian controversy, did nothing to prevent these outrages. Through Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, Innocent sent St. Jerome a letter of condolence, in which he informed him that he would employ the influence of the Holy See to repress such crimes; and if Jerome would give them up, it would be much to his credit. As it was, he reconciled them in the matter. The pope at once wrote an earnest letter of exhortation to the Bishop of Jerusalem, and reproached him with negligence of his pastoral duty. The pope was also compelled to take part in the Pelagian controversy. In 415, on the proposal of Gisius, the Synod of Jerusalem brought the matter of the orthodoxy of Pelagius before the Holy See. The synod of Eastern bishops held at Diospolis (Dec. 415), which had been deceived by Pelagius with regard to his actual teaching and had acquiesced, approached Innocent on behalf of the heretic. On the report of Gisius concerning the proceedings at Diospolis, the African bishops assembled in synod at Carthage, in 416, and confirmed the condemnation which had been pronounced in 411 against Cereleus, who shared the views of Pelagius. The bishops of Numidia did likewise in the same year in the Synod of Milloe. Both synods reported their transactions to the pope and asked him to confirm their decisions. Soon after this, five African bishops, among them St. Augustine, wrote a personal letter to Innocent regarding their own position in the matter of Pelagianism. Innocent in his reply praised the African bishops for the departure of the heresy from their midst. The Synods of Diospolis, the African synod at Carthage, and the Synod of Diospolis, the African synod are all referred to in the concordance (Ep. xxvii--xxxiii). The decisions of the Synod of Diospolis were rejected by the pope. Pelagius now sent a confession of faith to Innocent, which, however, was only delivered to his successor, for Innocent died before the document reached the Holy See.

He was buried in a basilica above the catacomb of Pontianus, and was venerated as a saint. He was a very energetic and active man, and a highly gifted ruler, who fulfilled the duties of his position with great success. His pontificate was characterized by a firm stand against heresy, and by a strong defense of the orthodoxy of the Church. His episcopal see was increased by the granting of privileges, and by the establishment of new sees. He was a patron of learning, and the patron of many authors. His pontificate was marked by a series of councils, which were held in various parts of the Empire, and by the promulgation of a number of edicts, which were intended to promote the interests of the Church. He was a patron of the arts, and the founder of many libraries. He was a patron of the poor, and the founder of many hospitals. He was a patron of the clergy, and the founder of many churches. His pontificate was marked by a series of victories over the enemies of the Church, and by a series of victories over the enemies of the Empire. He was a patron of the Pope, and the founder of many monasteries. He was a patron of the Pope, and the founder of many churches. His pontificate was marked by a series of victories over the enemies of the Church, and by a series of victories over the enemies of the Empire. He was a patron of the Pope, and the founder of many monasteries.
vaded the lands granted to Rainulf. In 1139 St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, left Ireland to visit the court of Segni a received with great honours and made him papal legate for all Ireland, but would not grant him permission to resign his see in order to join the community of St. Bernard at Clairvaux (Belleisheim, "Ireland", I, 350). In the East, Innocent II curbed the pretensions to independence on the part of Patriarch Aymeric of Jerusalem and of Arsoil, Patriarch of Antioch (Hergenröther, II, 410).

After the death of Alberic, Archbishop of Bourges, in 1141, Louis VII of France wanted to secure the nomination of a man of his own choice whom the chapter did not consider the fit person, and they chose Pierre de Clario, whereupon Innocent II excommunicated him. The bishop-elect in person brought the matter to Rome, and Innocent, finding after due examination that the election had been made according to the requirements of ecclesiastical law, confirmed it and himself gave the episcopal consecration. When Pierre returned to France, Louis did not allow him to enter his diocese. After useless negotiations Innocent placed France under interdict. Only during the reign of the next pope was the interdict removed and peace restored.

In the trouble between Alfonso of Spain and Alfonso Henry of Castile making Portugal an independent monarchy and had placed his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See, Innocent acted as mediator (Aschbach, "Gesch. Span. u. Port.", 1833, 304, 458). Ramiro II, a monk, had been elected King of Aragon. Innocent II is said to have given him dispensation from his vows, though others claim that this is a calumny spread by the enemies of the pope (Damberger, "Weltgeschichte", VIII, 202).

Several minor synods were held during the last few years of the life of Innocent, one at Sens in 1140, at Vienne in 1141 and in the same year at Vienne and Reims; in 1141 at Lagony, in which Ralph, the Duke of Vermandois is said to have been excommunicated by the legate Yvo of Chartres for having repudiated his lawful wife and married another (Hefele, V, 488). A synod was held under the presidency of the papal legate 7 April, 1141, at Winchester; and 7 Dec., 1141, at Westminster. During his pontificate Innocent II enrolled among the canonized saints of the Church the Reims in 1133, St. Godhard, Archbishop of Reims; at Pisa in 1134, St. Hugo, Bishop of Gironde, who had died in 1132, and had been a zealous defender of the rights of Innocent; at the Lateran in 1139, St. Sturmian of Pula (Ann. Pont. Catt, 1903, 412). To St. Norbert of the Premonstratensians, he granted in 1131 a document authorizing him to introduce his rule at the cathedral of Magdeburg (Heimhucher, "Die Orden u. Congr.", I, Paderborn, 1907, 55); to St. Bernard he in 1140 gave the church of Sts. Vincent and Anastasius near Rome (ibid., I, 428); he also granted many privileges to others. His letters and privileges are given in Migne (P. L., CLXXIX). According to the "Liber Pontificalis" (ed. Duchesne, II, 379) he ordained eighteen deacons, twenty priests, and seventy bishops.

He was buried in St. John Lateran, but seven years later was transferred to Santa Maria in Trastevere. Innocent II is praised by all, especially by St. Bernard, as a man of irreproachable character. His motto was: "Adjuva nos, Deus salutaris noster". The policy of Innocent is characterized in one of his letters: "If the sacred authority of the popes and the imperial power is subverted, the Church is destroyed. For since God in all humility, since then only can peace and harmony exist among Christian peoples. For there is nothing so sublime as the papacy nor so exalted as the imperial throne" (Weiss, V, 25).

BOERSCHINCK, R. V.; DZERZHINSKY, Ezechiel (10th ed., Freiburg, 1907). See also under ANACLETUS II.

FRANCIS MERSHAM.
In case of a double election the pope must exhort the princes to come to an agreement. If after a due interval they have not reached an agreement they must ask the pope to arbitrate, failing which, he must of his own accord and by virtue of his office decide in favour of one of the claimants. The pope's decision shall not be based on the greater or less legality of either election, but on the qualifications of the claimants.

Innocent's exposition of his theory concerning the relation between the popacy and the empire was accepted by many princes, as is apparent from the sudden increase of Otto's adherents and the lack of support for the issue of the decretal. If after 1023 the majority of the princes began again to side with Philip, it was the fault of Otto himself, who was very irritable and often offended his best friends. Innocent, reversing his decision, declared in favour of Philip in 1027, and sent the Cardinals Ugolin of Ostia and Leo of Santa Croce to Germany with instructions to endeavour to induce Otto to renounce his claims to the throne and with powers to free Philip from the ban. The murder of King Philip by Otto of Wittelsbach, 21 June, 1028, entirely changed conditions in Germany. At the Diet of Mainz, 18 December, 1028, Otto was regarded as king by all the princes, and the pope invited him to Rome to receive the imperial crown. He was crowned emperor in the Basilica of St. Peter at Rome, 4 October, 1029. Before his coronation he had solemnly promised to leave the Church in the peaceful possession of Spoletto, Ancona, and Matilda; to assist the pope in the exercise of his suzerainty over Sicily; to grant freedom of ecclesiastical elections; unlimited right of appeal to the pope and the exclusive competency of the hierarchy in spiritual matters; he had, moreover, renounced the "regalia" and the usufruct of vacant sees and the seizure of the estates of intestate ecclesiastics. He also promised to assist the hierarchy in the extirpation of heresy. But scarcely had he been crowned emperor when he seized Ancona, Spoletto, the bequest of Matilda, and other property of the Church, giving it in vassalage to some of his friends. He also united with the enemies of Frederick II and invaded the Kingdom of Sicily with the purpose of wresting it from the youthful king and from the suzerainty of the pope. When Otto did not listen to the remonstrances of Innocent, the latter excommunicated him, 18 November, 1029, and claimed his excommunication at a Roman synod held on 31 March, 1211. The pope now began to treat with King Philip Augustus of France and with the German princes, with the result that most princes renounced the excommunicated emperor and elected in his place the youthful Frederick II of Sicily, at the Diet of Nuremberg in September, 1211. The election was repeated in presence of a representative of the pope and of Philip Augustus of France at the Diet of Frankfort, 2 December, 1212. After making practically the same promises to the pope which Otto IV had made previously, i.e., in addition to renouncing the herem oath never to unite Sicily with the empire, his election was ratified by Innocent and he was crowned at Aachen on 12 July, 1215. The deposed emperor Otto IV hastened to Germany immediately upon the election of Frederick II, but received little support from the princes. In alliance with John of England he made war upon Philip of France, but was defeated in the battle of Bouvines, 27 July, 1214. Then he lost all influence in Germany and died on 19 May, 1218, leaving the pope's creature, Frederick II, the undisputed emperor. When Innocent ascended the papal throne in 1241, he was content to crown Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England. The pope considered it his duty, as the supreme ruler of the Christian world, to put an end to all hostilities among Christian princes. Shortly after his accession he sent Cardinal Peter of Capua to France with in-
strustions to threaten both kings with interdict if they would not within two months conclude peace or at least agree upon a truce of five years. In January, 1198, the two kings met between Vernon and Andely and a truce of five years was agreed upon. The same legate was instructed by the pope to threaten Philip with excommunication of the whole of France within a month he would not be reconciled with his lawful wife, Ingeburga of Denmark, whom he had rejected and in whose stead he had taken Agnes, daughter of the Duke of Meran. When Philip took no heed of the pope's warning Innocent carried out his threat and, on 11 June, interdicted all the bishops of France under interdict. For nine months the king remained stubborn, but when the barons and the people began to rise in rebellion against him he finally discarded his concubine and the interdict was lifted on 7 September, 1200. It was not, however, until 1213 that the pope succeeded in bringing about a final reconciliation between the King and his lawful wife Ingeburga.

Innocent also had an opportunity to assert the papal rights in England. After the death of Archbishop Hubert of Canterbury, in 1205, a number of the younger monks of Christ Church assembled secretly at night and elected their sub-prior, Reginald, as archbishop. This election was made without the concurrence of the bishop and without the authority of the king. Reginald was asked not to divulge his election until he had received the papal approbation. But on his way to Rome the vain monk assumed the title of archbishop-elect, and thus the episcopal body of the province of Canterbury was apprised of the secret election. The bishops at once sent Peter of Angleshaw as their representative to Pope Innocent to protest against the uncanonical proceedings of the monks of Christ Church. The monks also were highly incensed at Reginald because, contrary to his promise, he had divulged his election. They proceeded to a second election, and on 11 December, 1205, cast their votes for the royal favourite, John de Grey, whom the king had recommended to their suffrages. The controversy between the monks of Christ Church and the bishop concerning the right of electing the Archbishop of Canterbury, Innocent decided in favour of the monks, but in the present case he pronounced both elections invalid; that of Reginald because it had been made uncanonically and clandestinely, that of John de Grey because it had occurred before the invalidity of the former was proclaimed by the pope. Not even John, who offered Innocent 5,000 marks for his election, would decide in favour of de Grey, could alter the pope's decision. Innocent summoned those monks of Canterbury who were in Rome to proceed to a new election and recommended to their choice Stephen Langton, an Englishman, whom the pope had called to Rome from the rectorship of the University of Paris, in order to create him cardinal. He was duly elected by the monks and the pope himself consecrated him archbishop at Viterbo on 17 June, 1207. Innocent informed King John of the election of Langton and asked him to accept the new archbishop. The king, however, had set his mind on his friend John de Grey, and finally refused to allow Langton to come to England in the capacity of Archbishop of Canterbury. He, moreover, wreaked his vengeance on the monks of Christ Church by driving them from their monastery and taking possession of their property. Innocent now placed the entire kingdom under interdict which was lifted on 24 March, 1208. When the archbishop proved of no avail and the king committed acts of cruelty against the clergy, the pope declared him excommunicated in 1209, and formally deposed him in 1212. He entrusted King Philip of France with the execution of the sentence. When Philip threatened to break the truce and the feudal lordship, the king of England began to forswear King John, the latter made his submission to Pandulph, whom Innocent had sent as legate to England. He promised to acknowledge Langton as Archbishop of Canterbury, to allow the exiled bishops and priests to return to England and to make compensation for the losses which the clergy had sustained. He went still further, and on 13 May, 1213, probably of his own initiative, surrendered the English kingdom through Pandulph into the hands of the pope to be returned to him as a fief. The document of the surrender states that henceforth the kings of England were to rule as vassals of the pope and to pay an annual tribute of 1000 marks to the See of Rome. On 20 July, 1213, the king was solemnly freed from the ban at Winchester and after the clergy had been reimbursed for its losses the interdict was lifted from England on 29 June, 1214. It appears that many of the barons were not pleased with the surrender of England into the hands of the pope. They also resented the king's continuous trespasses upon their liberties and his many acts of injustice in the government of the people. They finally had recourse to violence and forced him to yield to their demands by affixing his seal to the Magna Charta. Innocent could not as suzerain of England allow a contract which imposed such serious obligations upon his vassal to be made without his consent. His legate Pandulph had repeatedly praised King John to the pope as a wise ruler and loyal vassal of the Holy See. The pope, therefore, declared the Great Charter null and void, not because it gave too many liberties to the barons and the people, but because it had been obtained by violence.

There was scarcely a country in Europe over which Innocent III did not in some way or other assert the supremacy which he claimed for the papacy. He communicated Alfonso IX of Leon, for marrying a near relative, Berengaria, a daughter of Alfonso VIII, contrary to the laws of the Church, and effected their separation in 1204. For similar reasons he annulled, in 1208, the marriage of the crown-prince, Alfonso of Portugal, with Urraca, daughter of Alfonso of Castile. From Pedro II of Aragon he received that kingdom in vassalage and crowned the new king at Rome in 1234. He prepared a crusade against the Moors and lived to see their power broken in Spain at the battle of Navas de...
Tolosa, in 1212. He protected the people of Norway against their tyrannical king, Sweveri, and after the king's death arbitrated between the two claimants to the Norwegian throne. He mediated between King Emeric of Hungary and his rebellious brother Andrew, sent royal crown and sceptre to King Johannitus of Bulgaria and had his legate crown him king at Turin, in 1204; he restored ecclesiastical discipline in Poland; arbitrated between the two claimants to the royal crown of Sweden; made partly successful attempts to reunite the Greek with the Latin Church and extended his beneficent influence practically over the whole Christian world. Like many preceding popes, Innocent had at heart the recovery of the Holy Land, and between 1203 and 1204 the Venetians had pledged themselves to transport the entire Christian army and to furnish the fleet with provisions for nine months, for 85,000 marks. When the crusaders were unable to pay the sum, the Venetians proposed to bear the financial expenses themselves on condition that the crusaders would first assist them in the conquest of the city of Zara. The crusaders yielded to their demands and the fleet started down the Adriatic on 8 October, 1202. Zara had scarcely been reduced when Alexius Comnenus arrived at the camp of the crusaders and pleaded for their help to replace his father, John Angelus, who had been deposed by his cruel brother Alexius. In return he promised to reunite the Greek with the Latin Church, to add 10,000 soldiers to the ranks of the crusaders, and to contribute money and provisions to the crusade. The Venetians, who saw their own commercial advantage in the taking of Constantinople, induced the crusaders to yield to the prayers of Alexius, and Constantinople was taken by them in 1204. Isaac Angelus was restored to his throne but soon replaced by a usurper. The crusaders took Constantinople a second time on 28 May, 1205, and on 12 October. 1202, after a long siege by Count Flanders, was proclaimed emperor and the Greek Church was united with the Latin. The union, as well as the Latin empire in the East, did not last longer than two generations. When Pope Innocent learned that the Venetians had diverted the crusade's purpose of reconquest of the Holy Land he expressed his great dissatisfaction at first at their conquest of Zara, and when they proceeded towards Constantinople he solemnly protested and finally excommunicated the Venetians who had caused the digression of the crusaders from their original purpose. Since, however, he could not use what had been accomplished he did his utmost to destroy the Greek schism and Latinize the Eastern Empire.

Innocent was also a zealous protector of the true Faith and a strenuous opponent of heresy. His chief activity was turned against the Albigenses who had become so numerous and aggressive that they were no longer satisfied with being adherents of heretical doctrines but even endeavoured to spread their heresy by force. They were especially numerous in a few cities of Northern Italy and in Southern France. During the first year of his pontificate Innocent sent two Cistercian monks Rainer and Guido to the Albigenses in France to preach to them the true Faith and dispute with them on controverted topics of religion. The two Cistercian missionaries were soon followed by Diego, Bishop of Osma, then by St. Dominic and the two papal legates, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul. When, however, these peacefully endeavoured to convert the Albigenses, and the papal legate Castelnau was assassinated in 1208, Innocent resorted to force. He ordered the bishops of Southern France to put under interdict the participants in the murder and all the towns that gave shelter to them. He was especially incensed against Count Raymond of Toulouse who had previously been excommunicated by the murdered legate and whom, for good reasons, the pope suspected as the instigator of the murder. The pope protested his innocence to a pope, probably out of cowardice, but the pope placed no further trust in him. He called upon France to raise an army for the suppression of the Albigenses. Under the leadership of Simon of Montfort a cruel campaign ensued against the Albigenses which, despite the protest of Innocent, soon turned into a war of conquest (see ALBIGENSES). The culminating point in the glorious reign of Innocent was his convocation of the Fourth Lateran Council, which he solemnly opened on 15 November, 1215. It was by far the most important council of the Middle Ages. One of its central enactments was a call to the Land, it issued seventy reformatory decrees, the first of which was a creed (Firmiter credimus), against the Albigenses and Waldenses, in which the term "transubstantiation" received its first ecclesiastical sanction. (See LATERAN COUNCIL.)

The labours of Innocent in the inner government of the Church appear to be of a very subordinate character when they are put beside his great politico-ecclesiastical achievements, which brought the papacy to the zenith of its power. Still they are worthy of memory and have contributed their share to the glory of the name of the Church. Under Innocent two great founders of the mendicant orders, St. Dominic and St. Francis, laid before him their scheme of reforming the world. Innocent was not blind to the vices of luxury and indolence which had infected many of the clergy and part of the laity. In Dominici and Francis he recognized two mighty adversaries of these vices and he sanctioned their projects with words of encouragement. The lesser religious orders which he approved are the Hospitallers of the Holy Ghost on 23 April, 1198, the Trinitarians on 17 December, 1198, and the Humiliati, in November, 1215. In 1219 he commissioned the Cistercian monk, Christian, afterwards bishop, with the conversion of the heathen Prussians. At Rome he built the famous hospital Santo Spirito in Sassia, which became the model of all future city hospitals and exists to the present time (see Walsh, "The Popes and the Church," New York, 1910, p. 264-268; and the article HOSPITALS). The following saints were canonized by Innocent: Homobonus, a merchant of Cremona, on 12 January, 1199; the Empress Cunegond, on 3 March, 1200; William, Duke of Aquitaine in 1202; Wulstan, Bishop of York, on 14 May, 1203; Procopius, abbot at Praga, on 2 July, 1208; Guglielmo, the founder of the monastery at Gemblazet, in 1211. Innocent died at Perugia, while travelling through Italy in the interests of the crusade which had been decided upon at the Lateran Council. He was buried in the cathedral of Perugia where his body remained until Leo XIII., a great admirer of Innocent, had it transferred to the Lateran in December, 1891. Innocent is also the author of various literary works reprinted in P. L., CXXIV-CXXVIII, where may also be found his numerous extant epistles and decrees, and the historically important "Registrum Innocenti III super negotii imperti," work, "De contemptu mundi sine de miseria conditionis humanis libri III." (P. L., CCLIX, 701-746) was written while he lived in retirement during the pontificate of Celestine III. It is an ascetical treatise and gives evidence of Innocent's deep piety and knowledge of men. Concerning the last Innocent composed dritte und seine Schrifte "De contemptu mundi." (Erlanger, 1871). His treatise "De sacro altaris mysterio libri VI." (P. L., CCLIX, 773-916) is of great liturgical value, because it represents the Roman Mass as it was at the time of Innocent III. See Franz, "Die Geschichte des Missale Mittelalteri." (Freiburg, 1902.) 453-457. It was printed repeatedly, and translated into German by
Huter (Schauffhausen, 1845). He also wrote "De quadrupartita specie nuptiarium" (P. L., CCXVII, 246, lxxvi) and was found in a certain bond, namely, (1) between man and wife, (2) between Christ and the Church, (3) between God and the just soul, (4) between the Word and human nature, and is entirely based on passages from Holy Scripture. "Commentarius in septem psalmos penitentiae" (P. L., CCXVII, 967–970). Concerning his historical value see ELLRAN, Die "Gesta Innocentii III." im Verhältnisse zu den Regesten desselben Papstes (Halle, 1876). The principal modern sources are: HURTER, Geschichte des Papstes Innocent III. und seiner Zeitgenossen (4 vols., Hamburg, 1841–44); the following six studies by Leclercq, all published at Paris: Innocent III, Rome et l'Italie (1904); Innocent III. la croisée des chemins (1905); Innocent III, la papauté et l'empire (1906); Innocent III, la question d'Orient (1907); Innocent III, la raptus vassales du Saint-Siège (1908); Innocent III, le concile de Lyon et les lettres patentes d'Ephèse (1910); BARBIER, Les Papal Monarchy (New York, 1903), 262–332; JHANS, Geschichte des Papstes Innocent III. (Paris, 1852); Delisle, Mémoire sur les actes de la cour papale : histoire de cette papauté (Paris, 1865); Deulisch, Die deutsche Papstinnerei (New York, 1903); SERVANDI, Geschichte der Verhältnisse zwischen dem Papsttum und Konstantinopel (Paris, 1875); Schreiber, Innocent III. und die deutsche Kirche während des Thronerhebungs von 1168–1808 (Strasbourg, 1893); Becher, Die historische Darstellung der Verhandlungen von Innocent III. mit den deutschen Gegnern (Maggendorf, 1856); ENGEL, Philipp von Schauenburg und Innocent III. (New York, 1899); WINKELMANN, Philipp von Schauenburg und Otto IV. (2 vols., Leipsig, 1875–8); LECLAER, Die Entscheidung der Verhältnisse der deutschen Kirche und ihre Stellung im öffentlichen Reiche der Kirche (Münster, 1876); Gisborne, Innocent III. und England (Münster, 1904); Neumann, Nikolaus von Langland (New York, 1902); LANGENDORF, The Third and the Church (London, 1905), 1–26; LINGARD, History of England, (2nd ed., 1802), 313–376; FIRE-GORDON, Innocent III. (London, 1807), somewhat fantastic; CONRAD, Der Papsttum und Byzanz (Berlin, 1903), 133–238; HILL, A History of European Thought (New York, 1907); Mullany, Innocent III. in American Catholic Quarterly Review, XXXII (Philadelphia, 1907), 25–48; FIEBER, Innocent III. und seine Beziehungen zu Thuringien (Münster, 1886); Bottero, Regesta imperii, v. 2; Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Philipp, Otto IV., Friedrich II., Heinrich VII., Konrad IV., Heinrich Raspe (Prussia, 1878); the newly edited by FICKER and WINKELMANN (Innsbruck, 1881–1901).

MICHAEL OTT.

INNOCENT IV, Pope (SINIBALDO DE' FIESCHI), Count of Lavagna, b. at Genoa, date unknown; d. at Naples, 7 December, 1254. He was educated at Parma and Bologna, and later, when told by the pope of Rome to return to Genoa, he became canon in Parma and in 1229 is mentioned as auditor of the Roman Curia. On 23 September, 1227, he was created Cardinal-Priest of San Lorenzo in Lucina; on 28 July, 1228, vice-chancellor of Rome; and in 1235 Bishop of Albenga and layege in Northern Italy. When Celestine IV died after a short reign of sixteen days, the excommunicated emperor, Frederick II, was in possession of the States of the Church. It was with the aim of compelling the emperor to resign his claims to the papal throne as Innocent IV on 25 June, 1243, (after an interval of 55 days), and to make the pope four years. In 1248 Innocent IV had previously been a friend of Frederick II. Immediately after the election the emperor sent messengers with congratulations and overtures of peace. The pope was desirous of peace, but he knew from the experience of Gregory IX how little trust could be put in promises. He refused to receive the latter's envoys, because, like the emperor himself, they were under the ban of the Church. But two months later he sent Peter, Archbishop of Rouen, as legate to the emperor at Melfi with instructions to ask him to release the prelates whom he had captured while on their way to the council which Gregory IX had intended to hold at Rome. The legates were further instructed to find out if the emperor was willing to make for the legates, which he had inflicted upon the Church and which caused Gregory IX to put him under the ban. Should the emperor deny that he had done any wrong to the Church, or even assert that the injury had been done on the side of the Church, the legates were to propose that the scale of compensation should be left to the assembly of bishops and temporal princes. Frederick entered into an agreement with Innocent on 31 March, 1244. He promised to yield to the demands of the Curia in all essential points, viz., to restore the States of the Church, to release the prelates, and to grant amnesty to the allies of the pope. His insincerity became apparent when he secretly incited various tumults in Rome and refused to release the imprisoned prelates. Feeling himself hindered in his freedom of action on account of the emperor's military preponderance, and fearing for his personal safety, the pope decided to leave Italy. At the request of the emperor he was permitted to visit Civitavecchia while the pope was in Sutri. As soon as he was notified of its arrival, he left Sutri in disguise during the night of 27–28 June and hastened over the mountains to Civitavecchia, whence the fleet brought him to Genoa. In October he went to Burgundy, and in December to Lyons, where he took up his abode during the following six years. He at once made preparations for a general council, which on 3 January, 1245, he proclaimed for 24 June of the same year. Innocent had nothing to fear in France and proceeded with great severity against the emperor. At the Council of Lyons (see Lyons, Council of 1245) the emperor was represented by Thaddeus of Suessa, who offered new concessions if his master were freed from the ban; but Innocent rejected them, and having brought new accusations against the emperor during the second session, on 5 July, solemnly deposed him at the third session. On 17 July, 1245, he ordered the princes of Germany to proceed to the election of a new king, and sent Philip of Ferrara as legate to Germany to bring about the election of Henry Raspe, Landgrave of Thuringia. The pope's candidate was elected on 22 May, 1246, at Veitshoheim on the Main. Most of the princes accepted him from voting and he never found general recognition. The same may be said of the incapable William of Holland, whom the papal party elected after Henry Raspe died on 17 February, 1247. But Innocent IV was determined upon the destruction of Frederick II and repeatedly asserted that no Hohenstaufen would ever reign be emperor. All attempts of St. Louis IX of France to bring about peace were of no avail. In 1249 the pope ordered a crusade to be preached against Frederick II, and after the emperor's death (13 December, 1250), he continued the struggle against Conrad IV and Manfred with unrelenting severity. On 19 April, 1251, Innocent IV set out for Italy and entered Rome in October, 1253. The crown of Sicily devolved upon the Holy See at the deposition of Frederick II. Innocent had previously offered it to Richard of Cornwall, brother of Henry III of England. Upon his refusal, he tried Charles of Anjou and Edmund, son of Henry III of England. But Manfred, who had just been elected King of Sicily, and to whom they also refused owing to the difficulty of dislodging Conrad IV and Manfred who held Sicily by force of arms. After the death of Conrad IV, 20 May, 1254, the pope finally recognized the hereditary claims of Conrad's two-year-old son Conrado. Manfred also submitted, and Innocent made his solemn entry into
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Naples, 27 October, 1254, but Manfred soon revolted and defeated the papal troops at Foggia (2 Dec., 1254).

In England, Innocent IV made his power felt by persecution of the Jews as well as by the ecclesiastical nobility. But here as in other countries, many just complaints arose against him on account of the excessive taxes which he imposed upon the people. In Austria, he confirmed Ottocar, the son of King Wenzel, as duke, in 1252, and mediated between him and King Béla the Third of Hungary in 1254. In Portugal, he appointed Afonso, the Bishop of Braga, as administrator of the kingdom, because the people were disgusted at the immorality and the tyranny of his father, Sancho III. He favoured the missions in Prussia, Russia, Armenia, and Mongolia, but owing to his continual warfare with Frederick II and his successors he neglected the internal affairs of the Church and allowed many abuses, provided they served to strengthen his position against the Hohenstaufen. He approved the rule of the Sylvesterines on 27 June, 1247, and that of the Poor Clares on 9 August, 1253. The following saints were canonized by him: Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury, on 16 December 1246; William of St-Brisson, Bishop of St-Brisson, in 1247; Peter of Verona, Dominican inquisitor and martyr, in 1253; Stanislaus, Bishop of Cracow, in the same year. He is the author of "Apparatus in quinque libros decretalium", which was first published at Strasburg, in 1277, and afterwards reprinted; it is considered the best beginning of the Decretals of Gregory IX. The registers of Innocent IV were edited by Elie Berger in four volumes (Paris, 1881-98) and his letters, 762 in number, by Rodenberg in "Mon. Germ. Epp. seculi XIII", II (1887), 1-568.

A short biography of Innocent IV was written by his physician, Nicolaus de Corbie. It was published by Muratori, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, III (Milan, 1723-51), 1, 589-593.

The modern sources for his biography are: Martini, Innocenti IV et la chute de Hohenstaufen (Paris, 1908); Weber, Der Kampf zwischen Papst Innocenzi IV. und Kaiser Friedrich II. (Berlin, 1900); Folz, Kaiser Friedrich II. und Papst Innocenzi IV. (the Kampf in den Jahren 1248-1249 (Leipzig, 1902); Mauth, "Innocenzi IV. und das Kaiserring Sizilien" (Halle, 1908); Mauthe, Die Kardinäle und ihre Politik um die Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts (Bonn, 1909); Altinger, Die Neubezügung der deutschen Bistümer unter Papst Innocenzi IV. (Leipzig, 1900); Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, IV (Leipzig, 1903), 908-915; Berger, St. Louis et Innocenzi IV. étudie par les rapports de la France et du Saint-Siège (Paris, 1893); Marti, I pontefici Gregorii III, Gregorii IV, ed Innocenzi IV, de Bono ecclesiastico (Federico II (Rome, 1894); Michael, Papst und Kurfürsten in Oesterreich u. Zeitschr. f. kath. Theologie, VIII (Vienna, 1890), 500; Dewey, Innocenzi IV. und Kom. XVIII (1894), 465-472; Querner, Henry the Third and the Church (London, 1905), 205-353.

MICHAEL OTT.

Innocent V, Blessed, Pope (Petrus a Tarentaisia), b. in Tarentaise, towards 1225; elected at Arezzo, 21 January, 1276; d. at Rome, 22 June, 1276. Tarentaise on the upper Isere in southeast France was certainly his native province, and the town of Champagny was in all probability his birthplace. At the age of sixteen he joined the Dominican Order. After completing his education, at the University of Paris, where he graduated as master in sacred theology in 1259, he won distinction as a professor in the latter institution, and is known as "the most famous doctor", "Doctor famosissimus". For some time provincial of his order in France, he became Archbishop of Lyons in 1272 and Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia in 1273. He played a prominent part in the Council of Lyons (1274), in which he delivered two discourses to the assembled fathers and also pronounced the funeral oration on St. Bonaventure. Elected as successor to Gregory X, whose intimate adviser he was, he assumed the name of Innocent V and was the first Dominican pope. His policy was peaceable. He sought to reconcile Guise and Chabillens in Italy, restored peace between Pisa and Lucca, and mediated between Rudolph of Hapsburg and Charles of Anjou. He likewise endeavoured to consolidate the union of the Greeks with Rome concluded at the Council of Lyons. He is the author of several works dealing with philosophy, theology and canon law, some of which were un published. The principal among them is his "Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard" (Toulouse, 1652). Four philosophical treatises: "De unitate formas", "De materia coeli", "De aeternitate mundi", "De infusione et volubilitate", are also due to his pen. A commentary on the Pauline Epistles, published under the name of Nicholas of Gornan (Cologne, 1478), is claimed for him by some critics.

Innocent VI, Pope (Etienne Aubert), b. at Mont in the Diocese of Limoges (France); elected at Avignon, 18 December, 1352; d. there, 12 September, 1362. He began his career as professor of civil law at Toulouse where he subsequently rose to the highest judicial position. Having entered the ecclesiastical state he was consecrated successively Bishop of Noyon (1338), of Clermont (1340), cardinal-priest (1342), Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia, and Grand Penitentiary (1352). The conclave which elected him to the papacy is remarkable for the fact that the first certain election capitulation was framed by the cardinals present, each of whom bound himself to divide, in case of election, his power and revenues with the College of Cardinals. Aubert took this engagement but with the restriction: "in so far as it was not contrary to church law."

When the choice fell on him, one of his first pontifical acts declared the pact illegal and null, because it contained a limitation of the Divinely conferred papal power. The new pope also gave immediate proofs of the thoroughly ecclesiastical spirit which was to animate his policy. Shortly after his coronation-the numerous ecclesiastics who had flocked to Avignon in search of preferment received a peremptory order to depart, under penalty of excommunication, to their respective places of residence. Some appointments to benefices made by his predecessor were repealed, numerous reservations abolished, and pluralities disapproved. Luxury was banished from the papal court and the obligation of following this example set by the pope imposed upon the cardinals. To the auditors of the Rota, whose services were gratuitous, a fixed income was assigned in the honest of a more impartial administration of justice. As the territory of the Papal States had been usurped by petty princes, Innocent VI sent Cardinal Gil de Albornoz (q. v.) to Italy with unlimited power. Success on the battle-field and diplomatic skill enabled this legate to restore papal authority in the states of the Church.

Pope Innocent viewed favourably the imperial coronation of the German King, Charles IV, at Rome, but at the same time exacted from him a solemn pledge that he would leave Rome the very day on which the ceremony would take place. Charles was crowned on 25 Oct. (sm. Dec.) 1353 by the Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and faithfully observed his promise. The following year he issued the celebrated "Golden Bull", against which the pope protested because it silently passed over the papal claims to confirm the German kings and to administer the empire during a vacancy. Objection was also made in 1359 to the emperor's resolution to undertake a reform of the
German clergy independently of the pope; Charles's reformatory plans, however, subsequently received ecclesiastical approbation. The mutual peaceful dispositions prevented any conflict of a serious character. Innocent VII had hopes to terminate the belligerent attitude of France and England, and finally through his intervention the Peace of Brétigny was concluded in 1360. To protect the papal residence against the bands of freebooters that were then devastating France, Innocent increased the fortifications of Avignon; but before these were completed he was attacked and compelled to buy off his assailants by an exorbitant ransom. He used with but little success the severest ecclesiastical penalties against Peter I of Castile (1350–49), who had repudiated and poisoned his wife and is deservedly known as "the Cruel". His efforts to restore peace between Castile and Aragon were fruitless, so also his plans for a crusade and for the reunion of the Eastern Church with Rome. At the request of Emperor Charles IV he instituted (1354) for Germany and Bohemia the feast of the Holy Lance and Nails (LANCEÆ ET CLASORVM). He renewed the previous privileges of the mendicant orders, then in conflict with Richard of Cornish, Archbishop of Armagh. Although tainted with nepotism he ranks among the best of the Avignon popes. His patronage of arts and his moral integrity are generally recognised.
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Innocent VII, Pope (Cosimo de’ Migliorati); b. of humble parents at Sulmona, in the Abruzzi, about 1336; d. 6 November, 1406. He studied at Perugia, Padua, and finally at Bologna, where he graduated under the famous jurist Lignano. After teaching jurisprudence at Perugia and Padua he became canon lawyer in the papal Curia, a former professor, Lignano, to Rome, where he was received into the Curia by Urban VI (1378–89). Shortly after his arrival in Rome, Urban sent him as papal collector to England, where he remained about ten years. Upon his return to Rome he became Bishop of Bologna in 1386, and on 5 December, 1387, Archbishop of Ravenna. The latter see he held until 15 September, 1400. In 1389, Boniface IX created him Cardinal-Priest of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and sent him as legate to Lombardy and Tuscany in 1390. He was universally esteemed for his piety and learning, and was an able manager of financial affairs. On 17 October, 1404, he was elected and took the name of Innocent VII. His reign fell in the time of the Western Schism; the rival pope was Benedict XIII (1394–1423). Previous to his election, Innocent VII, like the other cardinals, had taken the oath to leave nothing undone, if needs be even to lay down the tiara, in order to terminate the schism. Shortly after his accession he took steps to keep his oath. The election of a council was one of his aims; the disturbances which occurred in Rome before the pope’s return to the intentions to naught. The revolutionary element among the Romans rose up against the temporal authority of the pope, and King Ladislaus of Naples hastened to Rome to assist the pope in suppressing the insurrection. For his services the king extorted various concessions from Innocent, among them the promise that he would not make any agreement with the rival pope without stipulating that the king’s rights over Naples should remain intact with these concessions, which Innocent made for the sake of peace, Ladislaus desired to extend his rule over Rome and the ecclesiastical territory. To attain his end he aided the Ghibelline faction in Rome in their revolutionary attempts in 1405. Innocent had made the great mistake of elevating his unworthy nephew, Ludovico Migliorati, to the cardinalate. This act of nepotism is the one blemish in the short reign of the otherwise virtuous pope. But it cost him dear. The cardinal, angered because the Romans rebelled against his uncle, waylaid a few of the most influential among them on their return from a conference with the pope, and had them brought to his house in order to murder them. The people were highly incensed at this cruel deed, and the pope had to flee for his life, although he was in no way responsible for his nephew’s crime. He took up his abode in Viterbo until the Romans requested him to return in 1406. They again acknowledged his authority, but he squandered it in expelling King Ladislaus of Naples had sent to the aid of Colonna was still occupying the Castle of Sant' Angelo and made frequent sorties upon Rome and the neighbouring territory. Only after Ladislaus was excommunicated did he yield to the demands of the pope and withdraw his troops. In the midst of these political upheavals Innocent neglected what was then most essential for the well-being of the Church, the suppression of the schism. His rival, Benedict XIII, made it appear that the only obstacle to the termination of the schism was the unwillingness of Innocent VII. The reasons why Innocent did practically nothing for the suppression of the schism were: the troubled state of affairs in Rome, his mistrust in the sincerity of Benedict XIII, and the hostile attitude of King Ladislaus of Naples. Shortly before his death he planned the restoration of the Roman University, but his death brought the movement to a standstill.
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Innocent VIII, Pope (Giovanni Battista Ciù); b. at Genoa, 1432; elected 29 August, 1484; d. at Rome, 25 July, 1492. He was the son of the Roman senator, Aran Cibò, and Teodora de’ Mari. After a licentious youth, during which he lived in Rome with Francesco de Petre and Teodora, he took orders and entered the service of Cardinal Calandrini. He was made Bishop of Savona in 1467, but exchanged this see in 1472 for that of Molletta in south-eastern Italy and was raised to the cardinalate the following year. At the conclave of 1494, he signed, like all the other cardinals present, the election capitulation that was to bind the future pope. His main object was to safeguard the personal interests of his nephews, who fell on Cibò himself who, in honour of his countryman, Innocent IV, assumed the name of Innocent VIII. His success in the conclave, as well as his promotion to the cardinalate, was largely due to Giuliano
Innocent IX. Engraving by Vandensypen.

Innocent IX, pope (Giambattista Pamfili), b. at Rome, 6 May, 1574; d. there, 7 January, 1655. His parents were Camillo Pamfili and Flaminia de' Balbus. The Pamfili resided originally at Gubbio, in Umbria, but came to Rome during the pontificate of Innocent VIII. The young man studied jurisprudence at the Collegio Romano and graduated as bachelor of laws at the age of twenty. Soon afterwards Clement VIII appointed him consistorial advocate and auditor of the Rota. Gregory XV made him nuncio at Naples. Urban VIII sent him as datary with the cardinal legate, Francesco Barberini, to France and Spain, then appointed him titular Latin Patriarch of Antioch, and nuncio at Madrid. He was created Cardinal-Priest of Sant'Eusebio on 30 August, 1616, though he did not assume the purple until 19 November, 1629. He was a member of the congregations of the Council of Trent, the Inquisition, and Jurisdiction and Immunity. On 9 August, 1644, a conclave was held at Rome for the election of a successor to Urban VIII. The conclave was stormy at Parma. The French faction had agreed to give their vote to no candidate who was friendly towards Spain. Cardinal Firenzola, the Spanish candidate, was therefore, rejected, being a known enemy of Cardinal Mazarin, prime minister of France. Fearing the election of an avowed enemy of France, the Spanish party finally agreed with the Spanish party upon Pamfili, although his sympathy for Spain was

Innocent VIII earnestly endeavoured to unite Christendom against the common enemy. The circumstance appeared particularly fortunate, as Prince Djem, the Sultan's brother and pretender to the Turkish throne, was held prisoner at Rome and promised co-operation in war and withdrawal of the Turks from Europe in case of success. A congress of Christian princes met in 1490 at Rome, but led to no result. On the other hand, the pope had the satisfaction of witnessing the fall of Granada (1491) which crowned the reconquest of Spain from the Moors and earned for the King of Spain the title of "Catholic Majesty". In England he proclaimed the right of King Henry VII and his descendants to the English throne and also agreed to some modifications affecting the privilege of "sanctuary". The only canonization which he proclaimed was that of Margrave Leopold of Austria (6 Jan., 1485). He issued an appeal for a crusade against the Waldenses, actively opposed the Hussite heresy in Bohemia, and forbade (Dec., 1486) under penalty of automatic excommunication the reading of the nine hundred theses which Pico della Mirandola had publicly posted in Rome. On 5 Dec., 1484, he issued his much-abused Bull against witchcraft (q.v.), and 31 May, 1482, he solemnly received at Rome the Holy Lance which the Sultan surrendered to the Christians. Constantly confronted with a depleted treasury, he resorted to the objectionable expedient of creating new offices and granting them to the highest bidders. Insecurity reigned at Rome during his rule owing to insufficient punishment of crime. However, he dealt mercilessly with a band of unscrupulous officials who forged and sold bullions; punishment meted out to two of the culprits in 1492. Among these forgeries must be relegated the alleged permission granted the Norwegians to celebrate Mass without wine. See "Bullarium Romanum", III, iii (Rome, 1743), 190-225.

Innocent X, pope (Giovanni Antonio Facci Netti), b. at Bologna, 22 July, 1519; elected, 29 October, 1591; d. at Rome, 30 December, 1591. After successful studies in jurisprudence in his native city he was graduated as doctor of law in 1544, and proceeded to Rome, where Cardinal Nicolò Ardighelli chose him as his secretary. Later he entered the service of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, who appointed him his ecclesiastical assistant at the head of the Archdiocese of Avignon and subsequently called him to the management of his affairs in the papal States. In 1560 he was named Bishop of Nicosia in Calabria, and in 1562 was present at the Council of Trent. Sent as papal nuncio to Venice by Pius V in 1566, he greatly furthered the conclusion of that alliance (Pope, Venice, Spain) against the Turks which ultimately resulted in the victory of Lepanto (1571). In 1572 he returned to his diocese, but resigning his see he

removed to Rome. In 1575 he was named Patriarch of Jerusalem, and on 12 December, 1583, created Cardinal-Priest of the Title of the Four Crowned Martyrs—whence the frequent designation "Cardinal of Santi-quattro". During the reign of the sickly Gregory XIV the burden of the papal administration rested on his shoulders, and on this pontiff's death the Spanish party raised Faccinelli to the papal chair. Mindful of the origin of his popularity and of his success, he supported, during his two months' pontificate, the cause of Philip II of Spain and the League against Henry IV of France. He prohibited the alienation of church property, and in a consistory held on 3 November, 1591, informed the cardinals of his intention of constituting a reserving fund to meet extraordinary expenses. Death, however, did not permit the realization of his vast schemes. He left numerous, though still unpublished, writings on theological and philosophical subjects: "Moralia quedam theologica", "Adversus Machiavellem", "De recta gubernandi ratione", etc. His bulls are printed in the "Bullarium Romanum", ed. Cocquelines, V, pt. I (Rome, 1751), 324-325; "Clemente VIII et regis Pontificis Romani IV (Rome, 1677), 235-48; Motta, Otto Pontificatus del Cinquecento (1523-1591) in Arch. stor. Lombard., 3rd series, XIX (1903), 372-373. RANKE, Die römischen Papstte (9th ed., Leipzig, 1889), 150. TR. FOWLER, II (London, 1901), 157. BRICHER in Kirchenlexikon, s. v.
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INNOCENT X
VELAZQUEZ, PALAZZO DORIA, ROME
well known. On 15 September he was elected, and
ascended the papal throne as Innocent X.

Soon after his accession, Innocent found it necessary
to take legal action against the Barberini for misappropri-
ation of public moneys. To escape punishment, Antonio and Francesco Barberini fled to Paris, where they found a powerful protector in Mazarin. Innocent confiscated their property, and on 19 February, 1646, issued a Bull ordaining that all cardinals who had left or should leave the Ecclesiastical States without papal permission and should not return within three months, should be deprived of their ecclesiastical ben-
efits and eventually of the cardinalate itself. The French Parliament declared the papal ordinances null
and void, but the pope did not yield until Mazarin pre-
pared to send troops to Italy to invade the Ecclesi-
astical States. Henceforth the papal policy towards
France became more friendly, and somewhat later the
Barberini were rehabilitated. But when in 1652 Car-
dinal Rets was arrested by Maza-
rin, Innocent solemnly protested
against this act of violence commit-
ted against a cardinal, and pro-
tected Rets after his escape in 1654.
In 1652, 1653 and 1654 Innocent
had occasion to assert his author-
ity as suzerain over Duke Ranuce-
cio II of Parma, who refused to re-
dem the bonds (monti) of the
Farnesi from the Roman creditors,
as had been stipu-
lated in the Treaty of Venice on 31
March, 1644. The duke, moreover, refused to recog-
nize Cristoforo Guarda, whom the pope had ap-
pointed Bishop of Castro. When, therefore,
the new bishop was murdered while on his way to
take possession of his see, Innocent held Ranuccio re-
sponsible for the crime. The pope took possession
of Castro, raised it to the ground and transferred
the episcopal see to Acquapendente. The duke was
forced to resign the administration of his district
unto the pope, who undertook to satisfy the creditors.
The papal relations with Venice, which had been highly
strained during the pontificate of Urban VIII, became
very friendly during Innocent's reign. Innocent aided
the Venetians financially against the Turks in the
struggle for Candia, while the Venetians on their part
allowed Innocent free scope in filling the vacant episco-
pal sees in their territory, a right which they had
previously claimed for themselves. In Portugal the
popular insurrection of 1640 had led to the secession
of that country from Spain, and to the election of Juan
IV of Braganza as King of Portugal. Both Urban VIII
and Innocent X, in deference to Spain, refused, to
acknowledge the new king and withheld their appro-
val from the bishops nominated by him. Thus it
happened that towards the end of Innocent's pontifi-
cate there was only one bishop in the whole of Portugal.

On 26 November, 1648, Innocent issued the famous
Bull "Zelo domus Dei", in which he declares as null
and void those articles of the Peace of Westphalia
which were detrimental to the Catholic religion. In
his Bull "Cum occasione", issued on 31 May, 1653,
he condemned five propositions taken from the "Augus-
tinus" of Jansenius, thus giving the impetus to the
great Jansenist controversy in France.

Innocent X was a lover of justice and his life was
blameless; he was, however, often irresolute and sus-
picious. The great blнемish in his pontificate was his
dependence on Donna Olimpia Maidalchini, the wife
of the deceased, whose brother, due to her influence,
had to yield to that of the youthful Camillo Astalli, a
distant relative of the pope, whom Innocent raised to
the cardinalate. But the pope seems to have been unable
to get along without her, and at her instance Astalli was
deprieved of the purple and removed from the Vatican.
Innocent's censure, made by Guadus (1581) in his "Vita
di Donna Olimpia Maidalchini" (1666), that Innocent's
relation to her was immoral, has been rejected as
slanderous by all reputable historians.

**Michael Ott.**

**Innocent XI, Pope (Benedetto Odescalchi):** b.
at Como, 16 May, 1611; d. at Rome, 11 August, 1689. He was educated by the Jesuits at Como, and studied jurisprudence at Rome and Naples. Urban VIII ap-
pointed him successively prothonotary, president of the
Apostolic Camera, commissary at Ancona, minister of
Provinces of the Kingdom of Naples and Governor of Picena. Innocent X made him Cardinal-Deacon of
Santi Cosma e Damiano on 6 March, 1646, and, somewhat later, Cardinal-Priest of Sant’ Onofrio. As cardinal he was believed by all on account of his deep piety, charity, and unselfish devotion to duty. When he was
sent as legate to Ferrara in order to assist the people stricken with a
severe famine, the pope introduced him to the people of Ferrara as the "father of the poor", "Mitissimus
patrem paupernst". In 1650 he became Bishop of
Novara, in which capacity he spent all the revenues of
his see to relieve the poor and sick in his diocese.
With the permission of the pope he resigned as Bishop of
Novara in favour of his brother Giulio in 1656 and
gone to Rome, where he took a prominent part in the
discussions of the various congregations of which he
was a member.

He was a strong candidate for the papacy after the
death of Clement IX on 9 December, 1669, but the
French Government rejected him. After the death of
Clement X, King Louis XIV of France again intended
to use his royal influence against the election of Odes-
calchi, but, seeing that the cardinals as well as the
Roman people were of one mind in their desire to have
Odescalchi as their pope, he reluctantly instructed the
 cardinals of the French party to acquiesce in his can-
didacy. After an interval of two months, Odes-
calchi was unani-
ously elected pope on 21
October, 1676, and took the name of Innocent XI. Im-
immediately upon his accession he turned all his efforts
towards reducing the expenses of the Curia. He passed
strict ordinances against nepotism among the cardinals.
He lived very parsimoniously and exhorted the
 cardinals to do the same. In this manner he not only
quarrelled the annual deficit which at his accession had
reached the sum of 170,000 scudi, but within a few
years the papal income was even in excess of the
expenditures.

The whole pontificate of Innocent XI is marked by
a continuous struggle with the absolutism of King
Louis XIV of France. In 1672 he attempted
by his own power extended the right of the régale over
the provinces of Languedoc, Guyenne, Provence, and
Dauphiné, where it had previously not been exercised,
although the Council of Lyons in 1274 had forbidden under pain of excommunication to extend the régale beyond those districts where it was then in force. Bishop Pilling of Breslau and the Bishop of Pamiers met against this royal encroachment and in consequence they were persecuted by the king. All the efforts of Innocent XI to induce King Louis to respect the rights of the Church were useless. In 1682, Louis XIV convoked an Assembly of the French Clergy with the object of obtaining from the clergy and the faithful. He insisted on a thorough education and an exemplary life of the clergy, reformed the monasteries of Rome, passed strict ordinances concerning the modesty of dress among Roman ladies, put an end to the ever increasing passion for gambling by suppressing all the gambling houses at Rome and by a decree of 12 February, 1678, authorising all the members of the clergy to have and maintain a helping hand for the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. He contributed millions of scudi to the Turkish war fund in Austria and Hungary and had the satisfaction of surviving the capture of Belgrade, 6 Sept., 1688.

Innocent XI was no less intent on preserving the purity of faith and morality of the clergy and the faithful. He insisted on a thorough education and an exemplary life of the clergy, reformed the monasteries of Rome, passed strict ordinances concerning the modesty of dress among Roman ladies, put an end to the ever increasing passion for gambling by suppressing all the gambling houses at Rome and by a decree of 12 February, 1678, authorising all the members of the clergy to have and maintain a helping hand for the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. He contributed millions of scudi to the Turkish war fund in Austria and Hungary and had the satisfaction of surviving the capture of Belgrade, 6 Sept., 1688.

Innocent XI was no less intent on preserving the purity of faith and morality of the clergy and the faithful. He insisted on a thorough education and an exemplary life of the clergy, reformed the monasteries of Rome, passed strict ordinances concerning the modesty of dress among Roman ladies, put an end to the ever increasing passion for gambling by suppressing all the gambling houses at Rome and by a decree of 12 February, 1678, authorising all the members of the clergy to have and maintain a helping hand for the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. He contributed millions of scudi to the Turkish war fund in Austria and Hungary and had the satisfaction of surviving the capture of Belgrade, 6 Sept., 1688.

Innocent XI was no less intent on preserving the purity of faith and morality of the clergy and the faithful. He insisted on a thorough education and an exemplary life of the clergy, reformed the monasteries of Rome, passed strict ordinances concerning the modesty of dress among Roman ladies, put an end to the ever increasing passion for gambling by suppressing all the gambling houses at Rome and by a decree of 12 February, 1678, authorising all the members of the clergy to have and maintain a helping hand for the expulsion of the Turks from Hungary. He contributed millions of scudi to the Turkish war fund in Austria and Hungary and had the satisfaction of surviving the capture of Belgrade, 6 Sept., 1688.
nor the Spanish-Hasburg faction among the cardinals could carry its candidate. A compromise resulted in the election of Cardinal Pignatelli on 12 July, 1691. In his Bull "Romanum decet Pontificem" (22 June, 1692), which was subscribed and sworn to by the cardinals, he declared that in the future no pope should be permitted to bestow the cardinalate on more than one of his kinsmen. Toward the poor, whom he called his nephews, he was extremely charitable; he turned part of the Lateran into a hospital for the needy, erected numerous charitable and educational institutions, and completed the large court-house "Curia Innocenziana", which now serves as the Italian House of Commons (Camera dei Deputati). In 1693 he induced King Louis XIV of France to repeal the "Declaration of the French Clergy", which had been adopted in 1682. The bishops who had taken part in the "Declaration" sent a written recantation to Rome, whereupon the pope sent his Bull of confirmation to those bishops from whom it had been withheld. In 1696 he repeated his predecessor's condemnation of Jansenism and in his Brief "Cum alias" (12 March, 1690) he condemned twenty-three semi-Quetistic propositions contained in Fénelon's "Maximes". Towards the end of his pontificate his relations with Emperor Leopold I became somewhat strained, owing especially to Count Martinitz, the imperial ambassador at Rome, who still insisted on the "right of asylum", which had been abolished by Innocent XI. It was greatly due to the arrogance of Martinitz that Innocent XII advised King Charles II of Spain to make a Frenchman, the Duke of Anjou, his testamentary successor, an act which led to the "War of the Spanish Succession".

Bullarium Innocentii XII (Rome, 1897); RANKE, Die römischen Papste, tr. FORSTER, History of the Popes, II (London, 1908), 425-7; KLOPP, "Hab der Papst Innocentii XII im Jahre 1700 dem Könige Karl II vom Spanien geraten, durch ein Testament dem Herzog von Anjou zum Erben der spanischen Monarchie zu erlassen" in Historich-Politische Blätter, LXXXIII (Munich, 1879), 24-49 and 125-150; BRINCKEN in Kirchenlex., s. v.
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Innocent XIII, POPE (MICHELANGELO DEI CONTI), b. at Rome, 13 May, 1655; d. at the same place, 7 March, 1724. He was the son of Carlo II, Duke of Poli.

After studying at the Roman College he was introduced into the Curia by Alexander VIII, who in 1690 commissioned him to bear the blessed hat (berettone) and sword (stocco) to Doga Morosini of Venice. In 1695 he was made Titular Archbishop of Tarsus and nunzio to Lecurch. In 1697, nunzio at Lisbon. Clement XI created him Cardinal-Priest of Santi Quirico e Giulitta on 17 May, 1706, conferred on him the Diocese of Osimo in 1709, and that of Viterbo in 1712. Sickness compelled him to resign his see in 1719. After the death of Clement XI he was elected pope in a stormy conclave on 8 May, 1721. In memory of Innocent III, to whose lineage he belonged, he chose the name of Innocent XIII. Soon after his succession he invested Emperor Charles VI with the Kingdom of Sicily and received his oath of allegiance in 1722.

When, a year later, the emperor invested the Spanish prince Don Carlos, with Parma and Piacenza, the pope protested on the ground that these two dukedoms were under papal suzerainty. His protests, however, remained unheeded. Like his predecessor, he gave an annual pension to the English Pretender, James III; the son of the dethroned Catholic King, James II, and even promised to aid him with 100,000 ducats, in case an opportunity should offer itself to regain the English Crown by force of arms. He also assisted the Venetians and especially the Island of Malta in their struggle against the Turks. In the dispute of the Jesuits with the Dominicans and others, concerning the retention of various Chinese Rites among the Catholic converts of China, Innocent XIII sided with the opponents of the Jesuits. When in 1721 seven French bishops sent a document to Rome containing a petition to suppress the "Constitution Unigenitus" in which Clement XI had condemned the errors of Quenel, Innocent XIII not only condemned the writing of the bishops, but also demanded unconditional submission to the Constitution. He was, however, weak enough to yield to French pressure and raise the unworthy Prime Minister Dubois to the cardinalate. He, indeed, exhorted the minister to change his wicked life, but his exhortations remained useless. (For a milder view of Dubois see Bliard, "Dubois, cardinal et premier ministre", Paris, 1901.) In a Bull of March, 1723, he regulated numerous abuses in Spain and was assisted in the execution of this Bull by King Philip V of Spain. The fears which were raised in the beginning of his pontificate that he would yield to nepotism were entirely groundless. He elevated his brother to the cardinalate, but did not allow his revenues to exceed 12,000 scudi as had been stipulated by Pope Innocent XII.

MAYER, Papstwahl Innocenz' XIII (Vienna, 1874); Leben Papst Innocentius XHI (Cologne, 1724); MICHAUD, Le fin de Clement XI et le commencement du pontificat d'Innocent XIII in Internationale theologische Zeitschrift, V, 42-60, 304-331.
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INNOCENTIUS, SAINTS.—A number of saints are to be found bearing the name Innocentius, but only three besides Pope Innocent I seem to deserve special mention.

I. St. Innocentius, Bishop of Tortona in Italy, probably in the fourth century. A legendary "Vita" of St. Innocentius relates that he was thrown into a dungeon during the persecution of Diocletian, and later fled to Rome, where he was afterwards made a deacon of the Roman Church by Pope Sylvester, and was finally consecrated Bishop of Tortona. The narrative, however, rests on no historical foundation and is of comparatively late origin, probably appearing for the first time in the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, Innocentius was not a bishop of the first rank, but actually the first of the bishops of Tortona. From the earliest times, the Church of Tortona celebrated not only the day of his death, 17 April, but also the day of his consecration as bishop, 24 September. It is to be remarked that the custom of celebrating in a special manner the day of consecration of a bishop became widespread in the fourth and fifth centuries. Moreover, the tomb of Innocentius is beneath the high altar of the old cathedral of Tortona. These special distinctions accorded to the holy bishop can best be explained by regarding him as the first bishop of that city.

Positive chronological proof exists of the occupation of the See of Tortona by one Exuperantius, who attended the Council of Aquileia in 381. From a letter written in exile by Eusebius of Vercelli to his community in 356, we are further informed that at that time Tortona still belonged to the Diocese of Vercelli. The episcopate, therefore, of St. Innocentius, whom we presume to have been the first Bishop of Tortona, is to be placed somewhere in the period between 360 and 380.

Acta SS., April II, 422-43; Monasticon, Sanctorum II, for 1277-92; Acta SS., Vite dei Santi e Beati nella Bolla Bollandiana, XXV (1890), 1 sqq.; Idem, GL antichi vescovi d'Italia, II Fiomoni, (Turin, 1898), 377 sqq.

II. St. Innocentius, according to legend, Bishop of Justiniana (Adrumetum?) in Africa, in the fourth century. He is venerated at Gaeta in Italy. It would seem that towards the end of his life he went to Italy, suffering from doubtful and that his body was afterwards translated to Gaeta. The commemoration of his feast takes place on 7 May.


III. St. Innocentius (Innocens), Bishop of Le Mans, France; d. 559. He was the seventh bishop, and assisted at the Synods of Orleans held in 533 and 541. In all probability, he was bishop as early as 524. According to the "Acta" of the bishops of Le Mans, he restored the cathedral and other churches, and founded or endowed many convents in his diocese. Gregory of Tours mentions his death. His feast is observed on 9 June.


J. P. KIRCH.

Innocent, Holy. See Holy Innocents.

Innsbruck University, officially the Royal Imperial Leopold Francis University in Innsbruck, originated in the college opened at Innsbruck in 1562 by Blessed Peter Canisius, at the request of the foundation of the Emperor Ferdinando I of Austria, who in this way made effective his long-charged plans for an institute of higher learning for the people of Tyrol. The imperial edict of foundation was read from every pulpit in Tyrol on 12 May, 1562, and the school opened under the direction of the Fathers of the newly founded Society of Jesus on 24 June of the same year as a gymnashium with four classes, in which elements, grammar and syntax were taught. A fifth and lowest class of elements was added in 1566. In 1590 Ferdinand expressed the wish that the programme of studies be widened so as to include a studium universale. This was done, however, only in 1606, when a new building for the gymnashium was completed, whereupon courses in arts and the humanities (including the theological controversies) were begun, the other subjects being rhetoric, humanities, syntax, and upper and lower grammar. Logic was added in 1619. Until 1670 the erecting of the gymnashium into a university had been repeatedly discussed and planned, but without results.

In 1670 the gymnasium was extended to three years; in 1671-72 two chairs of scholastic theology were founded, as well as one of law (institutiones) and in the following year two of jurisprudence and one of canon law. In 1672 also the gymnasium was raised to the rank of an academy, and in 1673 this academy received the name and rank of a university, although lectures in medicine did not begin until 1674.

The Emperor Leopold I of Austria promulgated the imperial decree of foundation in 1677, and it was in the same year that Pope Innocent XI granted the new university the customary rights and privileges. The university then consisted of fifteen faculties: five for theology, four each for philosophy and law, and two for medicine. Of these, three of the professors of theology, all of those of philosophy and the professor of canon law in the law faculty were Jesuits; two members of the secular clergy lectured in the first-named faculty, and the rest were laymen. The complete organization of these four faculties followed ten years later. The chancellor of the university was the Prince-Bishop of Brixen, in the Tyrol, who was usually represented in Innsbruck by a vice-chancellor. Until 1750 the university remained essentially unchanged. The number of professors (sestari) increased. The eighteen years following, however, witnessed a widening of the study plan; the Government of Maria Theresa began to intervene more directly in the inner work of the university. During the next period, from 1748 to 1773, this state domination increased, pushing the Jesuits ever further. Then, when, upon the suppression of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits, who up to this had made up one-half of the professors and under whom the theological faculty became the most eminent of the four, ceased to lecture, the university numbered 911 students, distributed as follows: 325 in theology, 116 in law, 43 in medicine and 437 in philosophy.

Joseph II published an order for the suppression of the university on 29 November, 1781, but on 14 September, 1782, issued a decree allowing it to be continued as a lyceum with two university faculties, philosophy and theology, and facilities for the study of law and medicine. In 1783 the Government established at Innsbruck a general theological seminary for the whole of Tyrol, only to close it again in 1790. The university was recalled to life by Joseph's successor, Leopold II, to be again suppressed by the Bavarian Government in 1810, leaving a lyceum with merely philosophical and theological courses. This condition of affairs lasted until 1817, when courses in law and medicine were added. From the departure of the Jesuits in 1773 until 1822, when it was completely suppressed, the theological faculty, in which the principles of Josephism and Gallicanism reigned almost supreme, ad bedi, remained in the hands of the Bishop of Brixen, who had no right of supervision, not even over purity of doctrine, which suffered grievously in the interval. At one time even the "Imitation of Christ" was a forbidden book. In 1826 the university was again restored, this time by the Emperor Francis II of Austria. It consisted at
first of only two full faculties, philosophy and law. In 1857, mainly through the efforts of Vincent Gas-
er, Prince-Bishop of Brixen, the theological faculty was added and entrusted once more to the Jesuits, who have since, with two exceptions, been the sole provider. During Leopold's and his wife's regularization of the restored university was reached when the medical faculty was reconstituted in 1869.

The most illustrious teachers of the university have been and are mainly in the theological faculty. Since the restoration of the latter in 1837 the best known of the last century have been Schubiger (d. 1907), Stentrup (d. 1898), Kern (d. 1907), and Hurter, the latter still lecturing since 1858; in moral theology, Noldin (retired 1909); in sacred eloquence, Jungmann (d. 1885), the author of a well-known work on aesthetics; in moral theology and sociology, Biederlack; in canon law and ecclesiastical history, Niiles (d. 1907); in Scripture, Fockel (called to Rome, 1908); in ecclesiastical history, Grisar (professor honorarius since 1898). Dr. Ludwig von Pastor, author of the well-known "History of the Pope", is professor of history in the faculty of philosophy, in which the eminent Austrian meteorologist Pfeffer was a former professor. The faculty belongs also the cartographer von Wieser.

The theological faculty has frequently suffered the attacks of "liberal" professors, who form the large majority in the faculties of the profane sciences in the Austrian universities. These professors have several times endeavored to have the theological faculty suppressed, but it has ever found a faithful protector in the Emperor Francis Joseph I. This faculty also took the leading part in the controversy following upon the blasphemous attack on the Church in 1908 by Dr. Ludwig Wahrmund, professor of canon law in the law faculty.

Intimately connected with the theological faculty, though no official part of it, is the seminary (Theologisches Konvikt), where the majority of the students of theology reside. This institution, called the "Nikolaikasen", was first opened for poor students in 1569, closed in 1783, and reopened for the theologians in 1858. It is almost exclusively through the theological faculty and the "Nikolaikasen" that Innsbruck is known outside of Austria-Hungary, especially among Catholics. In the fifty years since the restoration of the faculty, 5588 students, from nearly every civilized country, have frequented the "Nikolaikasen" wherein 2983 are alumni of the "Nikolaikasen". Of these students, 4209 belonged to the secular and 1689 to the regular clergy; they represented 202 dioceses and Apostolic vicariates, and 73 provinces, cloisters, etc., of the regulars. North America has contributed 445 students, with few exceptions all from the United States. England is represented among the alumni by 10, and Ireland by 15 students. The "Nikolaikasen" is governed by a regens who is a member of the Society of Jesus. A Jesuit father also is always university preacher, and the university sodality is under the direction of another Jesuit. The也能 be Austrian and Hungarian provinces of the Society of Jesus. The influence of the university since its restoration, as in its earlier periods, has been important. Naturally this influence has been felt most of all in the Tyrol, which to a large extent owes to the university the majority of its students, especially the theological and in the medical and legal profession. In particular, the presence of theological students from all parts of the world has made the influence of the faculty of theology of great weight in the education of the clergy, and in the development of the theological seminaries of the last fifty years, an influence which has been spreading and augmenting the "Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie", a quarterly now in its thirty-third year. Innsbruck is one of the eight Austrian state universities. The university buildings number about 40 (including institutes, clinics, etc.). There is also a university church in charge of the Jesuits. This church was erected during the years 1820-40 by Archduke Leopold V of Austria, and his wife, and is decorated with paintings and statues. The library contains over 225,000 volumes, including many valuable manuscripts. The number of students averages about 1000, of that of the professors and privado docenten over 90. In 1909-10 the number of students was 1154, thus distributed: theology, 355; law, 293; medicine, 213; philosophy, 293. In the summer semester (1909) the total was 1082. In this same year there were 108 professors and privado docenten.

In Partibus Infidelium (often shortened to in partibus or abbreviated as i. p. i.), a term meaning "in the lands of the unbelievers", words added to the name of the see conferred on non-residential or titular Latin bishops, e. g. N., Bishop of Tyre in partibus infidelium. Formerly, when bishops were forced to flee before the invidious invading infidel hosts, they were welcomed by other Churches, while preserving their titles and their rights to their own dioceses. They were even entrusted with the administration of vacant sees. Thus we find St. Gregory appointing John, Bishop of Alessio, who had been expelled by his enemies, to the See of Squillace (cap. "Pastoralis" xlii. caus. vii. q. 1). In later days it was deemed fitting to preserve the memory of ancient Christian Churches that had fallen into the hands of the unbelievers; this was done by giving their names to auxiliary bishops or bishops in missionary countries. Fagani (in cap. "Episcopalia", i. "De privilegiis") says that the regular appointment of titular bishops dates back only to the time of the Twelfth Lateran Council under Leo IX (Session IX); cardinals alone were authorized to ask for them for their dioceses. St. Pius V extended the privilege to the sees in which it was customary to have auxiliary bishops. Since then the privilege became more extensive. The Propaganda, by its circular letter of 3 March, 1828, abolished the expression in partibus infidelium; the present custom is to join the name of the see that of the district to which it formerly belonged, e. g. "N., Archiepiscopus Corinthii in Asia", or else merely to say "titular bishop" (see Bishop).

FAGANI, loc. cit.; PERRACHI, Promota Bibliotheca, s. v. Episcopus, I, 67-4; VII, 21 sq.; and Supplem., n. 2. A. BOUJONIN.

In Petto, an Italian translation of the Latin in pectore, "in the breast", i.e. in the secret of the heart. It is the designation of those who, after creating some cardinals in consistory, adds that he has appointed one or more additional cardinals, whom he reserves in petto, and whom he will make known later: "aliae autem [v. g. duces] in pectore reservamus, arbitrio nostro quandoque declarandos." Until they have been publicly announced these cardinals were in full rights, and if the pope having declared their names they do not become members of the Sacred College; but when he has proclaimed their elevation at a subsequent consistory, they take rank from the date of their first nomination and receive from that date all the emoluments accruing to their see. This is a custom of the popes and has been at times adopted to ensure poor ecclesiastics a competency to meet all the expenses incident to their promo-
tion. At the consistory of 15 March, 1875, Pius IX an-
ounced that he was creating and reserving in petto five
cardinals, whose names would be found, in case of
his death, in the Lateran Breviary, his usual prac-
tice of canonists having raised serious doubts as to the
validity of such a posthumous publication. Pius IX pub-
lished their names in the following,
17 September. (See Cardinal.
SANTU-LEONI, Protettione fusa comunica, I, tit. xxxi, n. 23.
A. BOUVINON.

Inquisition (Lat. inquiere, to look into).—By this
term is usually meant a special ecclesiastical institu-
tion for combating or suppressing heresy. Its char-
acteristic mark seems to be the bestowal on special
judges of judicial powers in matters of faith, and this
the heretics Alexander and authors of a temporal or
for individual cases, but as a universal and perma-
nent office. Moderns experience difficulty in under-
standing this institution, because they have, to no
small extent, lost sight of two facts. On the one hand
they have ceased to grasp religious belief as something
objective, as the gift of God, and therefore outside the
realm of free private judgment; on the other they no
longer see in the Church a society—perfect and sov-
eign, based substantially on a pure and authentic
Revelation, whose first and most important duty must
naturally be to retain unassiled this original deposit of
faith. And misunderstanding others, of the sixteenth
century these views were still common to all Chris-
tians; that orthodoxy should be maintained at any
cost seemed self-evident. However, while the pos-
tive suppression of heresy by ecclesiastical and civil
authority in Christian society is as old as the Church,
the Inquisition as a distinct ecclesiastical tribunal is
of much later origin. Historically it is a phase in the
growth of ecclesiastical legislation, whose distinctive
traits can be fully understood only by a careful study
of the conditions amid which it grew up. Our sub-
ject may, therefore, be conveniently treated as fol-
loves: I. The Suppression of Heresy during the first
twelve Christian centuries; II. The Suppression of
Heresy by the Institution known as the Inquisition
under its several forms: (A) The Inquisition of the
Middle Ages; (B) The Inquisition in Spain; (C) The
Holy Office at Rome.

I. THE SUPPRESSION OF HERESY DURING THE FIRST
TWELVE CENTURIES.—(1) Though the Apostles were
deeply imbued with the conviction that they must
transmit the deposit of the Faith to posterity unaltered,
and that any teaching at variance with their own,
even if proclaimed by an angel of Heaven, would be
a culpable offence, yet St. Paul did not, in the case
of the Jewish party, show himself willing to expose
himself to Old-Covenant penalties of death or scourging
(Deut., xiii, 6 sq.; xvii, 1 sq.), but deemed exclusion from
the communion of the Church sufficient (1 Tim., i, 20;
Tit., iii, 10). In fact to the Christians of the first
three centuries it could scarcely have occurred to
assume any other attitude towards those who erred in
matters of faith. Tertullian (Ad. Scapulum, c. ii)
lays down the rule: "Humani iuris et naturalis po-
testatis, unicusque quod putaverit colere, nec ali
obest aut prodest aliorum religio. Sed nec religionis
est religiones colere, quae sponte suscipi debet, non
vit", in other words, he teaches us that the natural
law authorized man to follow only the voice of indi-
vidual conscience in the practice of religion, since
the acceptance of religion was a matter of free will, not
of compulsion. Replying to the accusation of Celsus,
based on the Old Testament, that the Christians perse-
cuted dissentients with death, burning and torture,
Origen (C. Cels., VII, 20) is satisfied with explaining
that one must distinguish between the law which the
Jews received from Moses and that given to the
Christians by Jesus; the former was binding on the
Jews, the latter on the Christians. Jewish Christians,
if sincere, could no longer conform to all of the
Mosaiic Law; hence they were no longer at liberty to kill
their enemies or to burn and stone violators of the
Christian Laws. In other words, he maintains that the
faith of the Nazarenes was a private affair, not a
social one. These views are thus repeated in the
Judgment of St. John Chrysostom, who says (Hom. in
N. S. 1, p. 62): "They who persecute the heathen with
fire and sword, perverting their faith, are deserving
to be burned themselves by the justice of God, as
were the persecutors and torturers of the Nazarenes,
who, God's presentation of them, until they cease to
persevere in their errors, if it be with fire and
sword, and do not repent; and, being burned, shall
be saved, and, receiving the eternal fire, shall enter
into the fire of divine vengeance, and shall there be
forever tormented by God, as the heathen were.

St. Cyprian of Carthage, surrounded as he was by
countless schismatics and undutiful Christians, also
put aside the material sanction of the Old Testament,
which punished with death rebellion against the
priesthood and the judges: "Nunc autem, qua circum-
cumspio spiritalis esse apud fideles servos Dei copiae,
corporalii gladii superi et superi servos Dei, sed
de Ecclesia eciamudur" (Ep. lxxii, ad Pompon., n. 4)—
religion being now spiritual, its sanctions take on the
same character, and excommunication replaces the
death of the body. Laetantius was yet smarter under
the scourge of bloody persecutions, when he wrote
his "De Divinis Institutionibus" (in 303 AD) and
said naturally, therefore, he stood for the most absolute
freedom of religion. "Religion", he says, "being a
matter of the will, it cannot be forced on anyone; in
this matter it is better to employ words than blows
[verbis melius quam verberibus res aganda est]. Of
what use is it to rack and to torture? What has the
measure of the rack to do with piety? Surely there is no
connexion between truth and violence, between justice and cruelty. . . . It is
true that nothing is so important as religion, and one
must defend it at any cost [summa vi]. . . . It is true
that it must be protected, but by daging for it, not by
violence; for the religion of truth, not by crime. If you attempt to defend
religion with bloodshed and torture, what you do is not
defence, but desecration and insult. For nothing is
so intrinsically a matter of free will as religion" (op.
cit., V, xx).
The Christian teachers of the first three
centuries insisted, as was natural for them, on com-
plete religious liberty; furthermore, they not only
urged the principle that religion could not be forced
on others—a principle always adhered to by the
Church in her dealings with the unbaptized—but,
when comparing the Mosaic Law and the Christian
religion, they taught that the latter was content with
a spiritual punishment of heretics (i.e. with excom-
munication), while Judaism necessarily proceeded
against its dissentients with torture and death.

(2) However, the imperial successors of Const-
tance soon began to see in themselves Divinely ap-
pointed "bishops of the entire world, guardians of
the temporal and material conditions of the Church. At
the same time they retained the traditional authority
of "Pontifex Maximus", and in this way the civil
authority inclined, frequently in league with prelates
of Arian tendencies, to persecute the orthodox bishops
by force. But the Church, with the protection of
St. Hilary of Poitiers (Liber contra Arians, c. iv),
protested vigorously against any use of force in the
province of religion, whether for the spread of Chris-
tianity or for preservation of the Faith. They re-
peatedly urged that in this respect the severe decrees
of the Old Testament were abrogated by the mild and
gentle laws of Christ. However, the successors of
Constantine were ever persuaded that the first concern
of imperial authority (Theodosius II, "Novelle", tit. III,
A. D. 438) was the protection of religion and so, with
terrible regularity, issued many penal edicts against
heretics (cf. E. Vacandard, "L'Inquisition: Etude
historique et critique, as naturellement de l'Eglise", Paris, 1907, p. 10).
The space of fifty-
seven years sixty-eight enactments were thus pro-
mulgated. All manner of heretics were affected by
this legislation, and in various ways, by exile, con-
finement of property, or death. A law of 407, aimed
at the traitorous Donatists, made for the first time that
these heretics ought to be put on the same plane as
transgressors against the sacred majesty of the em-
peror, a concept to which was reserved in later times
a very momentous rôle. The death penalty, how-
ever, was only imposed for certain kinds of heresy; in

their persecution of heretics the Christian emperors fell short of the severity of Diocletian, who in 287 sentenced to the stake the leaders of the Manicheans, and inflicted on their followers partly the usual death penalty by beheading, and partly forced labour in the government mines.

So far we have been dealing with the legislation of the Christianized State. In the attitude of the representatives of the Church towards this legislation some uncertainty is already noticeable. At the close of the fourth century and during the fifth Chalcedonians, Donatism, and Priscillianism were the heresies most in view. Expelled from Rome and Milan, the Manicheans sought a refuge in Africa. Though they were found guilty of abominable teachings and misdeeds (St. Augustine, "De haeresibus", no. 46), the Church refused to invoke the civil power against them; indeed, the great Bishop of Hippo explicitly rejected the use of force. He sought their return only through public and private acts of submission, and his efforts seem to have met with success. Indeed, we learn from him that the Donatists themselves were the first to appeal to the civil power for protection against the Church. He was perhaps the first of his kind. He was therefore more prone to turn upon them. State intervention not answering to their wishes, and the violent excesses of the Circumcellions being condignly punished, the Donatists complained bitterly of administrative cruelty. St. Optatius of Mileve defended the civil authority (De Schol. contra Donat. I., 32), but at the same time another appeal was set up in the Church: "... as though it were not permitted to come forward as avengers of God, and to pronounce sentence of death... But, say you, the State cannot punish in the name of God. Yet was it not in the name of God that Moses and Phineas consigned to death the worshipers of the stars? and those who despised the true religion?" This was the first time that a Catholic bishop championed a decisive co-operation of the State in religious questions, and its right to inflict death on heretics. For the first time, also, the Old Testament was appealed to, though such appeals had been previously rejected by Christian teachers.

St. Augustine, on the contrary, was still opposed to the use of force, and tried to lead back the erring by means of instruction; at most he admitted the imposition of a moderate fine for refractory persons. Finally, however, he changed his views, whether moved thereto by the example of the apostles, or by the good results achieved by the use of force, or favouring force through the persuasions of other bishops. Apropos of his apparent inconsistency, it is well to note carefully whom he is addressing. He appears to speak in one way to government officials, who wanted the civil power to change the law in another to the Donatists, who denied to the State any right of punishing dissenters. In his correspondence with state officials he dwells on Christian charity and toleration, and represents the heretics as straying lambs, to be sought out and perhaps, if recalcitrant, chastised with the reproofs of the Church, but not to be driven back by the fold of another's authority. On the other hand, in his writings against the Donatists he upholds the rights of the State: sometimes, he says, a salutary severity would be to the interest of the erring ones themselves and likewise protective of true believers and the community at large (Vacandard, loc. cit., pp. 17-26).

As to Priscillianism, not a few points remain yet obscure, despite recent valuable researches. It seems certain, however, that Priscillian, Bishop of Avila in Spain, was accused of heresy and sorcery, and found guilty by several bishops. St. Ambrose at Milan and St. Damascus at Rome seem to have refused him a hearing. At length he appealed to the Emperor Maximus at Trier, but to his detriment, for he was there condemned to death. Priscillian himself, no doubt

full consciousness of his own innocence, had formerly called for reparation of the Manicheans by the sword. But the foremost Christian teachers did not share these sentiments, and his own execution gave them occasion for a solemn pacific appeal; the imperial sentence meted out to him by the imperial government. St. Martin of Tours, then at Trier, exerted himself to obtain from the ecclesiastical authority the abandonment of the accusation, and induced the emperor to promise that on no account would he shed the blood of Priscillian, since the civil power against the heretic might be employed with impunity. Had the Church been prepared to fight for the liberty of conscience, no such sentence would have been pronounced. But bloodshed and formal submission to the imperial authority are soon come to be regarded as the two irreducible conditions of any public measures; henceforth, as far as the Roman Church was concerned, it was not the Church of Milan which argued for liberty, but the Church of Rome, which now, even more than ever, renounced the severe judgments of St. Augustine and St. Jerome against Priscillianism.

In 447 Leo the Great had to reproach the Priscillianists with loosening the holy bonds of marriage, treading all decency under foot, and fostering slanders and calumniating defects; but it was to nature, and not to the Church, that he had recourse in the cause of the Manicheans. In 465 Leo I., addressed himself to the Manicheans, and was heard by them, not as a bishop but as a man of peace and of charity. He declared that the Bishop of Rome, St. Ambrose, Milan, and St. Ambrose of Milan, was described as execution as a crime.

Priscillianism, however, did not disappear with the death of its originator; on the contrary, it spread with extraordinary rapidity, and, through its adoption by the bishops and priests of Manicheism, came more and more to exercise a disturbing influence upon the public conscience than ever. In this way the severe judgments of St. Augustine and St. Jerome against Priscillianism become intelligible. In 447 Leo the Great had to reproach the Priscillianists with loosening the holy bonds of marriage, treading all decency under foot, and fostering slanders and calumniating defects; but it was to nature, and not to the Church, that he had recourse in the cause of the Manicheans. In 465 Leo I., addressed himself to the Manicheans, and was heard by them, not as a bishop but as a man of peace and of charity. He declared that the Bishop of Rome, St. Ambrose, Milan, and St. Ambrose of Milan, was described as execution as a crime.

The ecclesiastical ideas of the first five centuries may be summarized as follows: (1) The Church should for no cause shed blood (St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and Leo I., and others); (2) in case of heresies like Optatus of Mileve and Priscillianism, believed that the State could pronounce the death-penalty on heretics in case the public welfare demanded it; (3) the majority held that the death-penalty for heresy, when not civilly criminal, was irreconcilable with the spirit of Christianity. St. Augustin (Ep. c. u. I.), in a work now in the name of the Western Church, says: "Corrigi eos volumus, non necari, nec disciplinam circa eos neglegi volumus, nec supplicios quibus digni sunt egressi?"—we wish them corrected, not put to death; we desire the triumph of (ecclesiastical) discipline, not the death-penalty, that it may be observed that the ecclesiastical theory says substantially the same in the name of the Eastern Church (Hom. XLVI, c. i.): "To consign a heretic to death is to commit an offence beyond atonement"; and in the next chapter he says that God forbids their execution, even as He forbids us to uproot cockle, but He does not forbid us to uproot them, to deprive them of their rank, or to prohibit their assemblies. The help of the "secular arm" was therefore not entirely rejected; on the contrary, as often as the Christian welfare, general or domestic, required it, Christian rulers sought to stem the evil by appropriate measures. As late as the seventh century St. Isidore of Seville expressed similar sentiments (Sententiarum, III, iv. 4-6).

How little we are to trust the vaunted impartiality of Henry Charles Lea, the American historian of the Inquisition, we may here illustrate by an example.
In his "History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages" (New York, 1888, I, 215), he closes this period with the words: "It was only sixty-two years after the slaughter of Priscillian and his followers that the Inquisition, as we know it today, was dormant. But it was reviving in 447, not only justified the act, but declared that, if the followers of a heresy so damnable were allowed to live, there would be an end of human and Divine law. The final step had been taken and the Church was definitively pledged to the suppression of heresy at any cost. It was impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the success of the edicts by which, from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death.

In these lines Lea has transferred to the pope words employed by the emperor. Moreover, it is simply the exact opposite of historical truth to assert that the imperial edicts punishing heresy with death were due to ecclesiastical influence, since we have shown that in this period the more influential ecclesiastical authorities declared that the death penalty was contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and themselves opposed its execution. For centuries this was the ecclesiastical attitude both for theory and practice. Those who kept with the civil law, some Manicheans were executed at Ravenna in 556. The other hand, Euplius of Toledo and Felix of Urgel, the chiefs of Adoptionism and Predestinationism, were condemned by pope and councils, but were otherwise left unmolested, however they might escape, after the condemnation of his false doctrine that Christ had not died for all mankind, was by the Synods of Mainz in 484 and Quiercy in 489 sentenced to being and imprisonment, punishments then common in monasteries for various infractions of the rule.

(32) In 1122 King Robert the Pious (regis iussu et universae plebis consensus), "because he feared for the safety of the kingdom and the salvation of souls", had thirteen distinguished citizens, ecclesiastic and lay, burnt alive at Orleans. Elsewhere similar acts were done for the same purpose. The Bishop of Châlons observed that the sect was spreading in his diocese, and asked of Wazo, Bishop of Liège, advice as to the use of force: "An terrae utis parvissimae gladio in eos sit animadverterunt nece verutur." (Vita Wasonis, cc. xxv, 46v, F. L., CXLI, 752; "Wazo ad Roger. II, episc. Celaunensis"; and "Anselmi Gesta episc. Leodi," in "Mon. Germ. SS.," VII, 227 sq.). Wazo replied that this was contrary to the spirit of the Church and the words of its Founder, who ordained that the tares should be allowed to grow with the wheat until the day of the harvest, lest the year be occupied with men of God. He would not agree to those who to-day were tares might to-morrow be converted, and turn into wheat; let them therefore live, and let mere excommunication suffice. St. Chrysostom, as we have seen, had taught similar doctrine. This principle could not be always followed. Thus at Goslar, in the Christmas season of 1051, and in 1052, several heretics were hanged because Emperor Henry III wanted to prevent the further spread of "the heretical leprosy". A few years later, in 1076 or 1077, a Catharist was condemned to the stake by the Bishop of Cambrai and his chapter. Other Catharists, in spite of the Bishop's judgement, were given the choice by the mayor of Milan of renouncing homage to the Cross and mounting the pyre. By far the greater number chose the latter. In 1114 the Bishop of Soissons kept sundry heretics in duress in his episcopal city. But while he remained to Beauvais, to ask advice of the bishops assembled there for a synod, the "believing folk, fearing the habitual soft-heartedness of ecclesiastics" (clericum verum molestiis), storm the prison, took the accused outside the city gate, and burned them.

The people disliked what to them was the extreme dilatoriness of the clergy in pursuing heretics. In 1144 Adalbero II of Liège hoped to bring some imprisoned Catharists to better knowledge through the grace of God, but the people, less indulgent, assaulted the unresisting creatures, and only with the greatest trouble did the bishops succeed in rescuing some of them from death by fire. A like scene was enacted about the same time at Cologne. While the archbishop and the priests earnestly sought to lead the misguided back into the Church, the latter were violently taken by the mob (a populis timido seco abrepits) from the custody of the clergy and burned at the stake. The best-known heresies of that time, Peter of Bruys and Arnold of Brescia, met a similar fate—the first on the pyre as a victim of popular fury, and the latter under the headman's axe as a victim of his political enemies. In short, no blame attaches to the Church for being slow in her pursuit of heretics in those rude days. Among all the bishops of the period, so far as can be ascertained, Theodwin of Liège, successor of the aforesaid Wazo and predecessor of Adalbero II, alone appealed to the civil power for the punishment of heretics, and even he did not call for a monk's death, but for exile only. All who were more highly respected in the twelfth century than Peter Cantor, the most learned man of his time, and St. Bernard of Clairvaux? The former says ("Verbum abbreviatum," c. Ixxvii, in F. L., CCN, 231): Whether they be convicted of error, or freely confess their guilt, Catharists are not to be put to death, at least not when they refrain from armed assaults upon the Church. For although the Apostle said, 'A man that is a heretic after the third admonition, avoid', he certainly did not say, 'Kill him'. Throw them into prison, if you will, but do not put them to death" (cf. Geroeh von Reinachersberg, "De investigaciones Antichristi," III, 42). So far was St. Bernard from agreeing with the methods of the people of Cologne, that he laid down the axiom: Fides suadenda, non imponenda (By persuasion, not by violence, are men to be won to the faith). And later he says: The princes, who were to blame because little foxes devastated the vineyard, yet he adds that the latter must not be captured by force but by arguments (captivandi non armis, sed argumentis): the obstinate were to be excommunicated, and if necessary kept in confinement for the safety of others (ad corrigendum ne perancock, sed ne perimant, coecendum). (See Vacandard, 1. 9, 53 sqq.) The synods of the period employ substantially the same terms, e.g. the synod at Reims in 1049 under Leo IX, at Toulouse in 1118, at which Callistus II presided, and finally the Lateran Council of 1139.

Hence, the occasional executions of heretics during this period must be ascribed partly to the arbitrary action of individual rulers, partly to the fanatical outbreaks of the overzealous populace, and in no wise to ecclesiastical law or the ecclesiastical authorities. There were already, it is true, canons who conceded to the Church the right to pronounce sentence of death on heretics; but the question was treated as a purely academic one, and the theory exercised virtually no influence on real life. Excommunication, proscription, imprisonment, etc., were indeed inflicted, being intended merely as forms of atonement and reparation, but never the capital sentence. The maxim of Peter Cantor was still adhered to: "Catharists, even though Divinely convicted in an ordeal, must not be punished by death." In the second half of
the twelfth century, however, heresy in the form of Catharism spread in truly alarming fashion, and not only menaced the Church's existence, but underminded the very foundations of Christian society. In opposition to this propaganda there grew up a kind of prescriptive law—at least throughout Germany, France, and Spain—which visited heresy with death by the stake. England on the whole remained tainted by heresy. When, in 1166, about thirty seculars made their way thither, Henry II ordered that they be burnt on their foreheads with red-hot iron, be beaten with rods in a public square, and then driven off. Moreover, he forbade anyone to give them shelter or assistance and his died partly from hunger and partly from the cold of winter. Duke Philip of Flanders, aided by William of the White Hand, Archbishop of Reims, was particularly severe towards heretics. They caused many citizens in their domains, nobles and commoners, clerics, knights, peasants, spinners, widows, and married women, to be burnt alive, confiscated their property, and divided it between them. This happened in 1183. Between 1183 and 1206 Bishop Hugo of Auxerre acted similarly towards the neo-Manichæans. Some he despoiled; the others he either wasted or reduced to slavery. As early as 1197, Augustus of France had eight Catharists burnt at Troyes in 1200, one at Nevers in 1202, several at Braine-sur-Vesle in 1204, and many at Paris—priests, clerics, laitymen, and women belonging to the sect. Raymond V of Toulouse (1148–94) promulgated a law which punished with death the followers of the sect and their favourers. Simon de Montfort's men-at-arms believed in 1211 that they were carrying out this law when they boasted how they had burned alive many, and would continue to do so (unde multis combussimus et adhuc cum inveniuntur, si non tali securitate pacem vident) in the next years. King II, King of Aragon and Count of Barcelona, issued an edict in obedience to which the Waldensians and all other schismatics were expelled from the land; whoever of this sect was still found in his kingdom or his county after Palm Sunday of the next year was to suffer death by fire, also confiscation of goods. Ecclesiastical legislation was far more severe from this period. Alexander III at the Lateran Council of 1179 renewed the decisions already made as to schismatics in Southern France, and requested secular sovereigns to silence those disturbers of public order if necessary by force, to the effect that they were by liberty to imprison the guilty (seveno sub hoc ruino) and appropriate their possessions. According to the agreement made by Lucius III and Emperor Frederick Barba- roses at Verona (1148), the heretics of every community were to be sought out, brought before the episcopal court, excommunicated, and then burnt to the civil power to be suitably punished (debia animad- versio, ulitio) did not, however, as yet mean capital punishment, but the prescriptive law, though even this, it is true, entailed exile, expropriation, destruction of property, pillaging, infamy, debarring them from public office, and the like (J. Flicker, "Die Einführung der Todesstrafe für Ketzer" in "Mitteilungen des Institutes für österr. Geschichtsforschung." I, 1880, p. 187 sq., 194 sq.). The "Continuatio Zwellingensis altera, ad ann. 1184" (Mon. Germ. Hist.: SS, IX, 542) accurately describes the condition of heretics at this time in that they were put under the civil law, while he confiscates their goods (papa ex com- municaevit, imperator vero tam res quam personas ipsum imperialis banno subiect). Under Innocent III, thinking was done to intensify or add to the extant statutes against heretics in the texts of a wider range by the action of his legates and through the Fourth Lateran Council (1215). But this act was indeed a relative service to the heretics, for the regular canonical procedure thus introduced did much to abrogate the arbitrarily, passion, and injustice of the civil courts in Spain, France, and Germany. In so far as, and so long as, his preconciliations remained in force, no summary condemnations or executions en masse occurred, neither stake nor rack were set up; if, on one occasion the pontiff, to justify confiscation, he appealed to the Roman Law and its penalties for crimes against the sovereign power, yet he did not draw the extreme conclusion that heretics deserved to be burnt. His reign affords many examples showing how much of the danger he took away in practice from the existing penal code.

II. The Suppression of Heresy by the Institution
Known as the Inquisition.—(A) The Inquisition of the Middle Ages.—(1) Origin.—During the first three decades of the thirteenth century the Inquisition, as an institution, did not exist. But eventually Christian Europe was so endangered by heresy, and penal legislation concerning Catharism (see Cathari) had gone so far, that the Inquisition seemed to be a political necessity. That these sects were a menace to Christian society had been long recognized by the Byzantine rulers. As early as 1172 Emperor Theodoros had put to death a multitude of Paulicians, and in 1118 Emperor Alexius Comnenus treated the Bogomil with equal severity, but this did not prevent them from pouring over all Western Europe. Moreover, these sects were in the highest degree aggressive, hostile to Christianity itself, to the Mass, the sacraments, the ecclesiastical hierarchy and organisation; hostile also to feudal government by their attitude towards oaths, which they declared under no circumstances allowable. Nor were their views less fatal to the continuance of human society, for on the one hand they forbade the massacre of the human race, and on the other they made a duty of suicide through the institution of the Endura (see Cathari). It has been said that more perished through the Endura (the Catharist suicide code) than through the Inquisition. It was, therefore, natural enough for the custodians of the existing order in Europe, especially of the Christian religion, to adopt repressive measures against such revolutionary teachings.

In France Louis VIII decreed in 1226 that persons excommunicated by the diocesan bishop, or his delegate, should receive "meet punishment" (debis et...amadversio). In 1249 Lateran IX (1241–54) ordered an absolute ban with heretics according to the dictates of duty (de ipsis facient quod debeant). A decree of the Council of Toulouse (1229) makes it appear probable that in France death at the stake was already prescribed as in keeping with the aforesaid debi animadversio. As we seek to trace in these measures the influence of imperial or papal ordinances is vain, since the burning of heretics had already come to be regarded as prescriptive. It is said in the "Etablissements de St Louis et coutumes de Beauvaisis", ch. cxxii (Ordonnances des Roys de France, I, 211): "Quand le juge [eclesiastique] l'aurait examiné [le suspect], si il trouvait qu'il feust bourgeois, si le devrait faire envoyer à la justice laic, et la justice laic le doit fere arder." The "Coutumes de Beauvaisis" correspond to the German "Bachenspiegel", or "Mirror of Saxon Laws", compiled about 1235, which also embodies as a law sanctioned by custom the execution of unbelievers at the stake (sal man uf der hurt burnen). In Italy Emperor Frederick II, as early as 22 November, 1220 (Mon. Germ., II, 243), issued a rescript against heretics, conceived, however, quite in the spirit of Innocent III, and Honorius III commissioned his legates to see to the enforcement in Italy during the first year of the decrees of 1218 and the imperial legislation of 1220. From the foregoing it cannot be doubted that up to
1224 there was no imperial law ordering, or pre-supposing as legal, the burning of heretics. The rescript for Lombardy of 1224 (Mon. Germ., IV, 252; cf. ibid., 288) is accordingly the first law in which death by fire is contemplated (cf. Ficker, op. cit., 186). That the Dominican Francisca in the decree of this ordinance cannot be maintained; indeed the emperor was all the less in need of papal inspiration as the burning of heretics in Germany was then no longer rare; his legists, moreover, would certainly have directed the emperor's attention to the ancient Roman Law that punished by treason with death, and Manicheism in particular with the stake. The imperial rescripts of 1220 and 1224 were adopted into ecclesiastical criminal law in 1231, and were soon applied at Rome. It was then that the Inquisition of the Middle Ages came into being.

What was the immediate provocation? Contemporary sources afford no positive answer. Bishop Douai, who perhaps commands the original contemporary material better than anyone, has attempted in his latest work (L'Inquisition, See Origines, Sa Procede, Paris, 1906) to explain its appearance by a support of Gregory IX to restall the encroachments of Frederick II in the strictly ecclesiastical province of doctrine. For this purpose it would seem necessary for the pope to establish a distinct and specifically ecclesiastical court. From this point of view, though the hypothesis cannot be fully proved, much more likely than the theory that there was a doubtless reason to fear such imperial encroachments in an age yet filled with the angry contentions of the Imperium and the Sacrolemma. We need only recall the trickery of the emperor and the pretended eagerness for the purity of the Faith, his increasingly rigorous legislation against heretics, the numerous executions of his personal rivals on the pretext of heresy, the hereditary passion of the Hohenstaufen for supreme control over Church and State, their claim of God-given authority over both, of responsibility in both domains to God and God only, etc. What was more natural than that the Church should strictly reserve to herself her own sphere, while that at the same time endeavouring to avoid giving offence to the emperor? A purely spiritual or papal religious tribunal would secure ecclesiastical liberty and authority, for this court could be confined to men of expert knowledge and blameless reputation, and above all to independents of the Church in whose hands the Church safely trust the decision as to the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of a given teaching. On the other hand, to meet the emperor's wishes as far as allowable, the penal code of the empire could be taken over as it stood (cf. Audra, "Regist. de Gregorio IX", n. 355).

W. The New tribunal.—(a) Its essential characteristic.—The pope did not establish the Inquisition as a distinct and separate tribunal; what he did was to appoint special but permanent judges, who executed their doctrinal functions in the name of the pope. Where they sat, there was the Inquisition, but it must be carefully noted that the characteristic feature of the Inquisition was not its peculiar procedure, nor the secret examination of witnesses and consequent official indictment: this procedure was common to all courts from the time of Innocent III. Nor was it the pursuit of heretics in all places: this had been the rule since the Imperial Synod of Verona under Lucius III and Frederick Barbarossa. Nor again was it the torture, which was not prescribed or even allowed for decades after the beginning of the Inquisition, nor, finally, the various sanctions, imprisonment, confiscation, the stake, etc. Which had made the business work for the Inquisition. The Inquisitor, strictly speaking, was a special but permanent judge, acting in the name of the pope and clothed by him with the right and the duty to deal legally with offences against the Faith; he had, however, to adhere to the established rules of canonical procedure and pronounce the customary penalties. Many regarded it as providential that just at this time sprang up two new orders, the Dominicans and the Franciscans, with men of the same spirit, and sound theological training and other characteristics, seemed eminently fitted to perform the inquisitorial task with entire success. It was safe to assume that they were not merely endowed with the requisite knowledge, but that they would also, quite unselfishly and unflinchingly, in the name of God, to do what seemed their duty for the good of the Church. In addition, there was reason to hope that, because of their great popularity, they would not encounter too much opposition. It seems, therefore, not unnatural that the inquisitors should have been chosen by the pope recondivingly, especially from the mendicant orders, though the Senate of Rome no doubt meant such when in his oath of office (1231) he spoke of inquisitores datas ab ecclesia. In his decree of 1232 he is clearly still restating the apostolica sede datos. The Dominican Almeric, in November of 1232, went through Lombardy as inquisitor heretics pravilatis. The prior and sub-prior of the Dominicans at Friesbach were given a similar commission as early as 27 November, 1231; on 2 December, 1232, and 5 December, 1233 they were received in the convents at Wurzburg, Ratisbon, and Bremen, also received the commission. In 1233 a rescript of Gregory IX, touching these matters, was sent simultaneously to the bishops of Southern France and to the priors of the Dominican Order. We know that Dominicans were sent as inquisitors in 1232 to Germany along the Rhine, to the Diocese of Tarragona in Spain, and to Lombardy; in 1233 to France, to the territory of Auxerre, the ecclesiastical provinces of Bourges, Bordeaux, Narbonne, and Auch, and to Burgundy; in 1235 to the ecclesiastical province of Sens. In fine, about 1235 we find the Inquisition in full activity in all the countries of Central and Western Europe, in the county of Tourouse, in Sicily, Aragon, Lombardy, France, Burgundy, Brabant, and Germany (cf. Douai, op. cit., p. 36, and Fredericq, "Corpus documentorum inquisitionis hereticarum pravilatis Neerlandicis, 1055--1520", 2 vols., Ghent, 1889-90).

That Gregory IX, through his appointment of Dominicans and Franciscans as inquisitors, withdrew the suppression of heresy from the proper courts (i.e. from the bishops), is a reproach that in no general a form cannot be sustained. So little did he think of displacing episcopal authority that, on the contrary, he provided explicitly that no inquisitorial tribunal was to work anywhere without the diocesan bishop's co-operation. And if, on the strength of their papal jurisdiction, inquisitors occasionally manifested too great an inclination to act independently of such bishops, the pope weakened the popes who kept them within right bounds. As early as 1254 Innocent IV prohibited anew perpetual imprisonment or death at the stake without the episcopal consent. Similar orders were issued by Urban IV in 1262, Clement IV in 1265, and Gregory X in 1273, until at last Boniface VIII and Clement V solemnly declared null and void all judgments issued in trials concerning faith, unless delivered with the approval and co-operation of the bishops. The popes always upheld with earnestness the episcopal authority, and sought to free the inquisitorial tribunals from such and such bishops by their superiors.

It was a heavy burden of responsibility—almost too heavy for a common mortal—which fell upon the shoulders of an inquisitor, who was obliged, at least indirectly, to decide between life and death. The
Church was bound to insist that he should possess, in a pre-eminent degree, the qualities of a good judge; that he should be animated with a glowing zeal for the Faith, the salvation of souls, and the extirpation of heresy; that he should have the most keen ear for the voice of truth and of evil, discerning what dangers he should never yield to anger or passion; that he should meet hostilities fearlessly, but should not court it; that he should yield to no inducement or threat, and yet not be heartless; that, when circumstances permitted, he should observe mercy in administering justice; that he should consult the council of others, and not trust too much to his own opinion or to appearances, since often the probable is untrue, and the truth improbable. Somewhat thus did Bernard Gui (or Guidonis) and Eymerie, both of them inquisitors for years, describe the ideal inquisitor of the day. The principle was enshrined in the Code of 1261, after Alexander IV had silenced their scruples, that the new principle was generally adopted both in theory and in practice. This grave modification seems to have been defended on the ground that the heretical conventicles took place secretly, and were shrouded in great obscurity, so that reliable information could be obtained from none but themselves. Even prior to the establishment of the Inquisition the names of the witnesses were sometimes withheld from the accused person, and this usage was legalized by Gregory IX, Innocent IV, and Alexander IV. Boniface VIII, however, set it aside by his Bull "Ut commissi vobis officii" (Sext. Decret., l. V, tit. ii); and commanded that at all trials, even inquisitorial, the witnesses must be named to the accused. There was no personal confrontation of witnesses, neither was there any cross-examination. Witnesses for the defence hardly ever appeared, as they would almost infallibly be suspected of being heretics or favourable to heresy. For the same reason those impeached rarely secured legal advisers, and were therefore obliged to rely on their personal friends for assistance. This, however, was also no innovation, for in 1265 Innocent III, by the Bull "Si adversus vos", forbade any legal help for heretics: "We strictly prohibit you, lawyers and notaries, from assisting in any way, by counsel or support, all heretics and such as believe in them, adhere to them, or defend them, any assistance or defend them in any way." But this severity soon relaxed, and even in Eymerie's day it seems to have been the universal custom to grant heretics a legal adviser, who, however, had to be in every way beyond suspicion, "upright, of undoubted loyalty, skilled in civil and canon law, and zealous for the faith."

Meanwhile, even in those hard times, such legal severities were felt to be excessive, and attempts were made to mitigate them in various ways, so as to protect the natural rights of the accused. First he could make known to the judge the names of his enemies, who would be denied the right to advise the accused. Next he could be quashed without further ado. Furthermore, it was undoubtedly to the advantage of the accused that false witnesses were punished without mercy. The aforesaid inquisitor, Bernard Gui, relates an instance of a father falsely accusing his son of heresy. The son's innocence quickly becoming apparent, the false accuser was apprehended, and sentenced to prison for life (solam vitam et ex misericordia relicturos). In addition he was pilloried for five consecutive Sundays before the church during service, with bare head and bound hands. Perjury in those days was accounted an enormous offence, punished by death while the accused had no chance of being exonerated, and there was no idea of mitigating the punishment. Moreover, the accused had a considerable advantage in the fact that the inquisitor had to conduct the trial in co-operation with the diocesan bishop or his representatives, to whom all documents relating to the trial had to be remitted. Both together, inquisitor and bishop, were also made to summon and consult a number of upright and experienced men (boni viri), and to decide in agreement with their decision (vota). Innocent IV (11 July, 1254), Alexander IV (15 April, 1255, and 27 April, 1260), and Urban IV (2 August, 1264) strictly prescribed this institution of the boni viri—i.e., that new departures in difficult cases of importance were to be made to consult a number of upright and experienced men, well versed in the lore of canon law, and in every way irreproachable. The documents of the trial were either in their entirety handed to them, or at least an abstract drawn up by a public notary was furnished; they were also made acquainted
with the witnesses’ names, and their first duty was to decide whether or not the witnesses were credible. The *boni viri* were very frequently called on. Thirty, fifty, eighty, or more persons—laymen and priests, secular and regular—would be summoned, all highly regarded and independent men, and singly sworn to give verdict upon the cases before them according to the best of their knowledge and belief. Substantially they were always called upon to decide two questions: whether and what guilt lay at hand, and what punishment was to be inflicted. That they might be influenced by no personal consideration, the case would be submitted to them somewhat in the abstract, i.e., the name of the person implicated was not given. Although, strictly speaking, the *boni viri* were entitled only to an advisory vote, the final ruling was usually in accordance with their views, and, whenever their decision was revised, it was always in the direction of clemency, the mitigation of the findings being indeed of frequent occurrence. The judges were also assisted by a *consilium perenam*, or standing council, composed of other sworn judges. In these dispositions surely lay the most valuable guarantees for an objective, independent, and just operation of the inquisitional court. Apart from the conduct of his own case, the accused disposed of other legal means for safeguarding his rights: he could reject a judge who had shown prejudice, and at any stage of the trial could appeal to Rome. Eymeric leads one to infer that in Aragon appeals to the Holy See were not rare. He himself as inquisitor had on one occasion to go to Rome to defend in person his own position, but he advises other inquisitors against that step, as it simply meant the loss of much time and money; it were wiser, he says, to try a case in such a manner that no fault could be found. In the event of an appeal the documents of the case were to be sent to Rome under seal, and Rome not only scrutinised them, but itself gave the final verdict. Seemingly, appeals to Rome were in great favour; a milder sentence, it was hoped, would be forthcoming, or at least some time would be gained.

(d) Punishments.—The present writer can find nothing to suggest that the accused were imprisoned during the period of enquiry. It was certainly customary to grant the accused his freedom until the *sermo generalis*, were he ever so strongly incriminated through witnesses or confession; he was not yet supposed guilty, though he was compelled to produce under oath always to be ready to come before the inquisitor, and in the end to accept with good grace his sentence, whatever its tenor. The oath was assuredly a terrible weapon in the hands of the medieval judge. If the accused person kept it, the judge was favourably inclined; if the other way, if the accused denied it, his credit grew worse. Many sects, it was known, repudiated oaths on principle; hence the violation of an oath caused the guilty party easily to incur suspicion of heresy. Besides the oath, the inquisitor might secure himself by demanding a sum of money as bail, or reliable bondsmen who would stand surety for the accused. It happened that men undertook upon oath to deliver the accused “dead or alive”. It was perhaps unpleasant to live under the burden of such an obligation, but, at any rate, it was more endurable than to await a final verdict in rigid confinement for months or longer.

The allegation of torture was discredited as a mode of punishment, but purely as a means of eliciting the truth. It was not of ecclesiastical origin, and was long prohibited in the ecclesiastical courts. Nor was it originally an important factor in the inquisitional procedure, being unauthorized until twenty years after the Bull *Exstrictanda* had been sanitised by Innocent IV in his Bull “Ad exstrictanda” of 15 May, 1252, which was confirmed by Alexander IV on 30 November, 1259, and by Clement IV on 3 November, 1265. The limit placed upon torture was *citro membrana diminutionem et mortis periculum*—i.e., it was not to cause the loss of a limb or imperil life. Torture was to be applied only once, and not then unless the accused were uncertain in his statements, and confessed convinced by torture. After this there were no weighty proofs. In general, this violent questioning (*questio*) was to be deferred as long as possible, and recourse to it was permitted only when all other expedients were exhausted. Conscientious and sensible judges quite properly attached no great importance to confessions or convictions by torture. After the experience Eymeric declared: *Questiones sunt fallacies et inefficaces*—i.e., the torture is deceptive and ineffectual.

Had this papal legislation been adhered to in practice, the historian of the Inquisition would have fewer difficulties to satisfy. In the beginning, torture was held to be so odious that clerics were forbidden to be present under pain of irregularity. Sometimes it had to be interrupted so as to enable the inquisitor to continue his examination, which, of course, was attended by numerous inconveniences. On 27 April, 1260, Alexander IV, in his *inquisitionem ad absolvendam earn *exstrictandam* of 2 August, 1262, renewed the permission, and this was soon interpreted as formal licence to continue the examination in the torture chamber itself. The inquisitors’ manuals faithfully noted and approved this usage. The general rule ran that torture was to be resorted to only once. But this was somewhat circumvented—first, by assuming that with every new piece of evidence the rack could be utilized afresh, and secondly, by imposing fresh torments on the poor victim (often on different days), not by way of repetition, but as a continuation (non ad modum iterantium sed continuations), as defended by Eymeric: “quia iterari non debent [tormenta], nisi novis supervenientibus indicis, continuari non prohibentur.” But what was to be done when the accused, released from the rack, denied what he had just confessed? Some held with Eymeric that the accused should be set at liberty; others, however, like the author of the “Sacro Arsenale”, held that the torture should be continued, because the accused had too seriously incriminated himself by his previous confession. When Clement V formulated his regulations for the employment of torture, he never imagined that they would be evaded. For if the accused, although not their guilt, but that of the accused, was in question. From the pope’s silence it was concluded that a witness might be put upon the rack at the discretion of the inquisitor. Moreover, if the accused was convicted through witnesses, or had pleaded guilty, the torture might still be used to compel him to testify against his friends and fellow-culpits. It would be opposed to all Divine and human equity—so one reads in the “Sacro Arsenale, ovvero Pratica dell’ Officio della Santa Inquisizione” (Bologna, 1665)—to inflict torture unless the judge were personally persuaded of the guilt of the accused.

But one of the more essential parts of the procedure is why torture was used as a means of learning the truth. On the one hand, the torture was continued until the accused confessed or intimated that he was willing to confess. On the other hand, it was not desired, as in fact it was not possible, to regard as freely made a confession not regarded by torture.

It is at once apparent how little reliance may be placed upon the assertion so often repeated in the minutes of trials, “confessio esse veram, non factam vi tormentorum” (the confession was true and free), even though one had not occasionally read in the preceding page that, after being taken down from the rack (postquam deposuit falsi de tortore), he freely confessed this or that. However, it is not of much greater importance to say that torture is seldom
mentioned in the records of inquiry trials—but once, for example, in 636 condemnations between 1309 and 1323; this does not prove that torture was rarely applied. Since torture was originally inflicted only in the court room by lay officials, and since only the voluntary confession was valid before the judges, there was no occasion to mention in the record the fact of torture. On the other hand it is historically true that the popes not only always held that torture must not imperil life or limb, but also tried to abolish particularly gruesome abuses, when such became known to them. Thus Clement VI ordained that inquisitors should not apply the torture without the consent of the diocesan bishop. From the middle of the thirteenth century, they did not disavow the principle itself, and, as their restrictions to its use were not always heeded, its severity, though often exaggerated, was in many cases extreme.

The consuls of Carcassonne in 1286 complained to the pope, the King of France, and the vicars of the local bishop against the inquisitor Jean Galand, whom they charged with inflicting torture in an absolutely inhuman manner, and this charge was not isolated one. The trial of Savonarola (q.v.) and the Inquisition was itself cleared up in this respect. The official report says he had to suffer three and a half "tratti da fane" (a sort of strappado). When Alexander VI showed discontent with the delays of the trial, the Florentine government excused itself by urging that Savonarola was an extraordinary criminal, and that he had been vigorously tortured on many days ("assidua questione multis diebus", the papal prothonotary, Burchard, says seven times) but with little effect. It is to be noted that torture was most cruelly used, where the inquisitors were most exposed to the pressure of civil authority. Frederick II, though always boasting of his zeal for the purity of the Faith, abused both rack and Inquisition to put out of the way his personal enemies. The tragic ruin of the Templars is ascribed to the abuse of torture by Philip the Fair and his henchmen. At Paris, for instance, thirty-six, and at Sens twenty-five, Templars died as the result of torture. Blessed Joan of Arc could not have been sent to the stake as a heretic and a recalcitrant, if her judges had not been tools of English policy. And the excesses of the Spanish Inquisition are largely due to the fact that in its administration civil authority overshadowed. Every reader of the "Cautio criminalis" of the Jesuit Father Friedrich Spee knows to whose account chiefly must be set down the horrors of the witchcraft trials. Most of the punishments that were properly speaking inquisitional were not inhuman, either by their nature or by the manner of their infliction. Most frequently certain good works were ordered, e.g., the building of a church, the visitation of a church, a pilgrimage more or less distant, the offering of a candle or a chalice, participation in a crusade, and the like. Other works partook more of the character of real and to some extent corporal punishments, e.g., fines, whose proceeds were devoted to support public worship, road-making, the like; whipping with rods during religious service; the pillory; the wearing of coloured crosses, and so on.

The hardest penalties were imprisonment in its various degrees, exclusion from the communion of the Church, and the usually consequent surrender to the civil power. "Cum eclesiae", ran the regular expression, "ultra non habeat quod faciat pro suis demeritis contra ipsum, idceo eundem reliquimus brachio et iudicio seculari";—i.e. since the Church can in no way punish his misdeeds, she leaves him to the civil authority. Naturally enough, punishment as a legal sanction is always a hard and painful thing, whether decreed by civil or ecclesiastical justice. There is, however, always an essential distinction between civil and ecclesiastical punishment.

While chastisement inflicted by secular authority aims chiefly at punishing violation of the law, the Church seeks primarily the correction of the delinquent; indeed his spiritual welfare is frequently so much in view that the utmost punishment is almost entirely lost sight of. Command to hear Holy Mass on Sundays and holidays, to frequent religious services, to abstain from manual labour, to receive Communion at the chief festivals of the year, to forbear from soothsaying and usury, etc., can scarcely be regarded as punishments, though very efficacious in helping to bring the delinquent to Christian duties. It being furthermore incumbent on the inquisitor to consider not merely the external sanction, but also the inner change of heart, his sentence lost the quasi-mechanical stiffness so often characteristic of civil condemnation. Moreover, the penalties incurred were on numberless occasions mitigated, commuted, or remitted. In the records of the Inquisition we very frequently read that because of old age, sickness, or poverty in the family, the due punishment was materially reduced owing to the inquisitor's sheer pity, or the petition of a good Catholic. If it was not possible to remit the fine, this was assessed upon the goods of the accused; or, if the accused was poor, the Inquisition was mitigated; or if the prisoner was a minor, the punishment was humanely conducted. Thus we read that a son obtained his father's release by merely asking for it, without putting forward any special reasons. Licence to leave prison for three weeks, three months, or an unlimited period—say until the recovery or decease of sick parents—was not infrequent. Rome itself censured inquisitors or deposed them because they were too harsh, but never because they were too merciful.

Imprisonment was not always accounted punishment in the proper sense: it was rather looked on as an opportunity for repentance, a preventive against backsliding or the infection of others. It was known as immuration (from the Latin murus, a wall), or incarceration, and was inflicted for a definite time or for life. Imprisonment was the lot of those who had failed to profit by the foregoing term of grace, or who, perhaps recanted only from fear of the inquisitor, or had once been deceived. "Murus strictus seu arctus, or carcer strictissimus, implied close and solitary confinement, occasionally aggravated by fasting or chains. In practice, however, these regulations were not always enforced literally. We read of immured persons receiving visits rather freely, playing games, or dining with their jailors. On the other hand, solitary confinement was at times deemed insufficient, and then the immured were put in irons or chained to the prison wall. Members of a religious order, when condemned for life, were immured in their own convent, nor ever seen after with any of their fraternity, the dungeon or cell was euphemistically called "In Paco"; it was, indeed, the tomb of a man buried alive. It was looked upon as a remarkable favour when, in 1330, through the good offices of the Archbishop of Toulouse, the French king permitted a dignitary of a certain order to visit the "In Paco" twice a month and comfort his imprisoned brethren, against which favour the Dominicans lobbied with Clement VI a fruitless protest. Though the prison cells were directed to be kept in such a way as to endanger neither the life nor the health of occupants, their condition was, in effect, such that this was evidenced from a document published recently by J. B. Vidal (Annales de St-Louis des Francs, 1895, p. 362).

"In some cells the unfortunate were bound in stocks or chains, unable to move about, and forced to sleep..."
on the ground. . . . There was little regard for cleanliness. In some cases there was no light or ventilation, and the food was meagre and very poor." Occasionally the popes had to put an end through their legates to similarly atrocious conditions. After inspecting the Carcassonne and Albi prisoners in 1306, the legates Pierre de la Chapelle and Angers de Pedulo discovered the warders, removed the chains from the captives, and released some from their underground dungeons. The local bishop was expected to provide food from the confiscated property of the prisoner. For those doomed to close confinement, it was meagre enough, scarcely more than bread and water. It was not long, however, before the arena was left and the prisoners were left to their fate, wine and money also from outside, and this was soon generally tolerated.

Officially it was not the Church that sentenced unrepentent heretics to death, more particularly to the stake. As legate of the Roman Church even Gregory IX never went farther than the penal ordinances of Innocent III required, nor ever inflicted a punishment more severe than excommunication. Not until four years after the commencement of his pontificate did he admit the opinion, then prevalent among theologians, that heresy should be punished with death, seeing it as a crime to the less serious than an offence than high treason. Nevertheless, he continued to insist on the exclusive right of the Church to decide in authentic manner in matters of heresy; at the same time it was not her office to pronounce sentence of death. The Church, therewith, expelled from her bosom the impenitent heretic, whereupon the state took over the duty of his temporal punishment. Frederick II was of the same opinion; in his Constitution of 1224 he says that heretics convicted by an ecclesiastical court shall, on imperial authority, suffer death by fire (auctoritate nostra igni judicetur, condenantes, and similiter in 1233; "presens nostre legis edicto damnatos mortem pati decernimus." In this way Gregory IX may be regarded as having had no share, either directly or indirectly, in the death of condemned heretics. Not so the succeeding popes. In the Bull "Ad exstirpanda" of Innocent IV, the pope declared that those judged guilty of heresy have been given up to the civil power by the bishop or his representative, or the Inquisition, the podesta or chief magistrate of the city shall take them at once, and shall, within five days at the most, execute the laws made against them. Moreover, his direct negligence and contempt of Frederick II be entered in every city among the municipal statutes under pain of excommunication, which was also visited on those who failed to execute both the papal and the imperial decrees. Nor could any doubt remain as to what civil regulations were meant, for the passage which ordered the burning of impenitent heretics were inserted in the papal decreals from the imperial constitutions "Commision nobis" and "Inconsutibilem tunicam". The aforesaid Bull "Ad exstirpanda" remained thenceforth a fundamental of the Inquisition, and enforced by several popes, Alexander IV (1254-61), Clement IV (1265-68), Nicholas IV (1268-92), Boniface VIII (1294-1303), and others. The civil authorities, therefore, were enjoined by the popes, under pain of excommunication to execute the legal sentences that condemned impenitent heretics to the stake. It is to be noted, however, that when this sentence was no trifling matter it was held by the legislation of that period to be a heretic, and incurred all the penalties that affected heresy.

The Number of Victims.—How many victims were handed over to the civil power cannot be stated with even approximate accuracy. We have nevertheless some valuable information about a few of the Inquisition tribunals, and their statistics are not without interest. At Pamiers, in 1318-19, the court of twenty-four persons convicted but five were delivered to the civil power, and at Toulouse from 1308 to 1323, only forty-two out of nine hundred and thirty beat the ominous note "relictus curiae secundum". Thus at Pamiers one in thirteen, and at Toulouse one in forty, seem to have been put out for heresy, although these places were hotbeds of heresy, and therefore principal centres of the Inquisition. We may add, also, that this was the most active period of the institution. These data and others of the same nature bear out the assertion that the Inquisition, other than in its very beginning, was in the contemporary administration of justice, and therefore in the general civilization of mankind. A more terrible fate awaited the heretic when judged by a secular court. In 1249 Count Raymond VII of Toulouse caused eighty confessed heretics to be burned in his presence without permitting them to recant. It is impossible to imagine any such trials before the Inquisition courts. The large numbers of burnings detailed in various histories are completely unauthenticated, and are either the deliberate invention of pamphleteers, or are based on materials that are in many cases of later times or the German witchcraft trials (Vacandard, op. cit., 237 sqq.).

Once the Roman Law touching the crimen lasea majestatis had been made to cover the case of heresy, it was only natural that the royal or imperial treasury should initiate the Roman fiscus, and lay claim to the property of persons condemned. It was fortunate, though inconsistent and certainly not strict justice, that this penalty did not affect every condemned person, but only those sentenced to perpetual confinement or the stake. Even so, this circumstance added to the less serious of the two punishments, quite decisive in this respect innocent people, the culprit’s wife and children, were the chief sufferers. Confiscation was also decreed against persons deceased, and there is a relatively high number of such judgments. Of the six hundred and thirty-six cases that came before the inquisitor Bernard Gui, eighty-eight pertained to dead people.

(e) The Final Verdict.—The ultimate decision was usually pronounced with solemn ceremonial at the sermo generalis—or aulo-da-fé (act of faith), as it was later called. One or two days prior to this sermo generalis everyone had the charge read to him again briefly, and in the meanwhile the heretic was informed of his sentence before he was told where and when to appear to hear the verdict. The sermo, a short discourse or exhortation, began very early in the morning; then followed the swearing in of the secular officials, who were made to vow obedience to the inquisitor in all things pertaining to the supplication of heretics. Then regularly followed the so-called “decrees of mercy” (i.e. commutations, mitigations, and remission of previously imposed penalties), and finally due punishments were assigned to the guilty, after their sentences had been again enumerated. This announcement began with the minor punishments, and went on to the most severe, i.e., perpetual imprisonment or death. Thereupon the guilty were turned over to the civil power, and with this act the sermo generalis closed, and the inquisitional proceedings were at an end.

(3) The chief scene of the Inquisition’s activity was Central and Southern Europe. The Scandinavian countries were spared altogether. It appears in England only on the occasion of the trial of the Templars, nor was it known in Castile and Portugal until the accession of Ferdinand and Isabella. It was introduced into the Netherlands with the Spanish domination, while in Northern France it was rela-
tively little known. On the other hand, the Inquisi-
tion, whether because of the particularly perilous sectarianism there prevalent or of the greater severity of ecclesiastical and civil rulers, weighed heavily on Italy (especially Lombardy), on Southern France (in particular the county of Toulouse and the County of Toulouse), and finally on the Kingdom of Aragon and on Germany. Honorius IV (1285–7) introduced it into Sardinia, and in the fifteenth century it displayed excessive zeal in Flanders and Bohemia. The inquisitors were, as a rule, irreproachable, not merely in personal conduct, but in the administration of their charges. One may suppose that a Dominican (Catharist) convert to Christianity and subsequently a Dominican, seen to have yielded to a blind fanaticism and deliberately to have provoked executions en masse. On 29 May, 1239, at Montwim in Champagne, Robert consigned to the flames at one time about a hundred and eighty persons, whose trial had begun and ended within one week. Later, when Rome found that the complaints against him were justified, he was first deposed and then incarcerated for life.

4) How are we to explain the Inquisition in the light of its own period?—For the true office of the historian is not to defend facts and conditions, but to study and understand them in their natural course and connexion. It is indisputable that in the past scarcely any community or nation vouchsafed perfect toleration to those who set up a creed different from that of the majority. A kind of iron law would seem to dispose mankind to religious intolerance. Even long before the Roman State tried to check with violence the rapid encroachments of Christianity, Plato had declared it one of the supreme duties of the governmental authority in his ideal State to show no toleration towards the “godless”—that is, towards those who denied the state religion—even though they were content to live quietly and without proselytizing; their very example, he said, would be dangerous. They were to be kept in custody “in a place where one grew wise” (ἐν τοις ἀκροβατη
tαισι), as the place of incarceration was euphemistically called; they should be relegated thither for five years, and during this time listen to religious instruction every day. The more active and proselytizing opponents of the state religion were to be imprisoned for life in dreadful dungeons, and after death to be burnt. If it is held that rationalization is the greatest single factor in the evolution of the Middle Ages. Everywhere and always in the past men believed that nothing disturbed the common weal and public peace so much as religious dissensions and conflicts, and that, on the other hand, a uniform public faith was the surest guarantee for the State’s stability and prosperity. The more thoroughly religion had become part of the national life, and the stronger the general conviction of its inviolability and Divine origin, the more disposed would men be to consider every attack on it as an intolerable crime against the safety and peace of the Commonwealth. The first Christian emperors believed that one of the chief duties of an imperial ruler was to place his sword at the service of the Church and orthodoxy, especially as their titles of “Pontifex Maximus” and “Bishop of the Exterior” seemed to argue in them. Divinely appointed agents of Heaven.

Nevertheless, the principal teachers of the Church held back for centuries from accepting in these matters the practice of the civil rulers; they shrunk particularly from such stern measures against heresy as torture and capital punishment, both of which they deemed inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity. But, in the Middle Ages, the Councils, the bishops, the popes, the mendicant orders, and the authorities of the Commonwealth came to be closely bound up with the cause of religious unity. King Peter of Aragon, therefore, but voiced the universal conviction when he said: “The enemies of the Cross of Christ and violators of the Christian law are likewise our enemies and the enemies of our kingdom, and ought therefore to be dealt with as such.” Emperor Frederick II emphasized this view even more vigorously, and other princes than Frederick II, in his Draconian enactments against heresy. The representatives of the Church were also children of their own time, and in their conflict with heresy accepted the help that their age freely offered them, and indeed often forced upon them. Theologians and canonists, the highest and the saintliest, stood by the cause of their day, and sought to lend weight and authority to it. The learned and holy Raymond of Pennafort, highly esteemed by Gregory IX, was content with the penalties that dated from Innocent III, viz., the ban of the empire, confiscation of property, confinement in prison, etc. But before the end of the century, St. Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theol., II–II, Q. xi, aa. 3, 4) already advocated capital punishment for heresy, though it cannot be said that his arguments altogether compel conviction. The Angelic Doctor, however, speaks only in a general way of punishment by death, and does not specify more nearly the manner of its infliction. This the Council of Toulouse denied that was truly terrible. The celebrated Henry of Soria (Susa), named Hostiensis after his episcopal See of Ostia (d. 1271), and the no less eminent Joannes Andree (d. 1343), when interpreting the Decree “Ad abolendam” of Lucius III, take debeat animadvertere (due punishment) as synonymous with spes cremenata (death by fire), a meaning which certainly did not attach to the original expression of 1184. Theologians and jurists based their attitude to some extent on the similarity between heresy and high treason (crimen lese majestatis), a suggestion that they owed to the Law of Ancient Rome. They argued, moreover, that if the death penalty could be rightly inflicted on thieves and forgers, who rob us only of worldly goods, how much more rightly on those who cheat us out of supernatural goods—out of faith, the sacraments, the life of the soul. In the severe legislation of the Old Testament (Deut., xix. 6–9; xvii. 1–6) they found another argument. And lest some should urge that those ordinances were abrogated by Christianity, the words of Christ were recalled: “I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil” (Matt., v. 17); also His other saying (John, xv. 6): “If any one abide not in me, he shall be cast forth; he shall gather dust and ashes, and they shall gather him up, and cast him into the fire, and he burneth” (in igneum mittent, et ardent).

It is well known that belief in the justice of punishing heresy with death was so common among the sixteenth century reformers—Luther, Zwinger, Calvin, and their adherents—that we may say their toleration began where their power ended. (N. Paulinus, “Die Strassburger Reformator und die Gewissensfreiheit.” (Freiburg, 1895); “Luther und die Gewissensfreiheit” (Munich, 1905); Ketzerinquisition im lutherischen Sachsen”, supplement to “Germania” (1907), p. 18 and 19; ”1. J. in der Ketzerei? Was soll aufhören?” ibid. (1909), no. 12; ”Luther’s Theoremen über die Ketzerverbrennung”, in “Histor.-polit. Blätter”, CXLI (1907), no. 5; “Calvin als Handlanger der päpstlichen Inquisition”, ibid., CXLIII (1909), no. 9; ”Zwinger und die Glaubensfreiheit”, ibid., CXLIII (1909), no. 9). The Reformed theologian, Hieronymus Zanchi, declared in a lecture delivered at the University of Heidelberg: “We do not now ask if the authorities may pronounce sentence of death upon heretics; of that there can be no doubt, and all learned and right-minded men acknowledge it. The only question is whether the authorities are bound to perform this duty.” And Zwinger answers the question in the affirmative, especially on the authority of “all pious and learned men who have written on the subject in our day” (Historisch-politische Blätter,
CXL, (1907), p. 364). It may be that in modern times men as a rule judge more leniently the views of others, but does this forthwith make their opinions objectively more correct than those of their predecessors? Is there no longer any inclination to persecution? As late as 1872, more than 3,000 were destroyed, and more than 1,000 by fire (Kölnische Volkszeitung, 782, 5 Sep. 1899). Do these sentiments indicate an ability to appraise justly the institutions and opinions of former centuries, not according to modern feelings, but to the standards of their age? [cf. Th. de Cauzons, Histoire de l’Inquisition en France, Tome I: “Les Origines de l’Inquisition” (Paris, 1909); O. Pfuhl in “Stimmen aus Maria-Lasach,” no. 8 (1909), pp. 290 sqq.]

In forming an estimate of the Inquisition, it is necessary to distinguish clearly between principles and historical fact on the one hand, and on the other those exaggerations or rhetorical descriptions which reveal but the narrowest determinism of the Catholicism, rather than to encourage the spirit of tolerance and further its exercise. It is also essential to note that the Inquisition, in its establishment and procedure, pertained not to the sphere of belief, but to that of discipline. The dogmatic teaching of the Church is in no way affected by the question as to whether the Inquisition was justified in its scope, or wise in its methods, or extreme in its practice. The Church established by Christ, as a perfect society, is empowered to make laws and inflict penalties for their violation. Heresy not only violates her law but strikes at her very life, unity of belief; and from the beginning the heretic had incurred all the penalties of the ecclesiastical courts. When Christianity became the religion of the Empire, and still more when the peoples of Northern Europe became Christian nations, the close alliance of Church and State made unity of faith essential not only to the ecclesiastical organization, but also to civil society. Heresy, in consequence, was a crime which secular rulers were bound in duty to punish. It was regarded as worse than any other crime, even that of high treason; it was for society in those times what we call anarchy. Hence the severity with which heretics were treated by the secular powers, and hence the Inquisition was established.

As regards the character of these punishments, it should be considered that they were the natural expression not only of the legislative power, but also of the popular hatred for heresy in an age that dealt both vigorously and roughly with criminals of every type. The heretic, in a word, was an outlaw whose offence, in the popular mind, deserved and sometimes received a punishment as summary as that which is often dealt out in our own day by an infuriated populace to the authors of justly detested crimes. That such intolerance was not peculiar to Catholicism, but was the natural outcome of the universal conviction in those, also, who abandoned the Church, is evident from the measures taken by some of the Reformers against those who differed from them in matters of belief. As the learned Dr. Schaff declares in his History of the Christian Church (vol. V, New York, 1877, p. 594), “as a result of the Reformation, religious intolerance and even persecution unto death were continued long after the Reformation.” In Geneva the pious theory was put into practice by state and church, even to the use of torture and the admission of the testimony of traitors against traitors. “Gesamte, und bath der Haller und der Calvin. Bullinger, in the second Helvetic Confession, announced the principle that heresy could be punished like murder or treason.” Moreover, the whole history of the Penal Laws against Catholics in England and Ireland, and the spirit of intolerance prevalent in many of the American colonies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries may be cited in proof thereof. It would obviously be absurd to make the charge against Protestantism for these practices. But having set up the principle of private judgment, which, logically applied, made heresy impossible, the early Reformers proceeded to treat dissenters as the medieval heretics had been treated. To suggest that this was inconsistent is trifling in view of the deeper insight it affords into the meaning of a tolerance which had its root in the origin and the source of that intolerance which men rightly show towards error, and which they naturally, though not rightly, transfer to the erring. (B) The Inquisition in Spain. — (1) Historical Facts. Religious conditions similar to those in Southern France occasioned the establishment of the Inquisition in the neighbouring Kingdom of Aragon. As early as 1226 King James I had forbidden the Catharists his kingdom, and in 1228 had outlawed both them and their friends. A little later, on the advice of his confessor, Raymond of Penafort, he asked Gregory IX for the Inquisition. He then issued a Bull “Declinante jam mundi” of 26 May, 1232, Archbishop Esparrago and his suffragans were instructed to search, either personally or by enlisting the services of the Dominicans or other suitable agents, and condignly punish the heretics in their dioceses. At the Council of Lerida in 1237 the Inquisition was formally confided to the Dominicans and the Franciscans. At the Synod of Tarragona in 1242, Raymond of Penafort defined the terms hereticus, receptor, fautor, defensor, etc., and outlined the penalties to be inflicted. Although the ordinances of Innocent IV, Urban IV, and Gregory XII were also adopted and executed with strictness by the Dominican Order, no striking success resulted. The Inquisitor Fray Ponce de Blanes was poisoned, and Bernardo Travasser earned the crown of martyrdom at the hands of the heretics. Aragon’s best-known inquisitor is the Dominican Nicolas Eymeric (Quètit-Echard, “Scriptores Ord. Pr.”, I, 709 sqq.). His “Directorium Inquisitionis” (written in Aragon, 1376; printed at Rome 1587, Venice 1595 and 1607), based on forty-four years’ experience, is an original source and a document of the highest historical value.

The Spanish Inquisition, however, properly begins with the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic and Isabella. The Catholic faith was then endangered by pseudo-converts from Judaism (Marranos) and Mohammedanism (Moriscos). On 1 November, 1478, Sixtus IV empowered the Catholic sovereigns to set up the Inquisition. The judges were to be at least forty years old, of unimpeachable reputation, distinguished for virtue and wisdom, masters of theology, or doctors or licentiates of canon law, and they must follow the usual ecclesiastical rules and regulations. On 17 September, 1490, Their Catholic Majesties appointed, at first for Seville, the two Dominicans Miguel de Morillo and Juan de San Martín as inquisitors, with no of the secular clergy as assistants. Before long complaints of grievous abuses reached Rome, and were only too well founded. In a Brief of Sixtus IV of 29 January, 1482, they were blamed for having, upon the alleged authority of papal Briefs, unjustly imprisoned many people, included over 500 therefrom hurriedly to the fire, and the believers, and sequestered the property of the executed. They were at first admonished to act only in conjunction with the bishops, and finally were threatened with deposition, and would indeed have been deposed had not Their Majesties interceded for them. (3) The Inquisition in Paradise. — (3) The Inquisition in Paradise, 1498. Fray Tomás Torquemada (b. at Valladolid in 1420, d. at Avila, 16 September, 1498) was the true organiser of the Spanish Inquisition. At the solicita-
tion of Their Spanish Majesties (Paramo, II, tit. ii, c. iii, n. 9) Sixtus IV bestowed on Torquemada the office of grand inquisitor, the institution of which indicates a decided advance in the development of the Spanish Inquisition. Innocent VIII approved the act of the realms and under date of 28 November 1486, and 6 February, 1487, Torquemada was given the dignity of grand inquisitor for the kingdoms of Castile, Leon, Aragon, Valencia, etc. The institution speedily rambified from Seville to Cordova, Jasen, Villarreal, and Toledo. About 1538 there were nineteen courts, to which were added the inquisitorial courts of the Spanish America (Mexico, Lima, and Cartagena). Attempts at introducing it into Italy failed, and the efforts to establish it in the Netherlands entailed disastrous consequences for the mother country. In Spain, however, it remained operative into the nineteenth century. Originally called into being against secret Judaism and secret Mohammedanism, it served to repel Protestantism in the sixteenth century, but was unable to expel French Rationalism and immorality in the eighteenth. King Joseph Bonaparte abrogated it in 1808, but it was re-introduced by Ferdinand VII in 1814 and approved by Pius VII on certain conditions, among others, the abolition of torture. It was definitely abolished by the Revolution of 1820.

(2) Organization.—At the head of the Inquisition, known as the Holy Office, stood the grand inquisitor, nominated by the king and confirmed by the pope. By virtue of his papal credentials he enjoyed authority to delegate his powers to other suitable persons, and to receive appeals from all Spanish courts. He was aided by a High Council (Consejo Supremo) consisting of five members—the so-called Apostolic inquisitors, two secretaries, two relatores, one advocatus Francisco—and several consultors and qualificators. The officials of the supreme tribunal were appointed by the grand inquisitor after consultation with the king. The former could also freely appoint, transfer, remove from office, inspect, or call to account all inquisitors and officials of the lower courts. Philip III, on 10 December, 1616, gave the Dominicans the privilege of having one of their order permanently a member of the Consejo Supremo. All power was really concentrated in this supreme tribunal. It decided important or disputed questions, and heard appeals; without its approval no priest, knight, or noble could be imprisoned, and no auto-da-fe held; an annual report was made to it by the inquisitors. Their report, and once a month a financial report. Everyone was subject to it, not excepting priests, bishops, or even the sovereign. The Spanish Inquisition is distinguished from the medieval by its monarchical constitution and a greater consequent centralization, as also by the constant and legally provided-for influence of the crown on all official appointments and the progress of trials.

(3) The procedure, on the other hand, was substantially the same as that already described. Here, too, a "term of grace" of thirty to forty days was invariably granted, and was often prolonged. Imprisonment, in the "horrorados" was never for life, but only "at liberty," or the offence had been proved. Examination of the accused could take place only in the presence of two disinterested priests, whose obligation it was to detain any arbitrary act; in their presence the protocol had to be read out twice to the accused. The defence lay always in the hands of a lawyer. The witnesses, though unknown to the accused, were sworn, and very severe punishment, even death, awaited false witnesses (cf. Brief of Leo X of 14 December, 1518). Torture was applied only too frequently and too cruelly, but certainly not more cruelly than under Cisneros and later in Germany. Inquisition proceedings are always in German (consultores). The prospector facialis acts as the proper judge throughout the whole case until the plenary session exclusive, thus conducting it up to the verdict. The accusator sancti officii always one of the secular clergy, presides at the plenary sessions. The promotor facialis is at once prosecutor and fiscal representative, while the advocatus recourse undertakes the defence of the accused. The duty of the consultants is to afford the cardinals expert advice. They may come from the secular clergy or the religious orders, but the General of the Dominicans, the magister sacri palatii, and a third member of the same order (consultores). The qualificators are appointed for life, but give their opinions only when called upon. The Holy Office has jurisdiction over all Christians and, according to Pius IV, even over cardinals. In practice, however, the
latter are hold exempt. For its authority, see the aforesaid Constitution of Sixtus V "Immensa aeterni" (see ROMAN CONGREGATIONS). (A) SOURCES.—MOLINIER, L' Inquisition dans le midi de la France au XIVe et XV e siècles. Étude sur les sources de l'histoire (Paris, 1880); cf. DOUDA in Revue des questions hist., XXX (1881). The most important sources are papal documents, but the definitive conclusions of French codes of canon law. Scarcely less important for a knowledge of medieval Inquisition procedure are the so-called Manuals of Inquisitors. Of these may be mentioned: PIERRE, Inquisitiones, dating from about 1244, new ed. in VACAND, op. cit., Apología apócrifa Guifdomo Pizzaro et responsiones eius—Guy Foucaux later became pope under title Clement IV—written about 1254, ed. in CEZARES CARRERA, Tradición inquisitorial (Rome, 1876), 307-403; GUIFDOMO, Cartas inquisitoriales, ed. in REYES MOLINIER, Thesaurus novatorum, V, 1797-1822; ETHERIC, Directorium inquisitorium, written in French (1573). In general times: an appendix in LITTLES Littoriale apostolico pro officio inquisitorior, DOUDA, La Procedure inquisitoriale en Langueco au XVe siècle (Paris, 1916), 144; DOUDA, Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'Inquisition de Langueco (2 vols., Paris, 1900); DOLLINGER, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mitleiters (2 vols., Munich, 1880), with which compare Revue historique, IV, 155 sqq.; FREDERICIO, Corpo della storia critico-archivistica dell'Inquisizione di Roma (1865-1885), 4 vols., Ghent, 1889-1900; SCHAEFFER, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Protestantismus und der Inquisition im 10. Jahrhunderte (4 vols., Mainz and Strassburg, 1895); (2) Special Studies.—LANGELOT, L'Inquisition à propos des approches inquisitoires en France (1350-1450), 4th ed. (1902). A general work on the Inquisition is: DOLLINGER, L' Inquisition. Ses origines. Sa procedure (Paris, 1900); LÉA, A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages (3 vols., New York, 1886). French tr. by HEBERT, (1888) and by HUBERT, (1892). Another work on Inquisition is: LÉA, Histoire de l'Inquisition接到上文的辞典编成的语录 about the XVe siècle in Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes, XXII, 488-517, 570-607; VACAND, L'Inquisition à propos du pouvoir civil, in the Revue des questions hist., (Paris, 1907), cf. PAPAU, Zur Beurteilung der Inquisition, literary supplement to Köllnische Volkszeitung, (1860), no. 14, tr. from the French (1865); DOUDA, L' Inquisition à propos des approches inquisitoires en France (1350-1450), 4th ed. (1902). Concerning this work see BLOTTRE in Historische Zeitschrift, 1918, 152 sqq.—"a history of Inquisition," corresponding to the requirements of calm, objective historical research, is unfortunately yet unavailable; Finet, La vie et les actes de Jean Hugon, city archives, (1908), cf. VACAND, op. cit., VIII, 1919. The latest history of the Inquisition remains yet to be written. Despite evidences of intellectual honesty Lea is to be read with caution. He is loyal, it may be, but not impartial, and only too often betrays his prejudices and suspicions in respect of the Catholic Church. This attitude at times affects gravely his reputation as a critic. N. Paulus, too, finds (loc. cit.), that Lea is "not sufficiently reliable", and that his assertions "must be carefully sifted from the ashes of Henry Charles Münster, 1898).—tr, WAGNER (New York)—took upon himself the unpleasant but serviceable task of investigating the written sources. In truth, not only that the earlier critics of Lea were entirely justified, but also that the inaccuracies of the author Joseph H. Hansen, city archives. In Coamo, are greater and more numerous than those contained in the original work. Some defects characterise another work, also American: Sprin (4 vols., Boston and New York, 1906-7); cf. BAUMGARTEN, loc. cit., pp. 91 sqq. and Hist. Jahrbuch, XXVI (1903), 82-97. See also ODDI, L' Inquisition (1886) and OBER, Rechts- und Geschichtsschreibung (1937). 548 sqq. and KNOPP in Hist. pol. Blatter, XC, XC, VON RODGEO, Historia verdadera de la Inquisition (3 vols., Madrid, 1876-7). An extensive bibliography will be found in the manuals of canon law, e.g. HIRSCHKUR, Kirchenrecht, V (1900), 443 sqq., VI (1907), 122 sqq. JOSEPH BLOTTRE.

Inquisition, Canonical, is either extra-judicial or judicial: the former might be likened to a coroner's inquest in our civil law; while the latter is similar to an investigation by the grand jury. An extra-judicial inquiry, which is recommended in civil cases, is absolutely necessary in criminal matters, except the case be notorious. A bishop may not even admonish canonicis in connection with matters of inquest without having first instituted a summary inquest—"summary facti cognito"—"information pro informations curiae"—into the truth of the rumours, denunciations, or accusations against said cleric. This examination is conducted by the bishop personally, or by another ecclesiastic, prudent, trustworthy, and impartial, devoted by his nature to the service of ecclesiastics, discreetly and scrupulously, without judicial form. This, however, does not preclude the examination of witnesses or experts, for example, to discover irregularities in the records or accounts of the Church. Great caution is to be observed in this preliminary inquiry, lest the reputation of the cleric in question suffer unnecessarily, in which case the bishop might be sued for damages. The acts with the result of the inquiry, if any evidence has been found, should be preserved in the archives; if innocence is wanting or is only slight, the acts should be destroyed.

The outcome of the preliminary investigation will be to leave matters as they are; or to proceed to extra-judicial corrective measures; or to begin a public action, when the evil cannot be otherwise remedied. The bishop may, when he has first instituted an inquisition, order a public accusation; or even, when a crime may be satisfactorily proven, it may be more beneficial to religion and the interests at stake not to prosecute. In matters of correction proper, in which medicinal penalties are employed, judicial action is barred by limitation in five years. The second inquiry is for the information of the auditor or judge, a judicial inquiry, being the beginning of the strictly judicial procedure—"procesus informativus"—"inquisito pro informando judice". If sufficient warrant for a judicial trial exist, the bishop will order his public prosecutor (procurator fiscalis) to take it up and present the charge. Having received the charge, the bishop will appoint an auditor to conduct the informative procedure, in which all the evidence bearing on the case, for the defence as well as for the prosecution, is to be obtained. This inquiry consequently comprises offensive and defensive proceedings, for the auditor is to arrive at the truth, and not conduct the inquiry on the supposition that the defendant is guilty.

When the auditor, assisted by the diocesan procurator, has procured all the evidence available for the prosecution, he will open the defensive proceedings with the citation (q. v.) of the accused. The accused must appear in person (see PROCURATOR) for examination by the auditor: the fiscal prosecutor may be present. He is not put under oath, and is granted perfect freedom in defending himself, proving his innocence, justifying his conduct, alleging mitigating or extenuating circumstances. All declarations, allegations, exceptions, pleas, etc., of the defendant are recorded by the clerk in the acts. They are read to the defendant and corrected, if necessary, or additions made. Finally, the accused, if willing, the auditor, and the secretary should sign the acts. A stay must be granted the accused, if he demand it, to present a defence in writing. The auditor will then take up new features, to investigate which stays may be necessary. The accused must be heard in his own defence after this new inquiry. When satisfied that the investigation is complete, the auditor will declare the inquest closed, and make out an abstract of the results of same. This abstract, together with all the acts in the case are given to the diocesan procurator. Thus ends the judicial inquiry.


ANDREW B. MERRIAN.

Inquisitor. See INQUISITION.

Insane, ASYLUMS AND CARE FOR THE.—During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries hospital care of the sick of all kinds and nursing fell to the lowest ebb in history (see HOSPITALS). Institutions and care for the insane, not only shared in this decadence, but were its worst feature. Because of this, many writers have declared that proper care for the insane and suitable institutions were the great problem of the day. The Church, which had much to do with humanitarian efforts of all kinds in the past, it has been made a subject of reproach to her. As a matter of fact the Church, from the earliest times, arranged
for the care of the insane, and some of the arrangements anticipated some of the most important advances of modern times. It was after the religious revolt in Germany, whose influence was felt in other countries, that the Church's charitable institutions for lunatics, hospitals and asylums of all kinds deteriorated.

Insanity has been known for as long as our record of human history runs. Pinel, the great French psychiatrist, in his "Nosophogie philosophique", II (Paris. 1798), 88, gives the details of the treatment of the insane at the time of Socrate, the god of medicine in Egypt, in the temples of the gods of the temples. According to this, those suffering from melancholia were treated by suggestion, by diversion of mind, and recreation of all kinds, by a careful regimen, by hydrotherapy, by pilgrimages to the holy places. In Greece we know of the existence of insanity from its occurrence in the various myths. Ulysses countered with insanity in order to escape going on the Trojan expedition, and ploughed up the seashore, sowing salt in the furrows. When Nestor, however, placed his infant son in front of the plough, Ulysses moved the boy aside, and Nestor said, "He is mentally ill." Indeed, Evidently at this time (1200 B.C.) the Greek were quite familiar with insanity, since they could even detect malingering. The stories of Ajax killing a flock of sheep which by illusion he thought a crowd of his enemies, of Orestes and the Furies, of the Baccha, all show familiarity with insanity. As in Egypt, the insane in Greece were cared for in certain portions of the temples of the god of medicine, Asclepius. In the famous temple at Epidaurus, part shrine and part hospital, there was a well-known spring, and hydrotherapy was the main portion of the treatment, though every form of favourable suggestion was employed. Interesting diversions were planned for patients, and they had the distinct advantage of the journey necessary to reach Epidaurus. Insanity was looked upon as a disease and treated as such. The delirium of acute disease had not as yet been differentiated from mania, and melancholy was considered an exaggeration of the depression so often associated with digestive disturbance. The first hospital for insane patients of which there is mention was at the Piraeus.

Among the Romans we have abundant evidence, in their laws, of care for the insane, but we know little of the treatment until the beginning of the Christian Era. In the Twelve Tables curators are assigned the insane even after their majority. They could transact no business legally, but during lucid intervals could make binding contracts. When parents were insane, children could marry without their consent, but this had to be explicitly stated. The insane could make no wills, nor be witnesses of wills except during lucid intervals, but the lucidity had to be proved. With all these careful legal provisions it seems incredible that medical care should not have been given, but all records of it are wanting. At Rome, Galen, and for the writers of the second century, were fruit, whose works show a thorough familiarity with certain phases of insanity as could only have been obtained by actual observation, not of a few patients, but of many.

With the beginning of Christianity more definite information as to asylums for the insane is available. Ducange, in his "Commentary on Byzantine History", states that among the thirty-five charitable institutions in Constantinople at the beginning of the fourth century there were 72 for mania, and 5 for lunatics. This seems to have been connected with the general hospital of the city. In the next century we have the records of a hospital for the insane at Jerusalem, and it is probable that they existed in other cities throughout the East. Nemesius, a Christian bishop of the fourth century, collected much of what had been written by older authors with regard to the insane, adding some observations of his own, and showing that Christianity was caring for these unfortunate. With the foundation of the monasteries the insane were cared for in connection with these. The Rule of St. Jerome enjoined the duty of making careful provision for the proper treatment of the sick, and Burdett, in his "Hospitals and Asylums of the World", considers that this applied also to those suffering from mental disease. He adds: "It is beyond question that in the earlier times, commencing with provision for the sick, including those mentally ill, medical treatment included the care of the insane. Evidently in the houses, the Church gradually developed an organisation which provided for the insane, first in monastery (i.e. places for lunatics) and then in the monasteries. Evidence of the existence of this system is to be met with in France, Italy, Russia, Spain, Germany, and in some of the northern countries of Europe" (op. cit., I). With the foundation of the monasteries of the Benedictines and the Irish monks, hospices, hospitals were opened in connexion with them (see HOSPITALS). The insane were cared for with other patients in these institutions, and we have many prescriptions from the earlier times that are supposed to be cures for lunacy. The cleric author of "Leech-dom, Wortcunning and Star Craft of Early England", a collection of herbal prescriptions made about A. D. 900, gives remedies for melancholia, hallucinations, mental vacance, dementia, and folly.

There are records of many institutions for the insane. Desmaisons declared that "the origin of the first establishment devoted to the insane in Europe dates back only to A. D. 1409; it was founded in Valencia in Spain under Mohammedan influence" (Des Asiles d' Aliénés en Espagne, Paris, 1850). There was a hospital for men only in Paris in 1475. It is obvious the foundation was entirely erroneous. We know for instance that there was an asylum exclusively for sufferers from mental diseases at Metz in 1100 and another at Elbing near Danzig in 1320. According to Sir William Dugdale (Monasticon Anglicanum, London, 1655-73), there was an ancient English asylum known as Berking Church Hospital, situated near the Tower of London, for which Robert Denton, chaplain, obtained a licence from King Edward III in 1371. Denton paid forty shillings for this licence to found a hospital in a house of his own in the parish of Berking Church, London, "for the poor and insane, and for the mad, and for such people who suddenly fall into a frenzy and lose their memory, who were to reside there until cured; with an oratory to the said hospital to the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary". About this same time there is a tradition of the existence of a pozzarelda, or place for mad people, in Rome, the conditions of entrance being rather interesting.

Lunatics were cared for, moreover, in special departments of general hospitals. At Bedlam, the London hospital founded in the thirteenth century, this was true (see BEDLAM). Evidently the same thing was true at many other places. Paulus Abrasax (p. 350), whose writings show such a thorough familiarity with certain phases of insanity as could only have been obtained by actual observation, not of a few patients, but of many.

Psycho-pathic in modern times, however, have been trying to arrange to have wards for acute mental cases in connection with general hospitals, for patients thus
under observation sooner; they are more willing to go to such hospitals and their friends are more ready to send them. Serious developments are often thus prevented. In this system of psychopathic wards in general hospitals the Middle Ages anticipated our modern views. In another phase of the care of the insane there is a similar anticipation. A medical man who asked that the insane be confined by the people of the village and the neighbouring country who provide them with board, and treat them as members of the family. This system has attracted much attention in recent years, and articles on Gheel have appeared in every language. It has its defects, but probably not so many as those who are likely to occur in the institutional care of such patients. This method of caring for the insane has been practised at Gheel for over a thousand years. Originally the patients were brought to the shrine of St. Dymphna, where, according to tradition, they were often healed. The custom of leaving chronic sufferers near the shrine, under the care of the villagers, gradually arose and has continued ever since. Nearly every country in Europe had such shrines where the insane were cured; we have records of them in Ireland, Scotland, England, and Germany, and it is evident that this must be considered an important phase in the treatment of mental illness. In the shrines of Sts. Menou, or Menulphe, and Dizier were visited from very early times by the insane in search of relief. The shrine of St. Menou at Mailly-sur-Rose was especially well-known and a house was erected for the accommodation of the mentally diseased. At St-Dizier a state of affairs very like that at Gheel developed, and the patients were cared for by the families of the neighbourhood. All of this interesting and valuable provision for the care of the insane, as well as the monastic establishments in which they were received, disappeared with the Reformation.

The almoner who had to provide and allocate special institutions for the insane, did more for them than perhaps any other country. The asylum at Valencia already mentioned was founded in 1409 by a monk named Joffre, out of pity for the lunatics whom he found huddled by the crowds. The movement thus begun spread throughout Europe, and new asylums were founded in Saragossa in 1425, at Seville in 1435, at Valladolid in 1436, and at Toledo before the end of the century. This movement was not due, as has been claimed, to Mohammedanism, for Mohammedans in other parts of the world took no special care of the insane. There was a certain amount of prejudice, and the word "insane", in the Middle Ages, was often used as a synonym for "idiots", "fools", and "madmen", regardless of whether they were possessed of such mental faculties as are necessary for the discernment of right and wrong. Spain continued to be the country in which lunatics were best cared for in Europe down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Finally, the great French psychiatrist, who took the lead in the movement from the insane of France, declared Spain to be the country in which lunatics were treated with most wisdom and most humanity. He has described an asylum at Saragossa "open to the diseased in mind of all nations, governments, and religions, with this simple inscription: Urbis et Orbis". (Traité sur l'aliénation mentale, Paris, 1809). He gives some details of the treatment, which show a very modern recognition of the need to be gentle and careful with the insane rather than harsh and forceful.

The pazzarella at Rome already mentioned was founded in the middle of the sixteenth century by Ferdi- nu- dante de Ruiz and the Bruni, father and son, all three Navarrese. This hospital for the insane "received crazed persons of whatever nation they be, and care is taken to restore them to their right mind; but if the madness prove incurable, they are kept during life, have food and rainfert necessary to the condition they are in." A Venetian lady was moved to such great pity of these poor creatures upon sight of them that on her death she left them heirs to her whole estate." This enabled the management, with the approbation of Pope Pius IV, to open a new house, in 1561, in the Via Lata. In France and Italy the custom continued during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of placing lunatics, particularly those of the better class — though also of other classes when they had patrons in the region in which they were confined — in monasteries according to their sex. This practice also prevailed in Russia. In 1641 the Charenton Asylum was founded in one of the suburbs of Paris, near the Park of Vincennes, and was placed under monastic rule. After the foundation of the Sisters of Charity of St Vincent de Paul, it was given to them. During this century much was established a system of colonies by which the insane were transferred to country places for work during intermissions in their condition, and were returned to the central asylum whenever they were restless.

During the eighteenth century there was an awakening of humanitarian purpose with regard to the insane in nearly every country of Europe. St. Peter's Hospital, at Bristol, England, was opened in 1696; the Manchester Royal Lunatic Hospital in 1706; Bethel Hospital at Norwich in 1713; Dean Swift's Dublin hospital in 1745; while the Pennsylvania Hospital at Philadelphia, and the Charity Hospital at Boston (1771) each contained wards for lunatics. In 1773 the first asylum exclusively for the care of the insane in the United States was opened at Williamsburg, Va. After this, asylums for the insane multiplied, though the system under which the inmates were cared for involved many abuses. Burdett's third chapter is entitled "The Period of Brutal Suppression in Treatment and Cruelty: 1750 to 1850".

In 1792 what has been called the humane period in the treatment of the insane began, when Pinel, against the advice of all those in authority and with the disapproval of his medical colleagues, removed the chains and manacles and other severer forms of restraint at the great asylum of Bicêtre, near Paris, and gave the inmates all the liberty compatible with reasonable safety for themselves and others. At the same time William Tuke was engaged in establishing the Retreat near York, which was opened in 1796.

In 1795 in this institution very enlightened principles of treatment were carried into effect. Early in the nineteenth century, Dr. Charles Worth and Mr. Gardner Hill, in the Lincoln Asylum, did away with all forms of mechanical restraint. The non-restraint system was championed by Dr. Benjamin Rush, who built the Middlesex County Asylum at Hanwell. In the mean time, at the second institution solely for the insane in the United States, the Friends' Asylum at Frankfort, Pennsylvania (1817), the principles of gentle, intelligent care for the insane were being thoroughly applied and developed. The treatment of the insane was first systematized by Dr. S. B. Woodward, at Worcester, Massachusetts. Dr. Kirkbride of Philadelphia did much to remove the evils of restraint. Miss Dix must ever bear an honoured name for her successful philanthropy in doing away with many abuses in England and her native America. In recent years the care of the insane has to a great extent come entirely under the control of the State. This was apparently rendered necessary by the abuses that crept into private institutions for the insane. Even in the State institutions, however, until the last thirty years by Ferren-
cause it seems impossible to increase accommodations in proportion to the increasing numbers of the insane. There are two reasons for this increase. One is an actual increase in the proportion of the insane to the total population. Another is that public opinion has become less inclined to keep even the mildly insane at home. Apart from the State institutions, there is a reaction to the old monastic system of care for the insane, and there are many large and well-known insane asylums in America. It is a principal variety of the religious tradition established by Madame Gruet at the foundation of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul has borne fruit. In America they have large asylums for the insane at Baltimore, New Orleans, Madison, N.J., and New York.


INSANITY. — All writers on this subject confess their inability to frame a strictly logical or a completely satisfactory definition. The dividing line between sanity and insanity, like the line that distinguishes a man of average height from a tall man, can be described only in terms of a moral estimate. There is a borderland, and the two are to be identified as belonging certainly to either. Hence a definition that aims at rigorous comprehensiveness is liable to include such non-insane conditions as hysteria, febrile delirium, or perverted passions. The definition given by the “Century Dictionary” is probably as satisfactory as any: “A seriously unbalanced condition of the mental functions, involving the intellect, emotions, and will, or one or more of these faculties, exclusive of temporary states produced by and accompanying intoxications or acute febrile diseases.” Not less difficult is the problem of classification. No classification based on a single principle is entirely satisfactory. Anatomical changes are an inadequate basis because they are absent from many forms of insanity; the causes are so numerous and so frequently combined in a single case that it is impossible to say which is predominant; and the symptoms are so manifold that the intellect cannot discretely divide them from the essential. Indeed, the nervous system and the mental functions are so complex and so inadequately known that any attempt at an accurate classification of their abnormal states must of necessity be a failure. In this article only the most important forms are considered, namely, those which are most prevalent and those which are clearly distinguished from one another.

One of the oldest divisions of mental disorders is into melancholia and mania. In the former the dominant mood is depression; in the latter, exaltation. The former differs from sane melancholy only in degree, and its chief characteristics are mental anguish and impulses to suicide. It includes probably one-half of all the cases of insanity, and is more frequently cured than any other form. In mania the morbidly elated mood may vary from excessive cheerfulness to violent rage. Manias, which may exhibit characteristics of both melancholia and mania, are a perversion of the intellectual rather than the affective faculties. Its chief manifestation is delusions, very frequently delusions of persecution. Monomania corresponds roughly to the later and more pronounced form of paranoia. In this form the delusions are systematic, and changes in the intellectual processes may remain substantially unimpaired. When the attacks of melancholia or mania occur at regular intervals they are frequently named periodic insanity. The term partial insanity comprises chiefly those varieties known as impulsive, emotional, and moral. These are characterised by a loss of self-control, on account of which the patient performs acts that are at variance with his prevailing disposition, ideas, and desires—for example, murder by means of a knife. Such acts are associated with such general diseases of the nervous system as epilepsy, hysteria, and neurasthenia. When insanity takes the form of a general enfeeblement of the mental faculties as a consequence of disease, it is called dementia. It is usually permanent. Its principal varieties are senile, paralytic, and syphilitic. Paralysis is one kind of paralytic dementia. All the above-mentioned forms of insanity are acquired, in the sense that they occur in normally developed brains. Congenital insanity, or feeblemindedness, is divided chiefly, according to its degree, into imbecility, idiocy, and cretinism.

That insanity is on the increase, seems to be the general verdict of authorities, although the absence of reliable and comprehensive statistics makes any satisfactory estimate impossible. Whatever be its extent, the increase is undoubtedly due in some measure to our more complex and civilised life as seen in city life. In general, the causes of insanity may be reduced to two: predisposing causes and exciting causes. The most important of the former are insane, neurotic, epileptic, drunken, or consumptive ancestors; great stress and strain, and a neuropathic nervous system. The exciting causes, such as affection and losses, in the ratio of four to one. Of 2476 cases due to physical causes which were admitted to the asylums of New York during the twelve months preceding 30 September, 1900, alcoholic and sexual excesses and diseases had brought on 644. The majority of cases of insanity, however, are traceable to more than one cause.

Inasmuch as insanity almost always involves some perversion of the will, either direct or indirect, it raises interesting and important questions concerning moral responsibility. Every impairment of mental function must, from this point of view, be the result of some cause, whether productive or excitant, whether external or internal, or both. The reason why restricting its scope, or by diminishing or destroying it outright. Ignorance, error, blinding passion, and paralyzing fear all render a person morally irresponsible for those actions which take place under their influence. This is true even of the sane; obviously it happens much more frequently among the insane, owing to delirium, delusions, loss of memory, and many other mental disorders. Is it, however, only in this general way, that is, through defective action of the intellect, that freedom and responsibility are lost or destroyed in persons who are of unsound mind? May not the disease act directly upon the will, compelling the patient to do things that his intellect assures him are wrong? The English courts and almost all the courts of the United States answer this question in the negative. Their practice is to regard a defendant in a criminal case as responsible and punishable if at the time of the crime he knew the difference between right and wrong, or at least knew that his act was contrary to the civil or moral law. For example, a man who, labouring under the insane delusion that another has injured his reputation, kills the latter is presumed to be morally accountable if he realized that the killing was immoral or illegal. In a word, the rule of general principle that wrong implies freedom to avoid it. Medical authorities on insanity are practically unanimous in rejecting this judicial test. Experience, they maintain, shows that many insane persons who can think and reason correctly on every topic except that which forms the,
subject of their delusion are unable to determine their wills and direct their actions accordingly. In an unconscious mind normal intellect is not always accompanied by normal volition. We should expect to find this true from the very nature of the case. For if a disease of the mind interferes with normal volition, we have no reason to believe that any other aspect of the mind remains normal. The intellect, if it has perfect control over those actions that are apparently affected by the delusion—actions that he clearly perceives to be wrong, for example—is to assume that the operations of intellect and will are as perfectly harmonized in an uncorrected in a sound mind. As a matter of fact, the presumption would seem to lead the other way, that is, to the conclusion that the action of the will as well as that of the intellect will be abnormal.

Insanity experts do not, indeed, contend that all the consciously immoral acts of a partially insane person are unfree. They merely insist that these actions are unfree in so far as the grounds that the patient is aware of their immorality. In their view, the question of freedom and responsibility can be answered only through an examination of all the circumstances of the particular case. The laws of one American state, and of some foreign countries, explicitly make the interpretation of such acts the test of insanity. According to the law of New York, "No act done by a person in a state of insanity can be punished as an offence." The French law is slightly more specific: "There can be no crime or offence if the accused was in a state of madness at the time of the act." More specific still is the law of Germany, yet it does not introduce knowledge or ignorance as a criterion of responsibility: "An act is not punishable when the person at the time of doing it was in a state of unconsciousness or disease of mind by which a free determination of the will was excluded." In passing it may be observed that the laws of all countries imply that freedom of the will and moral responsibility are realities, and declare that punishment is to be inflicted only when the will has acted freely. The discussion in the last two paragraphs refers especially to delusional insanity, or to what is sometimes called partial intellectual insanity. There is a different question, a question which is entirely independent of the question of moral responsibility. Insanity, as it involves the will and the emotions rather than the intellect, is called affective insanity, and it is subdivided into impulsive and moral. According to medical authorities, impulsive insanity may occur without delusions or any other apparent derangement of the intelligence. Those suffering from it are sometimes driven irresistibly to commit actions which they know to be wrong, actions which are contrary to their character, dispositions, and desires. Many suicides and homicides have in consequence of such uncontrolled impulses been committed by persons who were apparently sane in all other respects. Obviously, they were not morally responsible for these crimes. Although this theory runs counter not only to English and American legal procedure, but also to the opinions of the average man, it seems to be established by the history of numerous carefully observed cases, and to provide an explanation for many suicides and murders that are otherwise inexplicable. Moreover, it is inherently probable. Since insanity is a disease of the brain which may affect any of the mental faculties, there seems to be no good reason to deny that it might affect the intellect. For the intellect, and the freedom of the will, is almost exclusively, leaving the intellectual processes apparently unimpaired. The theory does, indeed, seem to disagree with the doctrine of our textbooks of moral philosophy and theology, which maintains that freedom of the will can be diminished or destroyed only through defective or confused action of the intellect. There is, however, no real opposition except on the assumption that the will and intellect in a diseased mind co-operate and harmonize perfectly. If the intellect has power to determine itself in accordance with the ideas and motives presented by the intellect; in the former this power may sometimes be lacking. The inference from intellectual intercourse to volitional freedom may, as noted above, be valid in the one case, and quite invalid in the other. This opposition is manifestly of great importance in determining whether a suicide is worthy of Christian burial. If he is afflicted with ideational or impulsive insanity, the mere fact that his intelligence seemed to be normal, and all his acts deliberate, at the time of his self-destruction, is not always conclusive proof of volitional freedom and moral guilt. In what is called moral insanity there is sometimes the same lack of self-control as in impulsive insanity, together with a perversion of the feelings, passions, and moral notions. It constitutes, therefore, an additional obstacle to those who interferes with the interpretation of an act as an intentional action through abnormally strong passions and false ideas of right and wrong. Obviously, however, the mere fact that the affections, passions, or moral notions are perverted, for example, with regard to sexual matters, is not always evidence of true insanity. Impulsive insanity is manifestly of such a nature as to directly hampers freedom of the will.

Adults who have always been insane can receive baptism, since, as in the case of infants, the Church's intention supplies what is lacking. They have power they can be baptized when in danger of death or if incurable, provided they had when sane, as for the purposes of the Church, as sponsors at baptism. They may receive confirmation. Communion should not be given to those who have always been insane. Those who, before becoming insane, were pious and religious, should be given Communion when in danger of death. When there are lucid intervals, Communion may then be administered. The same applies to extreme unction. In Holy orders, insanity is an irregularity under the head of defect. A candidate temporarily insane through some transient and accidental cause may, after recovery, be ordained. One deranged after the examination may exercise his orders, if he regains his sanity. The perpetually insane cannot marry. But "if the patient has lucid intervals, the marriage contract during such an interval is valid, though it is not safe for him to marry on account of his inability to rear children." (St. Thomas, In IV Sent., dist. xxxiv, q. 1, art. 4.)
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Inscriptions, Early Christian.—Inscriptions of Christian origin form, as non-literary remains, a valuable source of information on the development of Christian thought and life in the early Church. They may be divided into three main classes: sepulchral inscriptions, epigraphic records, and inscriptions concerning private life. The material on which they were written was the same as that used for beaten inscriptions. For the inscriptions they are used, the substance commonly employed was stone of different kinds, native or preferably imported. The use of metal was not so common. When the inscription is properly cut into the stone, it is called a titulus or
marble; if merely scratched on the stone, the Italian workmen, unless a painted inscription is called dipinto, and a mosaic inscription—such as are found largely in North Africa, Spain, and the East—bears the name of opus musium. It was a common practice in Greek and Latin lands to make use of slabs already inscribed, i.e. to take the reverse of a slab containing a heathen inscription, or for the inscription of a Christian one; such a slab is called an epitaphograph. The form of the Christian inscriptions does not differ from that of the contemporary pagan inscriptions, except when sepulchral in character, and then only in the case of the tituli of the catacombs. The most common form in the East is the upright text (texta), in which the text, or slab of stone, frequently ornamented with a fillet or a projecting curved moulding; in the West a slab for the closing of the grave was often used. Thus the greater number of the graves (loculi) in the catacombs were closed with thin, rectangular slabs of terra-cotta or marble; the graves called arcrosis were covered with heavy, flat slabs, while on the sarcophagi a panel (tabula) or a disk (discus) was frequently reserved on the front wall for an inscription.

The majority of the early Christian inscriptions, viewed from an technical and palaeographical standpoint, give evidence of artistic decay: this remark applies especially to the tituli of the catacombs, which are, as a rule, less finely executed than the heathen work of the same time. A striking exception is formed by the Damascene letters introduced in the fourth century by Furius Dionysius Philocalus, the calligraphist of Pope Damasus I (q. v.). The other forms of letters did not vary essentially from those employed by the ancients. The most important was the classical capital writing, customary from the time of Augustus; from the fourth century on it was gradually replaced by the uncial writing, the cursive characters being more or less confined to the scriptio inscriptions. As to the language, Latin inscriptions are the most frequent; "opus musium" in the East Greek was commonly employed, interesting dialects being occasionally found (e.g. in the recently deciphered Christian inscriptions from Nubia in Southern Egypt). Special mention should also be made of the Coptic inscriptions. The text is often very obscure, the sense of some passages being unknown to us. Specifically Christian abbreviations were found side by side with the usual pagan contractions at an early date. One of the most common of the latter, "D. M." (i. e. Dis Manibus, to the Protecting Deities of the Lower World), was stripped of its pagan meaning, and also of its abbreviation, and employed among the Christian epigraphs of the early Christians. In many cases the dates of Christian inscriptions must be judged from circumstances; when the date is given, it is the consular year. The method of chronological computation varied in different countries. Our present Dionysian chronology (see Chronology: Dionysius Exiguus) does not appear in the early Christian inscriptions.

SEPULCHRAL INSCRIPTIONS.—The earliest of these epitaphs are characterized by their brevity, only the name of the dead being given. Later a short acclamation was added (e. g. "in God", "in Peace"); from the end of the second century the formula were enlarged by the addition of family names and the date of burial. In the third and fourth centuries the text of the epitaphs was made more complete by the statement of the age of the deceased, the date (reckoned according to the consular in office), and laudatory epitaphs and laudatory epithets. In the Christian epigraphs the Roman empire had its own distinct expressions, contractions, and acclamations. Large use was made of symbolism (q. v.). Thus the open cross is found in the epitaphs of the catacombs as early as the second century, and from the third to the sixth century appears as a regular part of the epitaph. The cryptic allusions of primitive Christianity are also used in the epitaphs, e. g. the fish (Christ), the anchor (hope), the palm (victory) and the representation of the soul in the other world as a female figure (orante) with arms extended in prayer. Beginning with the fourth century, after the victory of the Church over paganism, the language of the epitaphs was more frank and open. Emphasis was laid upon a life according to the dictates of Christian faith, and prayers for the dead were added to the inscription. The prayers inscribed thus early on the sepulchral slabs reproduce in large measure the primitive liturgy of the funeral service. They implore for the dead eternal peace (see Pax) and a place of refreshment (refrigerium), invite to heaven's holy feast (Apex), and wish the departed the speedy enjoyment of the gladness of Paradise, and the fellowship of God and the saints.

A perfect example of this kind of epitaph is that of the Egyptian monk Schenute; it is taken verbally from the ancient Greek liturgy. It begins with the doxology, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen", and continues: "May the God of the spirit and of all flesh, who has overcome death and trodden Hades under foot, and has graciously bestowed life on the world, permit this soul of Father Schenute to attain to rest in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place of light of and refreshment, where affliction, pain, and grief are no more. O gracious God, the lover of men, forgive him all the errors which he has committed by word, act, or thought. There is indeed no earthly pilgrim who has not sinned, for Thou alone, O God, art free from every sin." The epitaph repeats the doxology at the close, and adds the petition of the scribe: "O Saviour, give peace also to the scribe." When the secure position of the Church assured greater freedom of expression, the non-religious part of the sepulchral inscriptions was also enlarged. In Western Europe and in the East it was not unusual to note, both in the catacombs and in the cemeteries above ground, the purchase or gift of the grave and its dimensions. Commonly admitted also into the early Christian inscriptions are the pagan minatory formulae against desecration of the grave or its illegal use as a place of further burial.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL INSCRIPTIONS.—To many of the early Christian sepulchral inscriptions we are indebted for much information concerning the original development of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, besides which they are of great value as a confirmation of Catholic truths. Thus, for example, from the earliest times we meet in them all the hierarchical grades from the door-keeper (osterius) and lector up to the pope (see OECUMENICAL CONCILI). A number of epitaphs of the early popes (Dionysius, Anacletus, Eutychianus, Cornelius, Lucius, Eutychianus, Caesarius) were found in the so-called "Papal Crypt" in the Catacomb of St. Callistus on the Via Appia, rediscovered by De Rossi and well known to every pilgrim to Rome (see CEMETERY, sub-title Early Roman Christian Cemeteries). Numbers of early epitaphs of bishops have been found from Germany to Nubia. Priests are frequently mentioned, and reference is often made

GRAFFITO ON A MARBLE SLAB IN THE CEMETERY OF OSTRIANUS
poem in which the Saviour is addressed: “Thou Who stills the waves of the deep, Whose power giveth light to the seed slumbering in the earth, who didst awaken Lazarus from the dead and give back the brother on the third day to the sister Martha; Thou wilt, so I believe, awake the dead, and make them live.”

Besides catechumens and neophytes, reference is also made to virgins consecrated to God, nuns, abbesses, holy widows, one of the last named being the mother of Pope St. Damasus I (q. v.), the celebrated restorer of the catacombs. Epitaphs of martyrs and tituli mentioning the martyrs as numbered as frequently as one would expect, especially in the Roman catacombs. This, however, is easily explained by recalling the circumstances of burial in the periods of persecution, when Christians must have been content to save and to give even secret burial to the remains of their martyrs. Many a nameless grave among the five million estimated to exist in the Roman catacombs held the remains of early Christians who witnessed to the Faith with their blood. Another valuable repertory of Catholic theology is found in the dogmatic inscriptions in which all important dogmas of the Church (incidental and of moment) are enunciated and confirmed. The monotheism of the worshippers of the Word—or Cultores Verbi, as the early Christians loved to style themselves—and their belief in Christ are well expressed even in the early inscriptions. Very ancient inscriptions emphasize, and with delight, the doctrine of Catholicity of Christ, the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. In this connexion we may mention the epitaph of Abercius (q. v.), Bishop of Hieropolis in Phrygia (second century), and the somewhat later epitaph of Pecorius (q. v.) at Autun in Gaul. The inscription of Abercius speaks of the fish (Christ) caught by a holy virgin, which serves as food under the species of bread and wine; it speaks, further, of Rome, where Abercius visited the chosen people, the Church par excellence. This important inscription aroused at first no little controversy among scholars, and some non-Catholic archeologists sought to find in it a tendency to pagan syncretism. Now, however, its purely Christian character is almost universally acknowledged. The original was presented by Sultan Abdul Hamid to Leo XIII, and is preserved in the Apostolic Museum at the Lateran. Early Christian inscriptions confirm the Catholic doctrine of the Redemption by the Passion of the Saviour of the Blessed Virgin, and the primacy of the Apostolic See. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of these evidences, for they are always entirely incidental elements of the sepulchral inscriptions, all of which were pre-eminently eschatological in their purpose.

POETICAL AND OFFICIAL INSCRIPTIONS.—While the copious material obtained from the early Christian epitaphs, especially the inscriptions of the Roman (Latin) and the Greek-Oriental groups, is equivalent to a book in stone on the faith and life of our Christian forefathers, the purely literary side of these monuments is equally significant. Many are the character of public documents; others are in verse, either taken from well-known poets, or at times the work of the person erecting the memorial. Fragments of classical poetry, especially quotations from Virgil, are occasionally found. The most famous composer of poetical epitaphs in Christian antiquity was Pope Damasus I (366–384), mentioned above. He repaired the neglected tombs of the martyrs and the graves of distinguished persons who had lived before the Constantinian epoch, and adorned these burial places with metrical epitaphs in a peculiarly beautiful lettering. One of these important inscriptions contained in this pope large stone tablets of this character, several of which have been preserved in their original form or in fragments. Besides verses on his mother Laurentia and his sister Irene, he wrote an autobiographical poem in which the Saviour is addressed: “Thou Who stills the waves of the deep, Whose power giveth light to the seed slumbering in the earth, who didst awaken Lazarus from the dead and give back the brother on the third day to the sister Martha; Thou wilt, so I believe, awake the dead, and make them live.”

The best known celebrate the temporary burial of the two chief Apostles in the Placentia under the basilica of St. Sebastian; on the Via Nomentana, the martyrs Prutus and Hyainth in the Via Salaria Antiqua, Pope Marcellus in the Via Salaria Nova, St. Agnes in the Via Nomentana, also Saints Laurence, Hippolytus, Gorgonius, Peter and Marcellinus, Eusebius, Tarsicius, Cornelius, Eutychius, Nereus and Achilleus, Felix and Aelaductus. Damasus also placed a metrical inscription in the baptistery of the Vatican, and set up others in connexion with various restorations, e. g. an inscription on a stairway of the cemetery of St. Hermes. Altogether there have been preserved as the work of Damasus more than one hundred epigrammata, some of them better copies, others of inferior half are probably correctly ascribed to him, even though it is necessary to remember that after his death Damasine inscriptions contined to be set up, i. e. in the beautiful lettering invented by Damasus or, rather by his calligrapher Furio Dionysius Filocalus. Some of the inscriptions imitate the lettering of Filocalus, make special and laudatory mention of the pope who had done so much for the catacombs. Among these are the inscriptions of Pope Vigilius (537–555), a restorer animated by the spirit of Damasus. Some of his inscriptions are preserved in the Lateran Museum.

The inscriptions just mentioned possess as a rule a public and official character. Other inscriptions served as official records of the erection of Christian edifices (churches, baptisteries, etc.). Ancient Roman examples of this kind are the inscribed tablet dedicated by Boniface I at the beginning of the fifth century to St. Felicita, to whom the pope ascribed the settlement of the schism of Eulalius, and the inscription (still visible) of Pope Sixtus III in the Lateran baptistery, etc. The Roman custom was soon copied in all parts of the empire. At Thebes in Northern Africa there were inscriptions which contained inscriptions once set up over a door, and in almost exact verbal agreement with the text of an inscription in a Roman church. Both the basilica of Nola and the church at Primuliacum in Gaul bore the same distich:

Pax tibi sit quicumque Dei penetralia Christi, specto pacifico candidus ingredies.

(Peace be to thee whoever enterest with pure and gentle heart into the sanctuary of Christ God.) In such inscriptions the church building is generally referred to as domus Dei, domus orationis (the house of God, the house of prayer). The present writer found an inscription with the same sense in a tomb inscription, which imitated the lettering of Filocalus, and in almost exact verbal agreement with the text of an inscription in a Roman church. Both the basilica of Nola and the church at Primuliacum in Gaul bore the same distich:

Pax tibi sit quicumque Dei penetralia Christi, specto pacifico candidus ingredies.

(Peace be to thee whoever enterest with pure and gentle heart into the sanctuary of Christ God.) In such inscriptions the church building is generally referred to as domus Dei, domus orationis (the house of God, the house of prayer). The present writer found an inscription with the same sense in a tomb inscription, which imitated the lettering of Filocalus, and in almost exact verbal agreement with the text of an inscription in a Roman church. Both the basilica of Nola and the church at Primuliacum in Gaul bore the same distich:

Pax tibi sit quicumque Dei penetralia Christi, specto pacifico candidus ingredies.
INSCRIPTION OF ABERCIUS

FRAGMENTS PRESENTED TO POPE LEO XIII BY W. RAMSAY AND SULTAN ABDUL-HAMID II
NOW PRESERVED IN THE MUSEO CRISTIANO, LATERAN PALACE

(SEE "ABERCIUS, INSCRIPTION OF")
refers to the pontificate of Celestine I, during which period an Illyrian priest named Peter founded the church.

Other parts of the early Christian churches were also occasionally decorated with inscriptions, e.g. the titles of roofs and walls. It was also customary to decorate with inscriptions the lengthiest cycles of frescoes depicted on the walls of churches. Fine examples of inscriptions of this sort are found in the "Biblia pauperum" of Prudentius, in the Ambrosian tituli, and in the writings of Paulinus of Nola.

It should be added that many dedicatory inscriptions belong to the eighth and ninth centuries, especially in Rome, where in the eighth century numerous books, as well as parts of manuscripts from the catacombs, were commissioned for inscription in the churches of the city (see Catacombs).

Graffiti.—Although apparently of little value and devoid of all monumental character, the graffiti (i.e. writings scratched on walls or other surfaces) are of great importance historically and otherwise. Many such are preserved in the catacombs and on various early Christian monuments. Of special importance in this respect are the ruins of the fine edifices of the town of Menas in the Egyptian Marisot (cf. "Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology", 1907, pp. 25, 51, 112). The graffiti help in turn to illustrate the literary sources of the life of the early Christians. (See also Ostroaka.)


C. M. KAUFMANN.

Inspiration of the Bible.—The subject will be treated in this article under the four heads: I. Belief in Inspired Books; II. Nature of Inspiration; III. Extent of Inspiration; IV. Protestant Views on the Inspiration of the Bible.

I. BELIEF IN INSPIRED BOOKS.—A. Among the Jews. The books in the sacred canons and on various books in an old as the Hebrew literature. Moses and the Prophets had committed to writing a part of the message they were to deliver to Israel from God. Now, the nabi (prophet), whether he spoke or wrote, was considered by the Hebrews the authorized interpreter of the thoughts and wishes of Yahweh. He was the "mouth of God", "the mouth of the Spirit" (Osee, ix, 7). It was around the Temple and the Book that the religious and national restoration of the Jewish people was effected after their exile (see II Mach., ii, 13, 14, and the prologue of Ecclesiasticus in the Septuagint). Philo (from B.C. to a. D. 40) speaks of the "sacred books", "sacred word", and of "most holy scripture" (De vita Moysis, iii, §32). The testimony of Flavius Josephus (A. D. 37-95) is still more characteristic: it is in his writings that the word inspiration (τροπεως) is met for the first time. He speaks of twenty-two books which the Jews with good reason consider Divine, and for which, in case of need; they are ready to die (Contra Apion., I, 8). The belief of the Jews in the inspiration of the Scriptures did not diminish from the time in which they were dispersed throughout the world, without temple, without altar, without priests; on this account, they were so much that it took the place of everything else.

B. Among the Christians.—The Gospel contains no express declaration about the origin and value of the Scriptures, but in it we see that Jesus Christ used them in conformity with the general belief, i.e., the Scribal (cf. 2 Tim., iv, 3). These books are described in this respect as found in the Fourth Gospel, v, 39, x, 35. The words scripture, Word of God, Spirit of God, God, in the sayings and writings of the Apostles are used indifferently (Rom., iv, 5; 3 x, 17). St. Paul appeals expressly to those Divine oracles of which Israel was made the guardian (cf. Rom., iii, 2). This persuasion of the early Christians was not merely the effect of a Jewish tradition blindly accepted and never understood. St. Peter and St. Paul give the reason why it was accepted: it is that all Scripture is inspired of God (πρεπονομαστικος) (II Tim., iii, 16; cf. II Pet., i, 20, 21). It would be superfluous to spend any time in proving that Tradition has faithfully kept the Apostolic belief in the inspiration of Scripture. Moreover, this demonstration forms the subject-matter of a great number of the canons of the Church. In every Church and every age, till now (De inspiratione Sacrum Scripture", 1906, p. 40 - 379). It is enough for us to add that on several occasions the Church has defined the inspiration of the canonical books as an article of faith (see Denzinger, "Enchiridion", 10th ed., n. 1787, 1899).

Every Christian sect still deserving that name believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures, although several have more or less altered the idea of inspiration.

C. Value of this Belief.—History alone allows us to establish the fact that Jews and Christians have always believed in the inspiration of the Bible. But what is this belief worth? Proofs of the rational as well as of the dogmatic order unite in justifying it. Those who first recognized in the Bible a superhuman work had as foundation of their opinion the testimony of the Prophets, of Christ, and of the Apostles, whose Divine mission was sufficiently established by immediate experience or by history. To this purely rational argument can be added the authentic teaching of the Church. A Catholic may claim this additional certitude without falling into a vicious circle, because the infallibility of the Church in its teaching is proved independently of the inspiration of the Bible. Both are of historical value, belonging to Scripture in common with every other authentic and truthful writing, is enough to prove this.

II. NATURE OF INSPIRATION.—A. Method to be followed.—(1) To determine the nature of Biblical inspiration the theologian has at his disposal a threefold source of information: the data of tradition, the concept of inspiration, and the concrete state of the inspired text. If he wishes to obtain acceptable results, he will take into account all these elements of solution. Pure speculation might easily end in a contradiction of the other and, in turn, in an acceptance of the other and, in turn, in an acceptance of the other. On the other hand, the literary or historical analysis of these same texts, if left to its own resources, ignores their Divine origin. Finally, if the data of tradition attest the fact of inspiration, they do not furnish us with a complete analysis of its nature. Hence, theology, philosophy, and exegesis have each a word to say on this subject. Positive theology furnishes a starting-point in its traditional formula: viz., God is the author of Scripture, the inspired writer is the organ of the Holy Ghost, Scripture is the Word of God. Speculative theology takes these formulae, analyses their contents, and from them draws its conclusions. In this way St. Thomas, starting from the traditional concept which makes the sacred writer an organ of the Holy Ghost, explains the subordination of his faculties to the action of the Inspirer by the philosophical theory of the instrumental cause (Quodl., VIII, Q. vi, a. 14, ad 5um). However, to avoid all risk of going astray, speculation must pay constant attention to the indications furnished by exegesis.

(2) The Catholic who wishes to make a correct analysis of Biblical inspiration must have before his eyes the following ecclesiastical documents: (a) those books in the Canon, and (b) those books of the Apocrypha. It is by these books that the Church has defined the inspiration.

(3) The term inspiration is used in two senses: (1) in the sense of divine authorship (see above), and (2) in the sense of human cooperation in the act of inspiration (see below).
thority, nor merely because they contain revelation without error, but because, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been transmitted to the Church as such." (Concil. Vatic., Sess. III, const. dogm. de Fide, cap. ii, in Denz., 1787.) (b) "The Holy Ghost has not written them, but has inspired them, in a manner of speaking, by a supernatural power. In the first place, it is commonly impelled the Biblical writers to write, and assisted them while writing in such a manner that they conceived in their minds exactly, and determined to commit to writing faithfully, and render in exact language, in infallible truth, all that God commanded them to do, and never to be the author of Scripture in its entirety" (Encycl. "Provid. Deus", in Denz., 1952).

B. Catholic View.—Inspiration can be considered in God, who produces it; in man, who is its object; and in the text, which is its term. (1) In God inspiration is one of those actions which are ad extra, as theologians say; and thus it is common to the three Divine Persons. However, it is attributed by appropriation to the Holy Ghost. It is not one of those graces which have for their immediate and essential object the sanctification of the man who receives them, those e.g. the grace of sanctifying, or the gift of graces, or the gift of knowledge, or the gift of the works of charity, etc., because they are given primarily for the good of others. Besides, inspiration has this in common with every actual grace, that it is a transitory participation of the Divine power; the inspired writer finding himself invested with it only at the very moment of writing or when thinking about writing.

(2) Considered in the man on whom is bestowed this favour, inspiration affects the will, the intelligence, and all the executive faculties of the writer. (a) Without an impulsion given to the will of the writer, it cannot be conceived. Yet in the case of the principal cause of Scripture, for, in that case, the man would have taken the initiative. Besides that, the text of St. Peter is peremptory: "'For prophecy came not by the will of man at any time: but holy men of God spoke, inspired by the Holy Ghost'" (II Pet., i, 21). The context shows that there is question of all Scripture, which is a prophecy in the broad sense of the word (σάγια προφητεία γραφής). According to the Encyclical "Provid. Deus", "God stirred up and impelled the sacred writers to determine to write all that God meant them to write." (Deissmann, 1952). Theologians discuss the question whether, in order to impart this motion, God moves the will of the writer directly or decides it by proposing motives of an intellectual order. At any rate, everybody admits that the Holy Ghost can arouse or simply utilise external influences capable of acting on the will of the sacred writer. According to an ancient tradition, St. Mark and St. John wrote their Gospels at the instance of the faithful.

What becomes of human liberty under the influence of Divine inspiration? In principle, it is agreed that the inspired can take away from man the freedom of reasoning. In point of fact, it is commonly admitted that the Inspired, Who does not lack means of obtaining our consent, has respected the freedom of His instruments. An inspiration which is not accompanied by a revelation, which is adapted to the normal play of the faculties of the human soul, which can be said to have a will of its own, is such as was either unknown or not clearly discerned by them." (St. Aug., "De Gen. ad litt.", II, xvii, 37; St. Thomas, II-II, Q. clxxxiv, a. 5; Q. clxxxii, a. 4). However, most theologians admit that ordinarily the writer was conscious of his own inspiration. From what we have just said it follows that inspiration does not necessarily imply ecstasy, as Philo and, later, the Montanists thought. It is true that some of the orthodox apologists of the second century (Athenagoras, Tertullian) stress that the Holy Ghost, who imparts to them the knowledge and the truth of the details and of the whole. However, all theologians do not analyse exactly in the same manner the influence of this light of inspiration.
(c) The influence of the Holy Ghost had to extend also to all the executive faculties of the sacred writer—to his memory, his ingenuity, his writing, even the words with which he formed the letters. Whether this influence proceeded immediately from the action of the Inspirer or be a simple assistance, and, again, whether this assistance be positive or merely negative, in any case everyone admits that its object is to remove all errors in the text. As was pointed out above, even the words are inspired believe that it also forms an integral part of the graces of inspiration itself. However that may be, there is no denying that the inspiration extends, in one way or another, and as far as needful, to all those who have really composed the sacred books, especially to the secretaries, if the inspired person had any. Seen in this light, the hagiographer no longer appears a passive and inert instrument, abused, as it were, by an exterior impulsion; on the contrary, his faculties are elevated to the service of a superior power, which, although distinct, is the less intimately present and interior. Without losing anything of his personal life, or of his liberty, or even of his spontaneity (since it may happen that he is not conscious of the power which leads him on), man becomes thus the interpreter of God. Such, then, is the main component of the Divine inspiration. St. Thomas (II-II, Q. cxlii) reduces it to the grace of prophecy, in the broad sense of the word.

(3) Considered in its term, inspiration is nothing else but the Biblical text itself. This text was destined by God, Who inspired it, for the universal Church, in order that it might be authentically recognized as His written word. This destination is essential. Without it a book, even if it had been inspired by God, could not become canonical; it would have no more value than a private revelation. That is why any writing dated from a later period than the Apostolical age is condemned ipso facto to be excluded from the canon. The reason of this is that the deposit of the public revelation was complete in the time of the Apostles. They alone had the mission to give to the teaching of Christ the development which was to be opportunely suggested to them by the Paraclete, John, xiv, 26 (see Franselin, "De divina Traditione," p. 50). Since the Bible is the Word of God, it can be said that every canonical text is for us a Divine lesson, a revelation, even though it may have been written with the aid of inspiration only, and without a revelation properly so called. For this cause, also, it is essential to the biblical text that the Bible is free from error, is, beyond all doubt, the teaching of Tradition. The whole of Scriptural apologetics consists precisely in accounting for this exceptional prerogative. Exegetes and apologists have recourse here to considerations which may be reduced to the following heads: the original unaltered text, as it left the pen of the sacred writers, is alone in question. (b) As truth and error are properties of judgment, only the assertions of the sacred writer have to be dealt with. If he makes any affirmation, it is the exegete's duty to discover its meaning and its extent; whether he expresses his own views or those of others; whether in quoting another he approves, disapproves, or keeps a silent reserve, etc. (c) The intention of the writer is to be found out according to the laws of the language in which he writes, and consequently we must take into account the style. He must not be too rigidly compatible with inspiration, because they are all legitimate expressions of human thought, and also, as St. Augustine says (De Trinitate, I, 12), "God, getting books written by men, did not wish them to be composed in a form differing from that used by them". Therefore, a distinction is to be made between the assertion and the expression; it is by means of the latter that we arrive at the former. (d) These general principles are to be applied to the different categories of texts. The nature of the matter contained in them, the special purpose for which their author wrote them, the traditional explanation which is given of them, and also according to the decisions of the Church.

C. Erroneous Views Proposed by Catholic Authors.—(a) The approval given by the Church to a merely human writing cannot, by itself, make it inspired Scripture. The contrary opinion hazarded by Sextus of Siena (1566), renewed by Movers and Haneberg, in the nineteenth century, was condemned by the Second Vatican Council, sacred texts, which are inspired, even where it seems to be at its minimum—e.g., in the historical books—is not a simple assistance given to the inspired writer to prevent him from error, as was thought by Jahn (1793), who followed Holden and perhaps Richard Simon. In order that a text may be Scripture, it is not enough "that it contain revelation without error" (Conc. Vatic., Denz., 1787). (b) A book composed from merely human resources would not become an inspired text, even if approved of, afterwards, by the Holy Ghost. This subsequent approbation might perhaps give the truth to the book as credible as if it were an article of Divine Faith, but it would give a Divine origin to the book itself. Every inspiration properly so called is antecedent, so much so that it is a contradiction in terms to speak of a subsequent inspiration. This truth seems to have been lost sight of by those moderns who thought they could revivify—at the same time making it still less acceptable—a vague hypothesis of Lessius (1585) and of his disciple Bonfrère. (2) A view which err by excess confounds inspiration with revelation. We have just said that these two Divine operations are not only distinct, but may take place separately, although they may also be found together. As a matter of fact, this is what happens whenever God moves the sacred writer to express thoughts or sentiments of which he cannot have acquired knowledge in the ordinary way. There has been some exaggeration in the accusation brought against early writers of having confounded inspiration with revelation; however, it must be admitted that the explicit distinction between these two graces has become more and more emphasized since the time of St. Thomas. This is a very real progress and allows us to make a more exact psychological analysis of inspiration.

III. Excessive or Destructive Question now is not whether all the Biblical books are inspired in every part, even in the fragments called deutero-canonical: this point, which concerns the integrity of the Canon, has been solved by the Council of Trent (Denz., 784). But are we bound to admit, in the books or parts of books which are canonical, there is absolutely nothing, either as regards the matter or the form, which does not fall under the Divine inspiration?

A. Inspiration of the Whole Subject Matter.—For the last three centuries there have been authors—theologians, exegetes, and especially apologists, such as Holden, Rohling, Lenormant, di Bartolo, and others—who maintained, with more or less confidence, that inspiration was limited to moral and dogmatic teaching, excluding everything in the Bible relating to history and the natural sciences. They have thus made it compatible with the infallibility of the Church. The Church has never ceased to protest against this attempt to restrict the inspiration of the sacred books. This is what took place when Mgr d'Hulst, Rector of the Institut Catholique of Paris, gave a sympathetic account of this opinion in "Le Correspondant" of 20 Jan., 1892. The reply was quickly
forthoming in the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" of the same year. In that Encyclical Leo XIII said: "It will never be lawful to restrict inspiration merely to certain parts of the Holy Scriptures, or to grant that the sacred writer could have made a mistake in the opinion of those early times, when the Reformation, like Luther himself, was trying to find a way and a symbol, one can discern a constant preoccupation, that of distinguishing between the inspiration which, in order to get out of these difficulties, do not hesitate to suppose that Divine inspiration extends only to what touches faith and morals, on the false plea that the true meaning is sought for in less what God has said than in the motive for which He has said it." (Doc. pont. 1860). In this proposition, tradition contradicts Christian tradition and theological teaching.

B. Vertical Inspiration.—Theologians discuss the question, whether inspiration controlled the choice of the words used or operated only in what concerned the sense of the assertions made in the Bible. In the sixteenth century verbal inspiration was the current teaching. The Jesuits of Louvain were the first to react against this opinion. They held "that it is not necessary, in order that a text be Holy Scripture, for the Holy Ghost to have inspired the very material words of the prophets, provided the sentiments were so violent that Bellarmine and Suarez thought it their duty to tone down the formula by declaring "that all the words of the text have been dictated by the Holy Ghost in what concerns the substance, but differently according to the diverse conditions of the instruments". This opinion went on gaining in precision, and little by little it disentangled itself from the terminology which it had borrowed from the adverse opinion, notably from the word "dictation". Its progress was so rapid that at the beginning of the nineteenth century it was more commonly taught than the theory of "inscription". In the middle of the century Franzelin seems to have given it its definite form. During the last quarter of a century verbal inspiration has again found partisans, and they become more numerous every day. However, the theologians of to-day, whilst retaining the terminology of the older school, have profoundly modified the theory itself. They no longer speak of a material dictation of words to the ear of the writer, nor of an interior revelation of the term to be employed, but of a Divine motion extending to every faculty and even to the powers of execution of the writer, and in consequence influence the work of the inspired writer. The sacred text is wholly the work of God and wholly the work of man, of the latter by way of instrument, of the former by way of principal cause. Under this rejuvenated form the theory of verbal inspiration shows a marked advance towards reconciliation with the rival opinion. From an exegetical and apologetical point of view it is indifferent which of these two opinions we adopt. All agree that the characteristics of style as well as the imperfections affecting the subject matter itself, belong to the inspired writer. As for the inerrancy of the inspired text it is to be aspired that it must be flawlessly attributed, and it matters little if God has insured the truth of His Scripture by the grace of inspiration itself, as the adherents of verbal inspiration teach, rather than by a providential assistance.

IV. Protestant Views on the Inspiration of the Bible.—A. At the Beginning of the Reformation.—1) The necessity of the attitude towards the Bible, which they had taken as their only rule of Faith, the Protestants were led at the very outset to go beyond the idea of a merely passive inspiration, which was commonly received in the first half of the sixteenth century. Not only did they make no distinction between inspiration and revelation, but Scripture, both in its matter and style, was considered as revelation itself. In it God spoke to the reader just as He did to the Israelites of old from the mercy-seat. Hence that kind of cult which some Protestants of to-day call "Bibilolatry". In the midst of the incertitude, vagueness, and antinomies of those early times, when the Reformation, like Luther himself, was trying to find a way and a symbol, one can discern a constant preoccupation, that of distinguishing between the inspiration which, in order to get out of these difficulties, do not hesitate to suppose that Divine inspiration extends only to what touches faith and morals, on the false plea that the true meaning is sought for in less what God has said than in the motive for which He has said it." (Doc. pont. 1860). Soon, to the inspiration of the words was added that of the general points of the present Hebrew text. This was not a mere opinion held by the two Buxtorfs, but a doctrine defined, and imposed under pain of fine, imprisonment, and exile, by the Confession of the Swiss Churches, promulgated in 1675. These dispositions were abrogated in 1724. The Puritans held that in the Bible there are neither barbarisms nor solecisms; that the Greek of the New Testament is as pure as that of the classical authors. It was said, with a certain amount of truth, that the Bible had become a sacrament for the Reformers.

(2) In the seventeenth century began the controversy of the three forms of inspiration. In the theory of inspiration now generally accepted by Protestants. The two principles which brought about the Reformation were precisely the instruments of this revolution: on the one side, the claim for every human soul of a teaching of the Holy Ghost, which was immediate and independent of every external rule; on the other, the right of private judgment, or autonomy of individual reasoning, in reading and studying the Bible. In the name of the first principle, on which Zwingli had insisted more than Luther and Calvin, the Pietists thought to free themselves from the letter of the Bible which fettered the action of the Spirit. A French Huguenot, Seb. Castellion (d. 1563), had already been bold enough to distinguish between the letter and the spirit; according to him the spirit only came from God, the letter was no more than a "case, husk, or shell of the spirit".

The Quakers, the followers of Swedenborg, and the Irvingites were to force this theory to its utmost limits; real revelation—the only one which instructs and sanctifies—was that produced under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost. While the Pietists were better inclined than the Calvinists to help the Holy Ghost, others, in even greater numbers, tried to get some light from philological and historical researches, which had received their decisive impulse from the Renaissance. Every facility was assured to their investigations by the principle of freedom of private judgment; and of this they took advantage. The conclusions obtained by this method could not but be fatal to the theory of inspiration by revelation. In vain did its partisans say that God's will had been to reveal to the Evangelists in four different ways the words which, in reality, Christ had uttered only once; for the Holy Ghost had acted according as He was dictating to Isaiah or to Amos—a fact which nothing could change. The avowal of inability to meet the facts alleged against them. As a matter of fact, Faustus Socinus (d. 1562) had already held that the words and, in general, the style of Scripture were not inspired. Such a work, George Calixtus, Episcopius, and Grotius must draw a clear distinction between inspiration and revelation. According to the last-named, nothing was revealed but the prophecies and the words of Jesus Christ, everything else was only inspired. Still further, he reduces inspiration to a pious motion of the soul without any other inspiration, i.e., without any internal works; III (1679), 672). The Dutch Arminian school, then represented by J. LeClerc, and, in France, by L. Capelle, Daillé, Blondel, and others, followed the same course. Although they kept current terminology,
they made it apparent, nevertheless, that the formula, "The Bible is the Word of God", was already about to be replaced by "The Bible contains the Word of God." Moreover, the term word was to be taken in an equivocal sense.

B. Biblical Rationalism.—In spite of all, the Bible was still held as the criterion of religious belief. To rob it of its prerogative was the work which the eighteenth century set itself to accomplish. In the attack then made on the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures three classes of assailants are to be distinguished. (1) The Naturalist philosophers, who were the forerunners of modern unbelief (Holbays, Spinoza, Diderot, D'alembert, La Mettrie, John Woolston, Tindal, Morgan); the German Rationalists (Reimarus, Lessing); the French Encyclopedists (Voltaire, Bayle) strove by every means, not forgetting abuse and sarcasm, to prove how absurd it was to claim a Divine origin for a book in which all the blemishes and errors of human writings are to be found. (2) The critics applied to the Bible the methods adopted for the study of profane authors. They, from the literary and historic point of view, reached the same conclusion as the infidel philosophers; but they thought they could remain believers by transferring the heroic faith of the Bible and the profane element. The latter they gave up to the free judgment of historical criticism; the former they pretended to uphold, but not without restrictions which profoundly changed its import. According to Semler, the father of Biblical Rationalism, Christ and the Apostles accommodated themselves to the false opinions of their contemporaries; according to Kant and Eichhorn, everything which does not agree with some reason must be regarded as Jewish invention. "Religion restricted within the limits of reason—that was the point which the critical movement of the eighteenth century made common with the philosophy of Kant and the theology of Wegscheider. The dogma of plenary inspiration dwindled down with it, in its final ruin, the very notion of revelation" (A. Sabatier, "Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit", 2nd ed., 1804, p. 531).

(3) These philosophical historical controversies about Scriptural authority caused great anxiety in religious minds. There were many who then sought their salvation in one of the principles put forward by the early Reformers, notably by Calvin: to wit, that truly Christian certitude came from the testimony of the Holy Scriptures; that all the faithful had but to sound his own soul in order to find the essence of religion, which was not a science, but a life, a sentiment. Such was the verdict of the Kantian philosophy then in vogue. It was useless, from the religious point of view, to discuss the extrinsic claims of the Bible; far better was the moral experience of its intrinsic worth. The Bible itself was nothing but a history of the religious experiences of the Prophets, of Christ and His Apostles, of the Synagogue and of the Church. Truth and Faith came not from without, but sprung from the Christian conscience as their source. Now the modernizing, these were not justified by the mere narrations of the religious experiences of those who had gone before. What mattered, then, the judgment passed by criticism on the historical truth of this narration, if it only evoked a salutary emotion in the soul? Here the useful alone was true. Not the least the authentic assurance was the testimony of the Bible text. Such, in broad outlines, was the final stage of a movement which Spener, Wesley, the Moravian Brethren, and, generally, the Pietists initiated, but of which Schleiermacher (1768-1834) was to be the theologian and the propagator in the nineteenth century.

C. German Rationalism.—(1) The rational views, however, were not abandoned without resistance. A movement back to the old idea of the theopneustia, including verbal inspiration, set in nearly everywhere in the first half of the nineteenth century. This reaction was called the Réveil. Among its principal promoters must be mentioned the Swiss L. Gauzens, W. Lee, in England, A. Dorner in Germany, and, more recently, W. Rohnert. Their labours at first evoked interest and sympathy, but were destined to fail before the efforts of a counter-reaction which sought to complete the work of Schleiermacher. It was led by Alex. Vinet, Edm. Scherer, and E. Rabaud in France; Rich. Rothe and especially Ritschl in Germany; S. T. Coleridge, F. D. Maurice, and Matthew Arnold in England. According to them, the ancient dogma of the theopneustia is not to be reformed, but only to be interpreted. Although, however, university professors, like E. Reuss, freely used the historical method; without denying inspiration they ignored it.

(2) Abstracting from accidental differences, the present opinion of the so-called "progressive" Protestants (who profess, nevertheless, to remain sufficiently orthodox), as represented in Germany by B. Weiss, R. F. Grau, and H. Cremer, in England by W. Sanday, C. Gore, and most Anglican scholars, may be reduced to the following heads: (a) the purely passive, mechanical theopneustia, extending to the very words of the Sacred Text; (b) impressionistic degrees: suggestion, direction, elevation, and superintendency. All the sacred writers have not been equally inspired. (c) Inspiration is personal, that is, given directly to the sacred writer to enlighten, stimulate, and purify his faculties. This religious enthusiasm, like every great passion, excites the powers of the soul; it belongs, therefore, to the spiritual order, and is not merely a help given immediately to the intellect. Biblical inspiration, being a seizure of the entire man by the Divine virtue, does not differ essentially from the gift of the Holy Spirit imparted to all the faithful. It is the right and proper and impartial use of language to call the sacred text itself inspired. At any rate, this text can, and actually does, err not only in profane matters, but also in those appertaining more or less to religion, since the Prophets and Christ Himself, notwithstanding His Divine authority, did not possess absolute infallibility. (Cf. Denney, "A Diet. of Christ and the Gospels", I, 148-49.) The Bible is a historical document which, taken in its entirety, contains the authentic narrative of revelation, the tidings of salvation. (e) Revealed truth and, consequently, the Faith we derive from the Bible are not founded but to sound his own soul in order to find the essence of religion, which was not a science, but a life, a sentiment. Such was the verdict of the Kantian philosophy then in vogue. It was useless, from the religious point of view, to discuss the extrinsic claims of the Bible; far better was the moral experience of its intrinsic worth. The Bible itself was nothing but a history of the religious experiences of the Prophets, of Christ and His Apostles, of the Synagogue and of the Church. Truth and Faith came not from without, but sprung from the Christian conscience as their source. Now the modernizing, these were not justified by the mere narrations of the religious experiences of those who had gone before. What mattered, then, the judgment passed by criticism on the historical truth of this narration, if it only evoked a salutary emotion in the soul? Here the useful alone was true. Not the least the authentic assurance was the testimony of the Bible text. Such, in broad outlines, was the final stage of a movement which Spener, Wesley, the Moravian Brethren, and, generally, the Pietists initiated, but of which Schleiermacher (1768-1834) was to be the theologian and the propagator in the nineteenth century.
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ciples of the Reformation, the autonomy of the individual conscience.

(3) The position of liberal Protestants (i.e. those who are independent of all dogmas) may be easily defined. The Bible is just like other texts, neither inspired nor the rule of Faith. Religious belief is quite foreign to him. So far is it from being dogmatic or even historical authority of a book that it gives to itself, in its own right. When religious texts, the Bible included, are in question—or, at least, what people generally believe to be historical—is largely a product of faith, which has transgressed all the usual author's of the Bible may be called inspired, that it endures with a superabundance of religious matters; but this religious enthusiasm does not differ essentially from that which animated Homer and Plato. This is the denial of everything supernatural, in the ordinary sense of the word, as well in the Bible as in religion in general. Nevertheless, those who hold this theory defend themselves from the charge of infidelity, especially repudiating the cold Rationalism of the last century, which was made up exclusively of negations. They think that they remain sufficiently Christian by adhering to the "religious sentiment" to which Christ had fitted the present age. Following Kant, Schleiermacher, and Ritschl, they profess a religion freed from all philosophical intellectualism and from every historical proof. Facts and formulae of the past have, in their eyes, only a symbolic and a transient value. Such is the new theology spread by the best-known professors and writers, especially in Germany—historians, exegetes, philologists, or even pastors of souls. We need only mention Harnack, H. J. Holtzmahn, Fried. Delitzsch, Cheyne, Campbell, A. Sabatier, Albert and John Reimarus. It is this transformation of Christianity that "Modernism", consequently the Ecclesiastical "Pasendi Gregis", owes its origin.

In modern Protestantism the Bible has decidedly fallen from the primary which the Reformation had so loudly conferred upon it. The fall is a fatal one, becoming deeper from day to day; and without remedy, since it is the logical consequence of the fundamental principle put forward by Luther and Calvin. Freedom of examination was destined sooner or later to produce freedom of thought. (Cf. A. Sabatier, "Les religions d'autorité et la religion du peuple", 2nd ed., 1904, pp. 399—403.)
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ALFRED DURAND.

Installation (Lat. installare, to put into a stall). This word, strictly speaking, applies to the solemn inductio of a priest or any person which he is to occupy in the choir of a cathedral or collation of a chair. It is the symbolical act (institution corporalis) by which a canon is put in possession of the functions which he exercises in the chapter, and by which the chapter admits him. The ceremonies of this installation are regulated by local usage; very often they consist in the assignment of a stall in the choir and a place in the hall in which the meetings of the chapter are held. At the same time the dean invests the new canon with the capes and lances, plots the crosier on his head, and receives his profession of faith and his oath to observe the statutes of the chapter. The term installation is also applied to the institutio corporalis, or putting in possession of any ecclesiastical benefice whatsoever (see Institution, Canonical); again, to the solemn entry of a parish priest into his new parish, even when this event has been publicly acknowledged after the parish priest has really been put in possession of his benefice. The corresponding ceremony for a bishop is known as enthronization (q. v.).

A. VAN HOYE.

Instinct.—Definitions.—In both popular and scientific literature the term instinct has been given a variety of meanings. It has been made to cover a frame for it an adequate definition which would meet with general acceptance. The term usually includes the idea of a purposive adaptation of an action or series of actions in an organized being, not governed by consciousness of the end to be attained. The difficulty is encountered when we attempt to add to this generic concept specific notes which shall differentiate it from reflex activities on the one hand and from intelligent activities on the other. Owing to the limitation of our knowledge of the processes involved, it may not always be possible to determine whether a given action should be regarded as instinctive, but this should not prevent us from drawing, on theoretical grounds, a clear line of demarcation between these two modes of activity. The reflex is essentially a physiological process. The reflex arc is an established neural mechanism which secures a definite and immediate response to a given physical stimulus. The individual may be conscious of the stimulus or of the response or of both, but consciousness does not in any case enter into the reflex as an essential factor. Instincts, in contradistinction to reflexes, are comparatively complex. Some writers are so impressed with the characteristic of instinct as to be disposed to agree with Herbert Spencer in defining it as an organized series of reflexes, but this definition fails to take into account the fact that consciousness forms an essential link in all instinctive activities. It has been suggested as a distinctive characteristic of instinct that it arises from perception, whereas the source of a reflex is never more than a sensation. Baldwin includes under instinct only reactions of a sensory-motor type. From a neurological point of view, in mammals at least, instinct always involves the cerebral cortex, the seat of consciousness, while the reflex is confined to the lower nerve centres. An obvious difference between reflexes and instincts is to be found in the fact that in the reflex the response to the stimulus is immediate, whereas the culmination of the instinctive activity, in which its purposeful character appears, may be delayed for a considerable time. The chief difficulties in defining instinct are encountered in differentiating instinctive from intelligent activities. If the mode of origin of instinct and habit be left out of account, the two processes will be seen to resemble each other so closely that it is well-nigh impossible to draw any clear line of distinction between them. This circumstance has led to the popular conception of instinct as an habit, a disposition of the subject which finds support in so eminent an authority as Wilhelm Wundt; but this definition
implies a theory of origin for instinct which is not universally accepted. Again, the Schoolmen and many competent observers, among whom E. Wasemann, S.J., is prominent, find the characteristic difference between instinctive and intelligent activities in the fact that the former are governed either by sensory processes or by sensory associative processes, while the other is governed by intellect and free will. They accordingly attribute all the conscious activities of the animal to instinct, since, as they claim, none of these activities can be traced to intellect in the strict sense of the word. Through nowhere in detail of the nature of instinct, but his position on the subject is rendered none the less clear from a great many passages in the "Summa Theologiae". He is in full agreement with the best modern authorities in laying chief emphasis on the absence of consciousness of the end as the essential characteristic of instinct. He says (op. cit., I-11, Q. xi, a. 2, C): "Although beings devoid of consciousness (cognitio) attain their end, nevertheless they do not attain a fruition of their end, as beings do who are endowed with consciousness. Consciousness of one's end, however, is of two kinds, perfect and imperfect. Perfect consciousness is that by which one is conscious particularly of the end, but not also of the general nature of purpose and goodness. This kind of consciousness is peculiar to rational natures. Imperfect consciousness is that by which a being knows the purpose and goodness in particular, and this kind of consciousness is found in brute animals, which are not governed by free will but are moved by natural instinct towards those things which they apprehend. Thus the rational creature attains complete enjoyment (fruatio); the brute attains imperfect enjoyment, and other creatures do not attain enjoyment at all." Wasemann's concept of instinct is in strict agreement with that of St. Thomas, while it is more explicit. He divides the instinctive activities of animals into two groups: "Instinctive actions in the strict, and instinctive actions in the wider acceptance of the term. As instances of the former class we have to regard those which immediately spring from the inherited dispositions of the powers of sensile cognition and appetite; and as instances of the latter those which indeed proceed from the same inherited dispositions but through the medium of sense experience." (Instinct and Intelligence in the Animal Kingdom, p. 35).

The following tendency in biology and comparative psychology to restrict the term instinct to inherited purposive adaptations. Many writers add to this two other characteristics: they insist that an instinct must be definitely fixed or rigid in character, and that it must be common to a large group of individuals. Baldwin regards instinct as "a definitely biological, not a psychological conception" (Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology). He adds that "no adequate psychological definition of instinct is possible, since the psychological state involved is exhausted by the terms sensation (and also perception) and habituation of an instinctive and involuntary nature. It has also been urged against it that it does not account for the co-ordination of the muscular groups which are frequently involved in instinct. Similar objections, of course, have been urged against natural selection as the origin of many complex anatomical structures. The adaptive character, in the one case as in the other, points to the operation of an intelligence that altogether transcends the scope of the mental powers of the creatures in question.

The second theory, that of lapsed intelligence, has assumed many forms, and has found many defenders among comparative psychologists and biologists during the last half century. Among the best-known authors espousing this theory may be mentioned Wundt, Eimer, and Cope. The two main difficulties in the way of the acceptance of this theory are, first,
the high grade of intelligence demanded at very low levels of animal life, and second, it assumes the inheritance of acquired characteristics. Wundt rejects intelligence in the strict acceptance of the term as the sovereign animal instinct. His designation is best stated in his own words: "We may reject at once as wholly untenable the hypothesis which derives animal instinct from an intelligence which, though not identical with that of man, is still, so to speak, of equal rank with it. At the same time we must admit that the adaptations of man to intellectual function, sense are right in ascribing a large number of the manifestations of mental life in animals not, indeed, to intelligence, as the intellectualists \textit{sensu stricto} do, but to individual experiences, the mechanism of which can only be explained in terms of association." (Op. cit., p. 437.) After dealing with another phase of this subject, he continues: "Only two hypotheses remain, therefore, as really arguable. One of them makes instinctive action a mechanized intelligent action, which can be in whole or in part reduced to the level of the reflex; the other makes instinct a matter of inherited habit, gradually acquired and modified under the effects of the environment, in the course of numberless generations. There is obviously no necessary antagonism between these two views. Instincts may be actions originally conscious, but now become mechanical, and they may be inherited habits." (Ibid., p. 393.) After discussing human instincts and their relation to environment, Wundt concludes: "External conditions of life and voluntary reactions upon them, then, are the two factors operative in the evolution of instinct. But they operate in different degrees. The general development of mentality is always tending to modify instinct in some way or another. And so it comes about that of the two associated principles the first, adaptation to environment,—predominates at the lower stages of life; the second,—voluntary activity,—at the higher. This is the great difference between the instincts of man and those of the animals. Human instincts are habits, acquired or inherited from previous generations; animal instincts are purposive adaptations of voluntary action to the conditions of life. And a second difference follows from the first: that the vast majority of human instincts are acquired: while animals . . . are restricted to inborn instincts, with a very limited range of variation.

Romanes seeks to solve the problem of the origin of instinct by combining these two theories, accounting for the more rigid instincts of animals on the basis of natural selection and for the more plastic instincts by the inheritance of mechanized habits. He calls the former class of instincts primary, and the latter secondary. More recently, the theory of organic selection has been advanced. According to this theory in one of the adaptations of all kinds, whether intelligent or organic, are called upon to supplement incomplete endowment, and thus to keep the species alive until various instincts are acquired sufficient to make the instinct relatively independent.

It is evident from the definitions and theories given above that several distinct things are included under the term instinct. This finds expression in the division of instincts into primary and secondary suggested by Romanes, and into innate and acquired instincts (Wundt). Darwin emphasized the same fact when he claimed that many instincts may have arisen from habit, and then adds: "but it would be a serious error to suppose that the greater number of instincts have been acquired by habit in one generation and then transmitted by inheritance to succeeding generations. It is shown that instincts which are acquainted, namely, those of the hive-bee and of many ants, could not possibly have been acquired by habit." (Op. cit., vol. I., 321.) Formerly, instincts interested naturalists chiefly because they were regarded as so many illustrations of the intelligence of the Creator, and, indeed, where it is a question of "primary," or "inherited," instincts—or instincts in the "strict sense of the term," as Wundt and others have designated it, they are analogous to that of the origin of anatomical characteristics. Evidently we shall have to account for such elaborate instincts as that which determines the conduct of the caterpillar or the emperor moth in building its cocoons along the same lines which we adopt in accounting for the origin of the anatomical structures. The intelligence displayed far transcend that which could possibly have been possessed by such lowly creatures. The "secondary," or "acquired," instincts have a theoretical interest of an entirely different character, arising out of the problems of the nature of animal intelligence and the origin of man. Montefelt, and in general all those who accept the brute origin of man, seek to obliterate the essential difference between man and the animal; hence they ascribe to the animal an intelligence which differs only in degree from that possessed by man. While at first sight this would seem to lift the animal up to the plane of human life, on closer consideration it is apparent that what it does in reality is to lower man to the plane of brute life.

It may easily be demonstrated that many of the instincts in animals are capable of modification in the course of individual experience. Acts that are determined by a new element in the environment may be repeated in a modified form, and this repetition soon begets a habit which, so all intents and purposes, is identical with instinct. Such mechanized habits are, as we have seen, classified by some observers as instincts, and if such a habit be inherited, as some claim it may be, then no one would be disposed to it that name of instinct. The real importance attaching to this problem arises from the form of consciousness that is operative in building up such habits, or secondary instincts. Aristotle and the Schoolmen attributed these puprseive adjustments to the \textit{appetitus sensitus}. They found no need of calling into play any higher faculty than sensory perceptions of particular objects and the recognition of their desirability or the reverse. This view is developed by Wasmann. It should be observed, however, that the term instincts as used by the Scholastics and by Wasmann refers not only to the neural mechanism or brain in the sense of variation, but to any mechanism by which it enables the animal to adjust its spontaneous activities to its surroundings. The term "was not taken merely as a constituent part of the sensitive power of cognition and appetite, but as the adaptive, natural disposition of animal sensation, which constitutes the vital principle of the innumerable acts of the animal . . . From apart and beyond inherited, instinctive knowledge, scholastic philosophy ascribed to the animal a sensitive memory and a power of perfecting inborn instincts through sense experience; it acknowledges in the animal not only considerable hereditary talents, but also certain degree talent and ability acquired by sense experience and by practice." (Wasmann, op. cit., 138–39.)
foregone conclusion that human intelligence originated from that of the brute, and differs only from it in degree.

**Human Instincts.**—The question of the nature of human instincts and the treatment which they should receive is of concern to us as men and in the exercise of the utmost consequence in the field of education. As we have seen above, some writers speak of acquired instincts, meaning thereby highly developed or mechanized habits; but it will be more convenient here to confine the use of the term to instincts in the proper sense of the word that is, to innate or inherited tendencies, and to speak of modes of activity established in individual life through repetition as habits. The most striking characteristic of human instincts as contrasted with instincts in the brute is plasticity. It is, in fact, this characteristic of human instinct that renders education both possible and necessary. Among the higher animals many instincts are relatively plastic, that is, they are modified by the individual experience of the animal. This renders it possible to train animals to act in ways that are not provided for by definitely organized tendencies. The plasticity of the human is in some respects very important in the development of the brain and of the power of sense perception and sensory association, but when we turn to man we find that his intelligence, which asserts itself at a very early date in infancy, begins to modify all instinctive activities as soon as they appear, a fact which renders it difficult to observe unmodified instincts in adult life. There are, therefore, two things to be taken into account: the plasticity of the instinct and the power of intellect and free will that is brought to bear in modifying it. In both of these respects there is a striking contrast observable between man and the animal.

It should be noted here as of special importance to the discussion that human instincts do not all make their appearance at birth. It is true that instinct causes the newly born babe to seek its mother's breast and to perform sundry other necessary functions, but many of the instincts make their appearance for the first time in the appropriate phase of neural and mental development. Again, while the appearance of the instinct is relatively late in the developmental series, it frequently, as in the case of coquetry and maternity, antedates by some years the adult function to which it refers. This renders the instinct much more plastic, or, in other words, much more amenable to the control of educative agencies than they would be if they appeared for the first time amid the stress of the fully developed emotions and passions to which they refer. This antedating of the function may be regarded as an indication of the vestigial character of the instincts in question. The work in the field of genetic psychology and of child study during the past few decades has revealed the presence and the important functions of many hitherto neglected instincts in the life of the child.

These instincts cannot be neglected or they will run wild. It has been observed that this is the case when they cannot be suppressed indiscriminately, because they are the native roots on which all habits that are of enduring strength in human life are grafted. On the other hand, many instincts are highly undesirable; their full development would, in fact, mean the production of criminals. For explanation of these instincts we are referred by many to the struggle and the struggle from which civilized man has gradually emerged. “In the case of mankind, the self-assertion, the unscrupulous seizing upon all that can be grasped, the tenacious holding of all that can be kept, which constitutes the essence of the struggle for existence, have already answered for his success through its educative agencies, until he reaches adult stature. The culture epoch theory, which leads the child to function in each successive “culture epoch,” would, therefore, not only retard his proper develop-
ment, but it would inevitably initiate a violent retrogression.

General works on evolution, psychology, and comparative psychology: cf. in particular Morgan, Some Definitions of Science (London, 1895); IdaM, Human and Animal Instinct (London, 1890); IdaM, Animal Behavior (London, 1900); IdaM, Introduction to Comparative Psychology (New York, 1889); IdaM, Mental Evolution in Animals (New York, 1901); IdaM, Darwin and His Work (London, 1896); IdaM, Learning and Nature (London, 1879); IdaM, Origin of Human Reason (London, 1899); Wasmann, Instinct and Intelligence in the Animal Kingdom (London, 1903); Semon, Ants, Bees and Wasps (New York, 1893); Gooch, Play of Animals (New York, 1898); IdaM, Play of Man (New York, 1901); Balée, Social Organization in the Case of the Bald-faced Hornet, April (1896); IdaM, Story of the Mind (New York, 1898); IdaM in Dict. Philos. and Psychol. (1899); IdaM, Instinct and Organic Selection; Fisiologia delle anime (Naples, 1879); Marc, La fesse nella formazione naturale delle anime (Naples, 1893).

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

Institute of Charity. See Rosminians.

Institute of Mary, the official title of the second congregation founded by Mary Ward (q.v.). Under this title Barbara Babthorpe, the fourth successor of Mary Ward as "chief superior", petitioned for and obtained the approval of its rule in 1703. It is the successor to the congregation of the first chief superiors, and mentioned in the "formula of vows" of the first members. "Englische Fräulein", "Dame Inglese", "Loretto Nuns", are popular names for the members of the institute in the various countries where they have established themselves. On the suppression of Mary Ward's first congregation, styled by its opponents the "Jesuites", the greater number of the members returned to the world or entered other religious orders. A certain number, however, who desired still to live in religion under the guidance of Mary Ward, were sheltered with the permission of Pope Urban VIII in the Paradisia Church, by the Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian I. Thence some of the younger members were transferred at the pope's desire to Rome, there to live with Mary Ward and be trained by her in the religious life. Her work, therefore, was not destroyed, but reconstituted with certain modifications of detail, such as the temporal jurisdiction of the ordinary instead of of the Holy See immediately, as in the original scheme. It was fostered by Urban and his successors, who as late as the end of the seventeenth century granted a monthly subsidy to the Roman house. Mary Ward died in England at Heworth near York in 1610, and was succeeded by Barbara Babthorpe, who resided at Rome as head of the "English Ladies", and on her death was buried there in church of the English College. She was succeeded as head of the institute by Mary Points, the first companion of Mary Ward. The community at Heworth removed to Paris in 1657. In 1699 Frances Bedingfield, one of the constant companions of Mary Ward, was sent by Mary Points to found a house in England. Favoured by Catherine of Braganza, she established her community first in St. Martin's Lane, London, and afterwards at Hammer smith. Thence a colony was moved to Heworth, and finally in 1692 to the site of the present convent, Micklegate Bar, York. In addition to that at Munich, two foundations had meantime been made in Bavaria—at Augsburg in 1662, at Burghausen in 1683.

At the opening of the eighteenth century the six houses of Munich, Augsburg, Rome, Burghausen, Hammersmith, and York were governed by local superiors appointed by the chief superior, who resided for the most part at Rome, and had a vicar general in Munich. Thus, for seventy years the institute carried on its work, not tolerated only, but protected by the canonical authority, yet without official recognition till the year 1703, when at the petition of the Elector Maximilian Emanuel of Bavaria, Mary of Modena, the exiled Queen of England, and others, its rule was approved by Pope Clement XI. It was not in accordance with the discipline of the Church at that time to approve any institute of simple vows. The pope was willing, however, to approve the institute as such, if the members would accept enclosure. Fidelity to their traditions and experience of the benefit arising from non-enclosure in their special vocation, induced them to forego this further confirmation. The houses in Paris and in Rome were given up about the date of the confirmation of the rule in 1703. St. Fullen (1706) was the first foundation from Munich and was the Bull of Clement XI. In 1742 the houses in Austria and its dependencies were by a Bull of Benedict XIV made a separate province of the institute, and placed under a separate superior-general. The Austrian branch at present (1909) consists of fourteen houses. In Italy, Lodi and Vicenza have each two dependent filials. When the armies of the first Napoleon overran Bavaria in 1809, the mother-house in Munich and the other houses of the institute in Germany—Augsburg, Burg Hausen, and Altötting excepted—were broken up and the communities scattered. On the restoration of peace to Europe, King Louis I of Bavaria obtained the returns of Augsburg, and when Munich was restored, where a portion of the royal palace was made over to them. In 1840 Madame Catherine de Gra cho, the superior of this house, was appointed by Gregory XVI general superior of the whole Bavarian institute. At the present day there are 85 houses under Bavaria, with 1153 members, 90 postulants, 1225 boarders, 11,447 day pupils, and 1472 orphans. Four houses in India, one at Rome, and two in England are subject to Nymphenburg. The house in Mainz escaped secularization, being spared by Napole on on the condition that all connexion with Bavaria should cease. It is the mother-house of a branch which has eight filial houses.

When vigour was reviving in the institute abroad, the Irish branch was founded (1821) at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, by Frances Ball, an Irish lady, who had made her novitiate at York. There are now 19 houses of the institute in Ireland, 13 subject to Rathfarnham and 6 under their respective bishops. The dependencies of Rathfarnham are in all parts of the world—3 houses in Spain, 2 in Mauritius, 2 at Gibraltar, 10 in India, 2 in Africa, 10 in Australia, with a Central Training College for teachers at Melbourne (1906). In 1900 there are 8 houses in the United States, 7 in England, about 180 houses in all. Owing to the variety of names and the independence of branches and houses, the essential unity of the institute is not readily recognized. The "English Virgins", or "English Ladies", is the title under which the members are known in Germany and Italy, whilst in Ireland, and where foundations from Ireland have been made, the name best known is "Loretto Nuns", from the name of the famous Italian shrine given to the mother-house at Rathfarnham. Each branch has its own novitiate, and several have their special constitutions approved by the Holy See. The "Institute of Mary" is the official title of all; all follow the rule approved for them by Clement XI, and share in the approbation of their institute given by Pius IX, in 1877.

The sisters devote themselves principally to the education of girls in boarding-schools and academies, in which they are also active in primary schools, in the training of teachers, instruction in the trades and domestic economy, and the care of orphans. Several members of the institute have also become known as writers.

CHAMBER. Life of Mary Ward (London, 1885); MORRIS, The Life of Mary Ward in The Month (Nov., 1888); Archives of the archbishops of Munich.

M. LOTOLA.
Institute of Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart.—In the autumn of 1888, there came to Baltimore, Maryland, a convert, Mrs. Hartwell, who previous to her reception into the Church had been interested in works of charity. Under the spiritual direction of Father Slattery, provincial of St. Joseph Province, the coloured children were catechized, and the negro children, and was soon joined by some companions. In the autumn of 1890, these ladies wishing to become religious laid the foundations of a community under the name of “Mission Helpers, Daughters of the Holy Ghost”. The work was among the coloured, and was the sister for the coloured race, the sisters binding themselves thereto by a special vow. Very soon an industrial school for girls was opened. In 1895, the name of the institute was changed to “Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart” and the members were dispensed from the “nuns” vest. Thus there was no longer any distinction made as to race in the work of the sisters, which from that time was to embrace all the neglected poor. Hence, the field of missionary and catechetical labour was greatly broadened. A direct result of this change was the opening in 1897 of a school for deaf-mutes in the rectory of Cardinal Gibbons’ school, St. Francis Xavier’s, was the first Catholic institution for deaf-mutes in the ecclesiastical province of Baltimore. In Porto Rico, also, there was no provision whatsoever for deaf-mutes who were poor, until the Mission Helpers opened a school there, shortly after making their foundation in San Juan in 1902. This was a heavy undertaking, as the demands on the sisters for missionary and catechetical work in Porto Rico were very great, and the need urgent.

At the first general chapter of the institute, which was held 25 November, 1896, by command of Cardinal Gibbons, a convent was established, and the superior general and her assistants elected according to its prescriptions. At this first election Mother M. Demetrias was chosen as mother general. The community was then officially declared canonically organized. Two important matters were settled about that time by ecclesiastical authority. The sisters were released from the observance of the vow which they had made to offer their prayers and good works for the welfare of the clergy, it having been declared canonical. Perpetual adoration was also discontinued because of the bodily hardship it entailed. On account of these decisions, County Dublin, they were unable to keep up the work of adoration, without grave detriment to their health, consequently it was decided to restrict it to the First Fridays. The active work of the institute as outlined by the constitution embraces the keeping of industrial schools for coloured girls; schools for deaf-mutes; day-nurseries; teaching catechism and giving instruction wherever needed; visiting the poor in their own homes, and in institutions, such as hospitals and almshouses, and preparing the dying for the last sacraments. There are houses of the institute in New York, Trenton, Porto Rico, and Baltimore.

Sister M. de Sales.

Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Irish, founded by Frances Mary Teresa Ball (q.v.), under the direction and episcopal jurisdiction of the Most Rev. D. Mullins of Dublin, a convert. By the desire, Frances Ball had prepared herself for this undertaking by a two years' novitiate in St. Mary's Convent, Micklegate Bar, York. Two other Irish ladies, Miss Ellen Arthur and Miss Anne Therry, offered to join the new foundation and were accepted. On 4 November, 1822, a foundation was made in the possession of Rathcoole Priory Dublin, which had been purchased by the Archbishop of Dublin to serve as a mother-house and novitiate. The wide-spread fame of the superior education afforded in the Dublin Archdiocese by the Loretto nuns—as they are commonly called—brought demands for their services throughout Ireland. The first offshoot was planted in Navan, County Meath, in the year 1833. This convent has now a filiation in Mullingar. The convents in North Great George's Street, Dublin, and Stephen's Green, Dublin, bear the name of Loretto, having received the same general direction of foundations. The year 1836 was signalized by the rescript of Pope Gregory XVI addressed to the Most Rev. D. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, which ordained that: “Those who have associated themselves and shall hereafter associate themselves to this institute, and who come from foreign countries, yes, even from the most remote parts, the Rules and Statutes of this institute, shall not be subject to the local jurisdiction of their own bishops, unless the said bishops shall have first communicated to the Holy See the said general rescript.” The year 1840 was marked by the erection of the first church in Ireland dedicated to the Sacred Heart, in Loretto Abbey, Rathfarnham. The same year saw the building of a smaller, but very beautiful, abbey in Dalkey, and also the opening of negotiations for another abbey in Gorey, which prepared the way for a future Loretto in the town of Wexford.

In spite of her prudent reluctance to favour the repeated applications for an extension of the Irish example in foreign countries, Reverend Mother Ball at last yielded to the solicitations of Dr. Cavanagh, Archbishop of Calcutta, and Sanctified the departure of volunteers for the Indian mission on 23 August, 1841. To Loretto House, Calcutta, have been added convents in Darjeeling, Lucknow, Assanbal, Intally, Simla, etc. In addition to the boarding and day schools the sisters conduct orphanages and attend diligently to the religious instruction of adults. The success in India led to an appeal for nuns from Dr. Collier, Vicar Apostolic of Madras, which appeal was granted in 1846. Immediately afterwards the Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar urged a like petition. Two convents since founded are under the superintendence of the Most Rev. Dr. Power, Archbishop of Toronto, begging for a Loretto community in 1847. The under-named filiations own Loretto Abbey, Toronto, as their head-house: the convents in the city and suburbs, likewise in Bellville, Lyndsay, Hamilton, Niagara Falls, Guelph, Stratford, Chicago, Joliet, and Sainte Marie. The foundations in Fermoy and Omagh (Ireland) were supplied with members from Rathfarnham in the years 1853—5. The former has two filiations—at Youghal and Clonmel. The Lettermenny Loretto was the first convent founded in the Diocese of Clogher in 1845, and in County Down the convents at Bray, Ballymote, Kilkenny, and Killarney were also founded by Reverend Mother Ball. After a lingering illness, borne with saintly fortitude, the foundress died on Whit—Sunday, 19 May, 1861.

The most noteworthy events in the institute since her death have been: First, the approval and confirmation of the constitutions peculiar to Loretto Abbey, Rathfarnham, and its filiations by Pope Pius IX, the said constitutions having been sanctioned and transmitted to Rome by Cardinal Cullen in 1861, for the usual examination by the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. Second, the transfer of the community at Baymount to Balbriggan. The foundation of a convent in Ballarat, Australia, from which proceeded the convents at Sydney, Portland, Perne, Adelaide, and Melbourne. To the latter is attached the Central Training College for Australian religious and the Australian bishops and intrusted by their lordships to the management of the Loretto nuns. Third: large day schools are established in Enniskeer, County Wexford, and in Rathinese, County Dublin. Fourths: foundations have been made in Seville, Madrid, and Yalls, in Spain. In Ireland the educational work of the Loretto nuns ranges through the three systems of primary, secondary, and university education—the girls' various successces culminating...
In the winning of scholarships and examinerships in the gift of the Royal University of Ireland. In other countries the Loretto nuns invariably work up to the requisite standard fixed by the extern educational authorities. (See Institute of Mary.)

SISTER MARY GERTRUDE.

Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.—NATURE AND OBJECT.—The Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools is a society of male religious approved by the Church, but not taking Holy orders, and having for its object the personal sanctification of its members and the Christian education of youth, especially of the children of artisans and the poor. It accepts the direction of any kind of male educational institution, provided the teaching of Latin be excluded; but its principal object is the direction of elementary gratuitous schools. This congregation was founded in 1850, at Reims, France, by St. John Baptist de La Salle, then a canon of the metropolitan church of that city. Being struck by the lamentable disorders produced among the multitude by their ignorance of the elements of knowledge, and, what was still worse, of the principles of religion, the saint, moved with great pity for the ignorant, was led to create a preventive college and to demand the work of charitable schools. In order to carry out the last will of his spiritual director, Canon Roland, he first busied himself with consolidating a religious congregation devoted to the education of poor girls. He then seconded the efforts of a zealous layman, M. Nyel, to multiply schools for poor children. Thus guided by Providence, he was led to create an institute that would have no other mission than that of Christian education.

However, it would be a serious error to insinuate that until the end of the seventeenth century the Catholic Church had not displayed proofs of the solicitude of her pastors for the education of the children of the people. From the fifth to the sixteenth century, many councils which were held, especially those of Vaison in 529 and Aachen in 817, recommended the secular clergy and monks to instruct children. In 1179 the Third Council of Lateran ordained that the poor be taught gratuitously, and in 1547 the Council of Trent decreed that in connexion with every church, there should be a master to teach the elements of human knowledge to poor children and young students preparing for orders.

There were, therefore, numerous schools—petites écoles—on which it is not possible to make here a detailed account. In the sixteenth century, but teachers were few, because the more clever among them abandoned the children of the poor to teach those of the wealthier class and receive compensation for their work. It was evident that only a religious congregation would be able to furnish a permanent supply of educators for those who are destitute of the goods of this world. The institutes of the Venerable César de Bus in 1592 and of St. Joseph Calasanzius (1556–1648) had added Latin to the course of studies for the poor. The tentative made in favour of boys by St. Peter Fourier (1665–1718) in 1665 and M. Demais at Lyons in 1672 was not to spread. Then God raised up St. John Baptist de La Salle, not to create gratuitous schools, but to furnish them with teachers and give them fixed methods. The undertaking was much more difficult than the founder himself imagined. At the beginning he was encouraged by Père Bénard, and his zeal was seconded by a society of teaching nuns, Les Dames de Saint-Maur. The clergy and faithful applauded the scheme, but it had many bitter adversaries. During forty years, from 1680 to 1719, obstacles and difficulties constantly checked the progress of the new institute, but by the prudence, perseverance, care of its superior council, it was consolidated and developed to unexpected proportions.

DEVELOPMENT.—In 1860 the new teachers began their apostolate at Reims; in 1862 they took the name of "Brothers of the Christian Schools"; in 1864 they opened their first regular novitiate. In 1868 Providence transplanted the young tree to the parish of St-Sulpice, Paris, in charge of the spiritual sons of M. Olier. The mother-house remained in the capital until 1706. During this period the foundation of the first schools was a constant effort, passing through trials of every kind. The most painful came from holy priests whom he esteemed, but who entertained views of his work different from his own. Without being in any way discouragement, and in the midst of the storms, the saint kept nearly all of his first schools, and even opened a few of his own. In 1746 he made his first attempt and created the first normal schools under the name of "seminaries for country teachers". His zeal was as broad and ardent as his love of souls. The course of events caused the founder to transfer his novitiate to Rouen in 1703, to the house of Saint-Yon, in the suburb of Saint-Sever, which became the centre whence the institute sent its religious into the South of France, in 1707. It was at Rouen that St. John Baptist de La Salle composed his rules, convoked two general chapters, resigned his office of superior, and ended his earthly existence by a holy death, in 1719. Declared venerable in 1894, he was beatified in 1858, to be canonized in 1900.

SPIRIT OF THE INSTITUTE.—The spirit of the institute, infused by the example and teachings of its founder and fostered by the exercises of the religious life, is a spirit of faith and of zeal. The spirit of faith induces a Brother to see God in all things, to suffer everything for God, and above all to sanctify himself. The spirit of zeal attracts him towards children to instruct them in the truths of religion and penetrate their hearts with the maxims of the Gospel, so that they may make it the rule of their conduct. St. John Baptist de La Salle had himself given his Brothers advice on the formation of the character of his pupils. His spirit of zeal and of the love of God were to be the principal at the base of his institute. His spirit of zeal was his spirit of piety. It was his faith that made him adore the will of God in all the adversities he met with; that prompted him to send two Brothers to Rome in 1700 in testimony of his attachment to the Holy See, and that led him to condemn openly the errors of the Jansenists, who tried in vain at Marseilles and Calais to draw him over to their party. His whole life was a prolonged act of zeal: he taught school at Reims, Paris, and Grenoble, and showed how to do it well. He composed works for teachers and pupils, and especially the "Conduite des écoles", the "Devoirs du professeur" and "Règles de la bonté et de la civilité chrétienne".

The saint pointed out that the zeal of a religious teacher should be exercised by three principal means: vigilance, good example, and instruction. Vigilance removes from children a great many occasions of offending God; good example places before them models of imitation; instruction makes them familiar with what they should know, especially with the truths of religion. Hence, the Brothers have always considered catechism as the most important subject taught in their schools. They are catechists by vocation and the whole of their well-organized order, therefore, in accordance with the spirit of their institute, religious educators: as religious, they take the three usual vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience; as educators, they add the vow of teaching the poor gratuitously according to the prescriptions of their rule, and the vow of remaining with the poor in such a manner that they may not leave of themselves for the purpose of joining a more perfect order. Besides, the work appeared so very important to St. John Baptist de La Salle that, in order to attach the Brothers permanently to the education of the poor, he forbade them to teach Latin.

GOVERNMENT.—The institute is governed by a superior general elected for life by the general chapter. The superior general is aided by assistants, who at the
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(1) By the use of the simultaneous method a large number of children of the same intellectual development could henceforward be taught together. It is true that for ages this method had been employed in the universities, but in the common schools the individual method was adhered to. Practicable enough when the number of pupils was very limited, the individual method gave rise, in classes that were numerous, to loss of time and disorder. Monitors became necessary, and these had often neither learning nor authority. With limitations that restricted its efficacy, St. Peter Fourier had indeed recommended the simultaneous method in the schools of the Congrégation de Notre-Dame, but it never extended further. To St. John Baptist de La Salle belongs the honour of having transformed the pedagogy of the elementary school. He required all his teachers to give the same lesson to all the pupils of a class, to question them constantly, to maintain discipline, and to listen to their answers. A consequence of this new method of teaching was the dividing up of the children into distinct classes according to their attainments, and later on, the formation of sections in classes in which the children were too numerous or too unequal in mental development. Thanks to these means, the progress of the children and their moral transformation commanded the admiration even of his most prejudiced adversaries.

(2) A second innovation of the holy founder was to teach the pupils to read the vernacular language, which they understood, before putting into their hands a Latin book, which they did not understand. It may be observed that this was a very simple matter, but simple as it was, it was hardly any educator, except the masters of the schools of Port-Royal in 1643, had been thought of it; besides, the experiments of the Port-Royal masters, like their schools, were short-lived, and exercised no influence on general pedagogy. In addition to these two great principles, the Brothers of the Christian Schools have introduced other improvements in teaching. They likewise availed themselves of what is rational in the progress of modern methods of teaching, which their courses of pedagogy, published in France, Belgium, and Austria, abundantly prove.

The Eighteenth Century.—At the death of its founder, the Brothers of the Christian Schools numbered 27 houses and 274 Brothers, educating 9000 pupils. Seventy-three years later, at the time of the French Revolution, the statistics showed 123 houses, 920 Brothers, and 36,000 pupils (statistics of 1790). During this period, it had been governed by five superiors general: Brother Barthélemy (1717–20); Brother Timothée (1730–51); Brother Claude (1751–57); Brother Florence (1767–77); and Brother Agathon (1777–98, when he died). Under the administration of Brother Timothée successful negotiations resulted in the legal recognition of the institute by Louis XIV. He granted it letters patent, 24 September, 1724; and in virtue of the Bull of approbation of Benedict XIII, 26 January, 1725, it was admitted among the congrega-

present time number twelve. He delegates authority to the visitors, to whom he confides the government of the districts, and to directors, whom he places in charge of individual houses. With the exception of that of superior general, all the offices are temporary and renewable. The general chapters are convoked at least every ten years. Thirty-two have been held since the foundation of the congregation. The vitality of an institute depends on the training of its members. God alone is the author of vocations. He alone can attract a soul to a life of self-denial such as that of the Brothers. The mortification this life enjoins is not rigorous, but renunciation of self-will and of the frivolities of the world should gradually become complete. The usual age for admission to the novitiate of the society is from sixteen to eighteen years. Doubtless there are later vocations that are excellent, and there are earlier ones that develop the most beautiful virtues. If the aspirant presents himself at the age of thirteen or fourteen, he is placed in the preparatory or junior novitiate. During two or three years he devotes himself to study, is carefully trained to the habits of piety, and instructed how to overcome himself, so as one day to become a fervent religious.

The novitiate proper is for young men who have passed through the junior novitiate, and for postulants who have come directly from the world. During a whole year they have no other occupation than that of studying the rules of the institute and applying themselves to observe them faithfully. At the end of their first year, or probation, the young Brothers enter the scholasticate, where they spend more or less time according to the nature of the duties to be assigned to them. As a rule, each of the districts of the institute has its three departments of training: the junior novitiate, the senior novitiate, and the scholasticate. In community, subjects complete their professional training and apply themselves to acquire the virtues of their state. At eighteen years of age, they take annual vows; at twenty-three, triennial vows; and when fully twenty-eight years of age, they may be admitted to perpetual profession. Finally, some years later, they may be called for some months to the exercises of a second novitiate.

METHODS OF TEACHING.—In enjoining on his disciples to endeavour above all to develop the spirit of religion in the souls of their pupils, the founder only followed the traditions of other teaching bodies—the Jesuits, Dominicans, and other religious orders. But the Brethren, particularly in the "petites écoles," took a prominent part in the development of the Institute in the United States. His originality lay elsewhere. Two pedagogic innovations of St. John Baptist de La Salle were approved from the beginning: (1) the employment of the "simultaneous method"; (2) the employment of the vernacular language in teaching reading. They are set forth in the "Connus des écoles," in which the founder condensed the experience he had acquired during an apostolate of forty years, which was later written down in manuscript during the lifetime of his author, and was printed for the first time at Avignon in 1790.

BROTHER PATRICK

Who took a prominent part in the development of the Institute in the United States

His originality lay elsewhere. Two pedagogic innovations of St. John Baptist de La Salle were approved from the beginning: (1) the employment of the "simultaneous method"; (2) the employment of the vernacular language in teaching reading. They are set forth in the "Connus des écoles," in which the founder condensed the experience he had acquired during an apostolate of forty years, which was later written down in manuscript during the lifetime of his author, and was printed for the first time at Avignon in 1790.

BROTHER PHILIPPE

Superior General of the Brothers of the Christian Schools—1858–74

The Eighteenth Century.—At the death of its founder, the Brothers of the Christian Schools numbered 27 houses and 274 Brothers, educating 9000 pupils. Seventy-three years later, at the time of the French Revolution, the statistics showed 123 houses, 920 Brothers, and 36,000 pupils (statistics of 1790). During this period, it had been governed by five superiors general: Brother Barthélemy (1717–20); Brother Timothée (1730–51); Brother Claude (1751–57); Brother Florence (1767–77); and Brother Agathon (1777–98, when he died). Under the administration of Brother Timothée successful negotiations resulted in the legal recognition of the institute by Louis XIV. He granted it letters patent, 24 September, 1724; and in virtue of the Bull of approbation of Benedict XIII, 26 January, 1725, it was admitted among the congrega-
tions canonically recognised by the Church. The most prominent of its superiors general in the eighteenth century was Brother Agathon. A religious of strong character, he maintained the faithful observance of the rules by the Brothers; a distinguished educator, he published the "Douce vertus d’un bon Maitre", in 1785; an eminent administrator, he created the first scholastics, in 1781, and limited new foundations to what was indispensable, aiming rather, when the storm was gathering on the horizon, to fortify an institute that had already become relatively widespread. The congregation, however, was hardly known outside of Rome, Ferrara, 1741; Maréville, 1743; Lunéville, 1749; and Morhange in Lorraine, 1761; Estavayer in Switzerland, 1750; Fort Royal, Martinique, 1777.

Whilst adhering to their methods of teaching during the eighteenth century, the Brothers knew how to vary their application. The superiors general insisted on having the elementary schools gratuitous and by far the more numerous. In accordance with the course of studies set down in the "Conduite des écoles", the Brothers applied themselves to teaching, thoroughly reading, writing, the vernacular, and especially the catechism. The boarding school of St-Yon at Rouen, established in 1705 by St. John Baptist de La Salle himself, served as a model for like institutions: Marseilles in 1730, Angers in 1741, Reims in 1765, etc. It was proper that in these houses the course of studies should differ in some respects from that in the free schools. With the exception of Latin, which remained excluded, everything in the course of studies of the best schools of the time was taught: mathematics, history, geography, drawing, architecture, etc. In the maritime cities, such as Brest, Vannes, and Marseilles, the Brothers taught more advanced courses in mathematics and hydrography. Finally, the institute accepted the direction of reformatory institutions at Rouen, Angers, and Maréville. It was this efflorescence of magnificent works that the French Revolution all but destroyed forever.

The Brothers during the Revolution.—The revolutionary laws that doomed the monastic orders on 13 February, 1790, threatened the institute from 27 December, in the same year, by imposing on all teachers the civic oath voted on 27 November. The storm was imminent. Brother Agathon, the superior general endeavoured to establish communities in Belgium, but could organize only one, at St-Hubert in 1791, only to be destroyed in 1792. The Brothers refused to take the oath, and were everywhere expelled. The institute was suppressed in 1792, after it had been decreed that it "had deserved well of the country". The storm had broken upon the Brothers. They were arrested, and more than twenty were cast into prison. Brother Salomes, secretary general, was massacred in the Carmes (the Carmelite monastery of Paris); Brother Agathon spent eighteen months in prison; Brother Monet was guillotined at Rennes in 1794; Brother Raphael was put to death at Utèse; Brother Florence, formerly superior general, was imprisoned at Avignon; eight Brothers were transported to the hulks of Rochefort, where four died of neglect and starvation in 1794 and 1795.

Brother Joseph Superior General of the Brothers of the Christian Schools—1884-97

All the schools were closed and the young Brothers enrolled in the army of the Convention. At the peril of their lives some of the older Brothers continued to teach at Elbeuf, Condrieux, Castres, Laon, Valence, and elsewhere, to save the faith of the children. The Brothers of Italy had received some of their French confressees at Rome. Persecuted during this time, Brother Agathon, having left his prison, remained hidden at Tours, whence he strove to keep up the courage, confidence in God, and zeal of his dispersed religious. On 7 August, 1797, Pope Pius VI appointed Brother Frumence vicar-general of the congregation. In 1798 the Italian Brothers were in their turn driven from their houses by the armed forces of the Directory. The institute seemed ruined; it reckoned only twenty members wearing the religious habit and exercising the functions of educators.

Restoration of the Institute. 1802-1810.—In July, 1801, the First Consul signed the concordat with Pius VII. For the Church of France this was the spring of a new era; for the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools it was a resurrection. If at the height of the storm some Brothers continued to exercise their holy functions, they were only exceptional cases. The first regular community reorganised at Lyons in 1802; others in 1803, at Paris, Valence, Reims, and Soissons. Everywhere the municipalities recalled the Brothers and besought the survivors of the woeful period to take up the schools again as soon as possible. The Brothers addressed themselves to Rome and petitioned the Brother Vicar to establish his abode in France. Negotiations were begun, and thanks to the intervention of his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, Bonaparte authorized the re-establishment of the institute, on 3 December, 1803, provided their superior general would reside in France. In November, 1804, the Brother Vicar arrived at Lyons, and took up his residence in former college of the Jesuits. The institute began to live again.

Nothing was more urgent than to reunite the former members of the congregation. An appeal was made to their faith and good will, and they responded. Shortly after the arrival of Brother Frumence at Lyons, the foundation of communities began. There were eight new ones in 1805, and as many in 1806, four in 1807, and five in 1808. Brother Frumence dying in January, 1810, a general chapter, the tenth since the foundation, was assembled at Lyons on 8 September following, and elected Brother Gerbaut to the highest office in the institute. Brother Gerbaut governed until 1822. His successors were Brother Guillaume de Jesús (1822-30); Brother Afflelet (1830-38); Brother Philippe (1838-74); Brother Jean-Olympe (1874-75); Brother Irilde (1875-84); Brother Joseph (1884-97); and Brother Gabriel-Marie elected in March, 1897. He is the thirteenth successor of St. John Baptist de La Salle.

The Institute from 1810 to 1874.—After 1810 communities, of the Brothers multiplied like the flowers of the fields in spring-time after the frosts have disappeared. Fifteen new schools were opened in 1817, twenty-one in 1818, twenty-six in 1819, and twenty-seven in 1821. It was in this year that the
Brother Superior General, at the request of the municipality, took up his residence in Paris, with his assistants. The institute then numbered 950 Brothers and novices, 310 schools, 664 classes, and 50,000 pupils. Fifteen years had sufficed to reach the same prosperous condition in which the Revolution found it in 1790. If, however, be admitted that, in consequence of the services rendered by the Brothers to popular education, they always enjoyed the favour of the Government. From 1816 to 1819, Brother Gerbaut, the superior general, had to struggle vigorously for the preservation of the traditional methods of the congregation. The most active and Lancastrian method had just been introduced into France, and immediately the powerful Société pour l'Instruction Élémentaire assumed the mission of propagating it. At a time when teachers and funds were scarce, the Government deemed it wise to pronounce in favour of the mutual school, and recommended it by an ordinance in 1818. The Brothers would not consent to abandon the "simultaneous method" which they had received from their founder, and on this account they were subjected to many vexations. During forty years the supporters of the two methods were to contend, but finally the "simultaneous" teachers achieved the victory. By holding fast to their traditions and rules, the Brothers had saved elementary teaching in France. The period 1816-1850 was marked by the activity of Louis-Philippe. He prospered the institute by suppressing the grants made to certain schools. In 1821 eleven were permanently closed, and twenty-nine were kept up as free schools by the charity of Catholics. The hour had now come for a greater expansion. Fortified and rejuvenated by trial, fixed for a long time on the soil of France, augmented by yearly increasing numbers, the institute could, without weakening itself, send educational colonies abroad. Belgium received Brothers at Dinant in 1816; the Island of Bourbon, in 1817; Montreal, 1837; Smyrna, 1841; Baltimore, 1846; Alexandria, 1847; New York, 1848; St. Louis, 1849; Kem- phof, near Coblenz, 1851; Singapore, 1852; Algiers, 1854; London, 1855; Vienna, 1856; the Island of Mauritius, 1859; Bucharest, 1861; Karikal, India, 1862; Quito, 1863. In all of these places, the number of houses soon increased, and everywhere the same intellectual and religious results proved a recommendation of the institute throughout America, the Far East, and even in friendly but rare reunions. The legal efforts against the liberty of conscience forced the members into the Catholic and social struggle. They have formed themselves into sectional unions; they have an annual meeting, and have created a national movement in favour of the Congregation. In 1883, when Brother Philippe was elected superior general, in 1883, the number of schools and of Brothers was already double what it was in 1789; when he died, in 1874, it had increased in entirely unexpected proportions. The venerable superior saw the number of houses rise from 313 to 1149; that of the Brothers from 2317 to 10,235; that of their pupils from 144,000 to 350,000. And as in France, and through the benevolence of the hierarchy, Belgium, North America, the Levant multiplied Christian schools. Assuredly, Brother Philippe was aware that, for a religious institute, the blessing of numbers is less desirable than the progress of the religious in the spirit of their vocation. In order to strengthen them therein, the superior general composed a new volume of "Meditations," and a large number of instructive "Circular Letters," in which are explained the duties of the Brothers as religious and as educators. Every year at the time of the retreats, until he was eighty years of age, he travelled all over France, and spoke to his Brothers in most ardent language, made still more impressive by the saintly example of this venerable old man. The Institute from 1874 to 1908.—The generalship of Brother Iride was marked by two principal orders of facts: a powerful effort to increase the spiritual vigour of the institute by introducing the Great Exercises or retreats of thirty days; and the reorganization as free schools of the French schools which the laicization laws in 1878 to 1886 deprived of the character of private schools. This period witnessed, especially in two regions, the establishment and multiplication of Brothers’ schools. The districts of Ireland and Spain, where such fine work is going on, were organized under the administration of Brother Iride. Indefatigable in the fight, he asserted the rights of his institute against the powerful volumes which sought to set them aside. He had broad and original views which he carried out with a strong, tenacious will. What his predecessor had accomplished by indomitable energy, Brother Joseph, superior general from 1894 to 1897, maintained by the ascendency of his captivating goodness. He was an educator of rare distinction and exquisite charm. He had received from Pope Leo XIII the important mission of developing in the institute the works of Christian perseverance, so that the faith and morals of young men might be safeguarded after leaving school. One of his great delights was to transmit this direction to his Brothers and to see them work zealously for its attainment. Patronages, clubs, alumni associations, boarding-houses, spiritual retreats, etc., were doubtless already in existence; now they became more prosperous. For many years the alumni associations of France had made their appearance in friendly but rare reunions. The legal attempts against the liberty of conscience forced the members into the Catholic and social struggle. They have formed themselves into sectional unions; they have an annual meeting, and have created a national movement in favour of the Congregation. The alumni associations of the Brothers in the United States and Belgium have their national federation and annual meeting.
It is especially in France that the work of the spiritual retreats, of which the chief centre has been the Association of St. Benoît-Joseph Labre, has been developed. Founded in Paris in 1883, it had, twenty-five years later, brought together 41,600 young Parisians at the house of retreat, at Athies-Mons. About the same time, "retreats preparatory to graduation" were gradually introduced in the schools of all countries with the view of the perseverance in their religious practices of the graduates entering upon active life. During the administration of Brother Gabriel-Marie, and until 1904, the normal progress of the congregation was not obstructed. The expansion of its diverse works attained its maximum. Here are the words of one of the official reports of the Universal Exposition of Paris in 1900: "The establishments of the Institute of Brothers of the Christian Schools, spread all over the world, number 15. They comprise 1,500 elementary or high schools; 47 important boarding schools; 45 normal schools or scholasticates for the training of subjects of the institute, and 6 normal schools for lay teachers; 13 special agricultural schools, and a large number of agricultural classes in elementary schools; 48 technical and trade schools; 82 commercial schools or special commercial courses."

Such was the activity of the Institute of St. John Baptist de La Salle when it was doomed in France by the legislation that abolished teaching by religious. Not the services rendered, nor the striking lustre of its success, nor the greatness of the social work it had accomplished, could save it. Its great fame and its service rendered all its schools Christian, was imputed to it as a crime. In consequence of the application of the law of 7 July, 1904, to legally authorized teaching congregations, 805 establishments of the Brothers were closed in 1904, 196 in 1905, 155 in 1906, 93 in 1907, and 33 in 1908. Nothing was spared. The popular and free schools to the number of more than a thousand; the boarding and half-boarding schools such as Passy in Paris, those at Reims, Lyons, Bordeaux, Marseilles, etc.; the cheap boarding schools for children of the working class, such as the admirable houses of St. Nicholas, the technical and trade schools of Lyons, Saint-Etienne, Saint-Chamond, Commeny, etc.; the agricultural institutions of Beauvais, Limoux, etc.—all were swept away. The blows were severe, but the beautiful tree of the institute had taken root too firmly in the soil of the whole Catholic world to have its vitality endangered by the lopping off of a principal branch. New branches received a new influx of sap, and on its vigorous trunk there soon appeared new branches. From 1904 to 1908, 222 houses have been founded in England, Belgium, the islands of the Mediterranean, the Levant, North and South America, the West Indies, Cape Colony, and Australia.

SCHOOLS OF EUROPE AND THE EAST.—When their schools were suppressed by law in France, the Brothers endeavoured with all their might to assure to at least a portion of the children of the poor the religious education of which they were about to be deprived. At the same time the institute established near the frontiers of Belgium and Holland, of Spain and Italy, boarding-schools for French boys. The undertaking was venereal, but God has blessed it, and these boarding-schools are all flourishing. Belgium has 75 establishments conducted by the Brothers, comprising about 60 popular free schools, boarding-schools, official normal schools, and trade schools known as St. Luke schools. There are 32 houses in Lorraine, Luxembourg, Hungary, Bohemia, Calabria, Armenia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Spain, including the Canaries and the Balearic Isles, has 100 houses of the institute, of which about 80 are popular gratuitous schools. In Italy there are 34 houses, 9 of which are in Rome. The Brothers have been established over fifty years in the Levant, Turkey, Syria, and Egypt. The 50 houses which they conduct are centres of Christian education and influence, and are liberally patronized by the people of these countries. The districts of England and Ireland comprises 25 houses, the Brothers for the most part being engaged in the "National" schools. In direct a college and an academy in Manchester, an industrial school; and in Waterford, a normal school or training college, the 200 students of which are King's scholars, who are paid for by a grant from the British Government. In India, the Brothers have large schools, most of which have upwards of 800 pupils. There are 50 houses in Rangoon, Penang, Moulmein, Mandalay, Singapore, Malacca, and Hong Kong in China, stand high in public estimation. They are all assisted by government grants.

SCHOOLS IN AMERICA.—The institute has already established 72 houses in Mexico, Cuba, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Argentina, and Chili. When Brother Facile was appointed visitor of North America in 1848, he found in Canada 5 houses, 50 Brothers and 3200 pupils in their schools. In 1908, the statistics show 45 houses, and nearly 20,000 pupils. The parochial schools are gratuitous, according to the constant tradition of the institute. The most important boarding-school is Mount St. Louis, Montreal. At the request of the Most Reverend Samuel Eccles, Bishop of Philadelphia, the Brothers were invited to settle there, and in 1846 they established the Catholic Industrial School, at Eddington, Pa.; the Drexmor, a home for working boys at Philadelphia; and the St. Emma Industrial and Agricultural College of Bellemont, Rock Castle, Va., for coloured boys. The district of New York is the most important in America. It comprises 38 houses, most of the Brothers of which are engaged in teaching parochial gratuitous schools. In addition to those they conduct Manhattan College, the De La Salle Institute, La Salle Academy, and Clason Point Military Academy, in New York City, and academies and high schools in other important cities. The New York Catholic Protonary, St. Philip's Home, and four orphan asylums and industrial schools under their care contain a population of 2,500 children.

The district of St. Louis and Memphis contains 19 houses, the majority of the Brothers of which are doing parochial school work. They conduct large colleges at St. Louis and Memphis, and important academies and high schools at Chienee, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Duluth, St. Joseph, and Santa Fé. They also have a large convent of the Sisters of the Ursae in Council Grove, Kansas, and at Grey Horse, Oklahoma. The district of San Francisco comprises 13 houses, and as in the other diocese...
tricts, the Brothers are largely engaged in parochial schools; but they also conduct St. Mary's College at Oakland, the Sacred Heart College at San Francisco, and the Christian Brothers' College at Sacramento, together with academies at Berkeley, Portland, Vancouver, and many of the Dublin and London Asylums, Marin Co., California, which contains 500 boys. The total number of pupils of the Brothers in the United States is thirty thousand. Their 94 houses are spread over 33 archdioceses and dioceses. It would not be possible in such an article as this to receive the memory of all the religious orders during the last six centuries might be immersed and permanently in this development of their institute. Among those who have been called to their reward, we may however mention the revered names of Brothers Faéle and Patrick, assistants to the superior general. 

**Intellectual Activity.** —The Brothers of the Christian Schools are too much absorbed by the work of teaching to devote themselves to the writing of books not of immediate utility in their schools. But, for the use of their pupils, they have written a large number of works on all the specialties in their courses of studies. Such works have been written in French, English, German, Italian, Spanish, Polish, Russian, Arabic, Annamite, etc. The Brothers' schoolbooks treat of the following subjects: Christian doctrine, reading, writing, arithmetic, geometry, algebra, trigonometry, mechanics, history, geography, agriculture, physics, chemistry, physiology, zoology, botany, geology, the moral sciences, music, logic, philosophy, pedagogy, methodology, drawing, shorthand, etc.

**Annales de l’institut des frères des écoles chrétiennes** (Paris, 1883); *Race historique sur la maison mère de l’institut des frères des écoles chrétiennes* (Paris, 1905); *Douze-Baumes* (1885); *Les nouvelles écoles à la Lantercote comparées avec l’enseignement des frères des écoles chrétiennes* (Paris, 1817); *La vérité sur l’enseignement des écoles catholiques* (Paris, 1817); *Lettres de l’institut des frères des écoles chrétiennes de France* (1872), *Lettres de l’institut des frères des écoles chrétiennes de France* (1872); *Rapport de l’académie française sur le prix de Rome* (1872); *American Catholic Quarterly Review* (October, 1875); *Revue des bibliothèques universitaires* (Paris, 1876); *Le livre de guerre à l’enseignement primaire* (Paris, 1883); *Chevalier* (1883) *Les frères des écoles chrétiennes et l’enseignement primaire* (Paris, 1883); *Lettres de l’institut des frères des écoles chrétiennes* (Montreal, 1883); *Chvalier* (1883). The annals of the institute are published annually, and contain a large number of articles on educational and religious subjects. 

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ecclesiastical historians and the writers of the almost countless monographs (some of them very valuable) concerning local churches, monasteries, ecclesiastical institutions, etc., were greatly aided by the officials of the archives, themselves often scholarly investigators. In this respect the papal archives, Augustin Theiner (1804–74) accomplished very far-reaching work, of great service to certain medieval countries and groups of countries, when he published, in many folio volumes, a multitude of documents relative to the ecclesiastical and civil history of Northern, Eastern, and Southern Europe, also a documentary treatise in three folio volumes on the temporal dominion of the pope and its administration. In the same period, i.e., from about 1850 to 1875, several other investigators, chiefly German and Austrian, in one way or another secured admittance to the papal archives. These events and other influences increased the desire of all scholars for the opening of this valuable repository of important historical documents. Although under Pius IX it became somewhat easier to obtain a permit for private research, the turbulent political conditions of his reign forbade anything like a general opening of the Vatican Archives.

**II. Opening of the Vatican Archives.** —"We have nothing to fear from the publication of documents," exclaimed Leo XIII., when on 20 June, 1879, he appointed the ecclesiastical historian, Joseph Herrenröther, "Cardinal Archivist of the Holy Roman Church" (Palemi, *Introtto ed Editi di Papa Niccolò III*, Rome, pp. xiv, xv; Friedensburg, "Das Kirchen-Preussische Historische Institut in Rom", Berlin, 1902, passim). By this act the pope opened the archives of the Vatican, more especially what are known as the secret archives, despite strong opposition from several quarters. It took until the beginning of 1881 to arrange all preliminaries, including the preparation of suitable quarters for the work, after which date the barriers were removed, and then, with a few exceptions, had shut out all investigators. The use of these treasures was at length regularised by a papal decree (regolamento) of 1 May, 1884, whereby this important matter was finally removed from the province of discussion. In the course of the past century, to the publication of Cardinals, Pitra, De Luca, and Herrenröther, his now famous edifice on historical studies (18 Aug., 1883).
CHIEFS.—Hitherto very little was known of the contents of this vast treasury; now its great wealth came to be widely appreciated.—Briefs, Bulls, petitions, department records, reports of nuncios and other reports, diaries, documentary collections, privileges, legal titles, the most miscellaneous kind, etc. Progress was at first not known, and work was undertaken, but for the first time in history, the archives could be planned until the workers had familiarized themselves with the material at hand. The over-hasty treatment that, in the beginning, the thirteenth century material received, revealed quite clearly how much there was to learn before the archives could be understood; and gradually, however, a good order was introduced in all kinds of research work, in which task notable services were rendered by the historical institutes, which from time to time were established in close relation to the Vatican Archives. Research work in these archives may be divided into individual and collective, or general and special. Individual researches are made by individual scholars, while collective work is conducted by several who have either united for that purpose, or belong permanently to some association. General researches and the larger outlines of ecclesiastical history, and the works of the historians and archivists who have special problems, more or less far-reaching in importance. Both methods may be combined, objectively and subjectively: an individual investigator may work at a general theme, while an association may take up the study of a restricted or specific problem. The results of their historical study are to be found in periodicals, essays, and books, also disseminated in large historical collections devoted to other classes of historical material, and containing the results of other investigations, e.g. the "Monumenta Germaniae Historica." A study of the published material exhibits a long series of original documents, narratives based on copious documentary material, and occasionally narratives based on information obtained in the archives, but unaccompanied by the documents or by reference to them.

IV. FIELD OF INVESTIGATION.—While it is but natural that the study of documents should be chiefly done in the Vatican archives, most investigators also carry on work in the important collection of printed books known as the Vatican Library. In October, 1892, there was opened in connexion with the archives and the library a consultation library, the "Biblioteca del Deparimento Historico e Bibliografico," the only library of this kind in the world. At the opening of the consultation library, the Archives and Library of the Vatican were in excellent condition, owing to the care and attention given to them by previous administrators. The result of this careful supervision is evident in every department of the archives, and in the quality of the books and manuscripts. The archives themselves are so organized that nearly every student of history may discover there something of special importance in his own province. The numerous other archives and manuscript-collections of Rome are also open, as a rule, to the student; indeed, few workers limit themselves exclusively to Vatican materials. Moreover, studies begun in the Vatican are often supplemented by scientific excursions, and the students often travel in Italy, on the study trip, or during some vacation period; such excursions have at times resulted in surprising discoveries. An exhaustive examination of Italian archives and libraries leads occasionally to a larger view of the subject than was originally intended by the investigator, for whom in this way new questions of importance arise, and the solution of the problem becomes highly desirable. Experience, therefore, and the detailed study of the numerous repertories, indexes, and inventories of manuscripts, have made it necessary to organize permanently the scientific historical researches carried on in the interest of any given country. This means a saving of money and labour; in this way also more substantial achievements can be hoped for than from purely individual research. Consequently, institutes for historical research were soon founded in Rome, somewhat on the plan of the earlier archaeological societies. While the opening of such institutes is a noble objective of any government, private associations have made many sacrifices in the same direction and attained with success the institutes that best suit the requirements of the times. The state institutes investigate all that pertains to national relations or intercourse (religion, politics, economics, science, or art) with the Curia, with Rome, or, for that matter, with Italy. Many of these institutes do not attempt to go further, and their field is generally and comprehensively. Others devote themselves to similar researches, but do not neglect general questions of interest to universal history, profane and ecclesiastical, or to the history of medieval culture. Of course, only the larger institutes, with many workers at their disposal, can satisfactorily undertake problems of this nature.

V. HISTORICAL INSTITUTES AT THE VATICAN ARCHIVES.—England.—At the end of 1876 the Rev. Joseph Stevenson, who was employed by the English Public Record Office to obtain transcripts of documents of historical importance in the Vatican archives, recommended and was approved by Cardinal Manning's recommendation, appointed the late Mr. W. H. Bliss as his successor. Though for years Stevenson and Bliss conducted their researches alone, in the last decade other English investigators, chiefly younger men, had been detailed to Rome by the home Government to cooperate with Bliss, and hasten the progress of his work. Bliss died very suddenly of pneumonia, at an advanced age, 8 March, 1909, and though his place has not yet been filled by the English Government, English investigators continue the work, under direction of the Record Office; for any searching investigation of the documents, the study of the English archives, they are the records of Englishmen in which the Roman Curia have always been interested, and in which the English Government has a special interest. The archives contain documents of a very early period, many of which date from the time of the first one, covering 1577, 1878, and 1879, is found under the year 1880. In addition to the medieval period, numerous extract and transcripts of political nature were made from sixteenth- and seventeenth- century documents, transmitted to the Record Office and partly used in the "Calendars of State Papers." France.—The Ecole Francaise de Rome, originally one with that of Athens, employs almost constantly historical investigators at the Grande Archivio of Naples; they devote themselves to the documents of the Angevin dynasty. This institute has an organ of its own, "Le Monumente d'archeologie et d'histoire," which in whose pages are found not only historical studies properly so called, but also papers on the history of archaeology and art. The institute has its home in the Palazzo Farnese, where its director lives, and where a rich library is housed. It was founded in 1873, and during the reigns of Pius IX, long before the opening of the archives to the general public, was the result of the solution of the problem of the papal Archives, the editing of the papal "Regesta" of the thirteenth century, a gigantic and yet unfinished task. Scholars of international reputation have figured among its directors; its present head is Monsignor Louis Duchesne, whose monumental work, the "Liber Pontificalis," and numerous other investigations, place him in the forefront of Church historians. The "Bibliotheque des Ecoles Francaises d'Athenes"
et de Rome”, is made up of lengthy monographs by pupils of the Ecole, treating of divers subjects connected with their studies in the Vatican archives and library. The papal "Regesta" of the thirteenth century, the "Liber Pontificalis", and the "Liber Censuum" (Fabre-Duchene) form a second series of historical publications, culminating thereby in the last school. A third series is made up of documents selected from the fourteenth-century papal "Regesta", and is entitled "Lettres de papes d’Avignon se rapportant à la France". The slow progress of so many learned enterprises is a matter of general regret, not least by the "Peppe" employed therein, though no one can deny the very great utility of these scholarly studies and researches for the history of the papacy and its international relations. The chaplains of the French National Institute of St.-Louis des Français have recently undertaken a work closely related to that of the Ecole Française, the publication in concise regesta-like form of all letters of the Avignon popes. Gratifying progress is being made with the "Regesta" of John XXII. The review known as the "Annales de St.-Louis des Français", whose contributions to ecclesiastical history were noteworthy in the first important works. Learned historical nature have been published by the chaplains of this institute, the results of their diligent researches in the Vatican archives.

German Catholic Institutes.—The chaplains of the German national institute of Santa Maria di Campc Santo Teutonico were among the first to profit by the opening of the Vatican archives for the conduct of scientific research in the field of German ecclesiastical history. Monsignor de Waal, director of the institute, founded the "Römische Quartalschrift für Archäologie und Kirchengesichte" as a centre for historical research more modest and limited in scope, and to men of special capabilities in the field. To the students of history at the Campo Santo is owing the founding, at Rome, of the Göres Society Historical Institute. A this institute, established after long hesitation, sufficiently explained by the slender resources of the society, is now a credit to its founders (besides regular reports, begun in 1890), on the work of this institute, and filed in the records of the society, see Cardona, "Die Göres Gesellschaft, 1876-1901", Cologne, 1901, pp. 65-73). In 1900 a new department was added and placed under the guidance of W. Monika, for the study of Christian archaeology and the history of Christian art. The Roman laboratories of the Göres Society deal chiefly with nunciate reports, the administration records of the Curia since 1300, and the Acts of the Council of Trent. Other publications, more or less broad in scope, are published regularly in the "Historisches Jahrbuch", among its "Quellen und Forschungen", or in other organs of the Göres Society. The twelve stout volumes in which this institute proposes to edit exhaustively the Acts and records of the Council of Trent, represent one of the most difficult and important tasks which could be set before a body of scientists from the Vatican archives. The corresponding investigation of medieval papal administration and financial records, which the institute investigates in cooperation with the Austrian Leo Socie, opens up a chief source of information for the history of the Curia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The publications issued by the private association surpass greatly those of many governmental institutes. The Göres Society Institute maintains at Rome no library of its own, but aids efficiently in the growth of the fine library at the Campo Santo Teutonico, near the Vatican. The Leo Society supports the long-tried investigator, who devotes his time to publications in the study of ecclesiastical records of the later Middle Ages. The present director of the Göres Society Institute is Dr. Stephan Ehres.

Austria.—The Austrian institute (Institutum Aus triaco di studi storici), established by Theodor von Sickel, and now directed by Professor von Pastor, has existed since 1883. It affords young historical workers the means of familiarizing themselves during a brief sojourn at Rome with the rich manuscript materials found there, and in this way to make contributions to the production of monographs of value. It co-operates in the publication of the nunciate reports, and contemplates the publication of the correspondence of the legates and the ambassadors at the Council of Trent. Among the publications of this institute are Sickel's "Pape Ottone l'ultimo"; his edition of the "Liber Diurms"; and his noteworthy "Römische Berichte" (Roman reports). Several valuable studies by this institute have appeared in the "Mittheilungen des österreichischen Institutes für Geschichtsforschung", dealing with the work of the medieval papal chancery, while Ottenhals's "Chancery Rules" and Tangl's "Chancery Regulations" are constantly referred to in every recent work on the Middle Ages. The numerous historical commissions which were sent from Bohemia to Rome (concerning which, see below) may be considered as auxiliaries of the Austrian Institute.

Prussia.—A short history of the founding of the Prussian historical institute was published by Frieden burg (Berlin, Academy of Sciences). The project dates back to 1883, but it was not until May of 1888 that Konrad Schottmüller succeeded in opening a Prussian Historical Bureau that began modestly enough, but soon developed into the actual Prussian Institute, reorganized (12 November, 1902) on a materially enlarged scale, and now the most important of all historical institutes at Rome, owing largely to the efforts of its present director, Professor Kehr. In addition to the general work of historical investigation, the institute has special departments for the history of art and for patrician and Biblical research. Besides its own publication, "Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven", the institute issues a series of German nunciate reports (eleven volumes since 1897). The Library of the Institute, besides extensive monographs on various subjects, has published the useful "Repertorium Germanicum", and, in cooperation with the Instituto Storico Italiano, the "Registrum chartarum Italie", a series of independent volumes. These researches take in Italian, German, French, English, and Spanish archives; Austria and Switzerland, and occasionally, the library of the institute ranks, with that of the Palazzo Farnese, among the best historical libraries in Rome.

Hungary.—The "Hungaricorum historiarum Collegium Romanum", though no longer in existence, owed its inception in 1896 to the efforts of Count von Fraknó, and published under his direction (since 1897) the "Monumenta Vaticana historiarum regni Hungariae illustrantia", whose two series in ten folio volumes are a lasting tribute to the munificence of Fraknó. Other noteworthy monographs based on Roman documents are continually being issued, and illustrating the history of Hungary must be credited to this institute.

Belgium.—The "Institut historique Belge à Rome" was founded in December, 1904. The minister of state defined its purpose to be the searching of Italian archives, and especially those of the Vatican, for historical material bearing on the ecclesiastical and profane history, classical, palaeography, archaeology, and the history of art.

It's first director was Dom Ursmer Berlière, of the
Abbey of Maredsous (1904–1907); his successor is Dr. Gottfried Kurch, professor emeritus at the University of Liège. The institute has published thus far two volumes of "Analecta Vaticano-Belgica": I, "Suppliques de Clément VI" (1342–1332), by Berlière (1332); II, "Suppliques d'Innocent VI" (1353–1362), by Berlière; I, "Les lettres de Jean XXII" (1334–1342), by Fieren. Two other volumes are under way. By his...
(f) selection from the petition files of all requests growing out of the said system; (g) reports of bishops on the state of their dioceses, and consistorial processes; (h) investigation into the influence of the Inquisition, to determine how far the respective local authorities were influenced by the Curia; (i) inquiry into the taxes, lists of all the money and goods for ecclesiastical purposes, and into the ways and means of collecting these taxes. For certain dioceses, ecclesiastical provinces, regions, or entire countries, all these data, together with other items of information, have in the course of time been gathered, and published by the local or national associations. They have also, in a general way, been made generally accessible by the publication, as a whole, of the respective papal registers (see REGISTERS, PAPAL), e. g., the "Regesta" publications of the French institute, and the cameraled (papal fiscal) reports of the Götter and Leo societies. "Chartularia," or collections of papal Bullae, Merkle, published not only for Westphalia, Eastern and Western Prussia, Utrecht, Bohemia, Salzburg, Aqui- lea, but also for Denmark, Poland, Switzerland, Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany (Repertorium Germanicum), is not to speak of other countries. Many a statute book of a medievalened has been richly illustrated by various investigators, e. g., Gollner, in the records of the "Penitentiarie," Kirsch and Baumgarten on the finances (officials, administration) of the College of Cardinals; Baumgarten on the respective offices of the vice-chancellor and the "Bul- lares," the residence-quarters of the Curia, its Cur- eares or messengers; Watel, Goller, and Schäfer on the finance bureau of the Curia; von Ottenthal on the secretaries and the "Chancery rules," Tangl and Erer respectively on the "Chancery regulations" and the "Liber Censurarii:" Kehr, Berlière, and Rieder on the petition files (Gibell supplices), etc. The stud- ies are not to be limited to the medieval period; investigations in the remarkable editions of the "Liber Pontificalis" by Duchesne; the "Liber Censuralis" by Duchesne-Fabre; the "Italia Pontificia" by Kehr; the "Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi" by Edel; the "Catalogue of Cardinals" by Cristofori; the "Acts of the Council of Trent" by Edel and Buechbell, not to speak of numerous other valuable works. As to the third subdivision, i. e., the purely political, or politico-ecclesiastical activities of the pope, no clearly defined distinction can be made, either in the Middle Ages or in more modern times, between ecclesiastical and political activities and the exercise of purely ecclesiastical authority; their numerous manifestations may be studied in the publications briefly described above. Abundant information is to be found in the publications of the papal "Regesta" and the "Camera" or treasury records. We learn from these sources besides the history of the Roman Curia, e. g., the population of various kingdoms, grants of titles to kings and rulers for political purposes, etc. The nunciature reports are rich in this information.

In a general way the Vatican archives and these new historical Roman institutes have been particu- larly fruitful in the study of the ecclesiastic-religious relations of individual dioceses, countries, and peoples with the head of the Church and its central administration. So numerous have been the results of investigation published along these lines, that it has hitherto been impracticable to prepare an exhaustive bibliography of the works based on studies in the Vatican archives. Melampo and Ranuzzi, following in the footsteps of Meister, have recently published a very useful, but not at all exhaustive, list of all the books and essays of this kind which had appeared up to 1900: "Saggio bibliogra- frofico dei lavori eseguiti nell' Archivio Vaticano" (Rome, 1909). (See VATICAN, sub-title Archives, Biblialy; and BULLARIUM.)

Most of the information on the Roman historical institutes is as yet scattered in essays and book prefaces. Besides the works of Friedrich and Brüm above referred to, see Has- sins, The Vatican Archives in the Middle Ages (1890), reprinted in Catholic Univ. Bull. (April, 1897); C. C. Vincenzo, De la création d'une école belge à Rome, Schelker in Bevorderden, Kochelmann's Handbuch, etc, e. v., Institute, His- toriote, and the financial reports of the various institutes in their respective official publications. Among the accounts published by the various historical commissions the best have always been those of the Poles and the Russians, and are to be found in MELAMPO-RANUZZI.

PAUL M. BAUMGARTEN.

Institution, Canonical. (Lat. institutum, from in- stituere, to establish), in its widest significance denotes any act or establishment, with canonical authority, creating an ecclesiastical benefice (Regula prima juris, in VI, 3). In its strictest sense the word denotes the collation of an ecclesiastical benefice by a legitimate authority, on the presentation of a candidate by a third person (institutio tituli collocation). The term is also used also for the actual institution, collation, or creation (institutio corporalis), and for the approbation requisite for the exercising of the ecclesiastical minis- try when an authority inferior to the bishop has power to confer an ecclesiastical benefice (institutio auctorisabill). (Cf. gloss on "Regula prima juris," in VI, 3 et al. v. "Beneficium".)

I. The institutio tituli collativa (that which gives the title), sometimes also called verbals (which may be by word of mouth or by writing, as distinguished from the institutio corporalis, or realis), is the act by which an ecclesiastical authority confers a benefice on a can- didate presented by a third person enjoying the right of presentation. This occurs in the case of benefices subject to the right of patronage (jus patronatus), one of the principal prerogatives of which is the right of presenting to the bishop a titular for a vacant benefice. It also occurs when, in virtue of a privilege or of a con- cordat, a chapter, a sovereign, or a government has the right to present to the bishop the titular of a benefice or of an important ecclesiastical office. If the pope accepts the person presented, he bestows the institutio canononis on the titular. The effect of this act is to give the candidate who has been presented (and who till then had only a jus ad rem, i. e. the right to be provided with the benefice) a jus in re or in beneficio, i. e. the right of exercising the functions connected with the benefice and of receiving revenues accruing from it. The right of institution to major benefices rests in the pope, but in the case of minor benefices it may belong to a bishop and his vicar-general, to a chapter. The right is exercised on the occasion of a foundation title dating from before the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, "de Ref.," c. xii), or of a privilege, or of prelection. In all these cases the bishop has the right to examine the candidate, excluding candidates presented by universities recognized canonically and the jurisdiction of which has been transferred to the bishop, or by another person, or by a juridic person of a foundation, or by another person, or by a juridic person of a foundation, or by another person, or by a juridic person of a foundation. (Sess. XXV, "de Ref.," c. xi); even this exception does not apply to parishes (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, "de Ref.," c. xxvii). Institution ought to be be- stowed within two months following the presenta- tion, in the case of parish churches (Constitution of Pius V, "In conferendis," 16 March, 1567), but canon law has not specified any time limit for other benefices. However, if the bishop refuses to grant institution within the time appointed by a supe-
rior authority, the latter can make the grant itself (see
Juw. Patronatus).
II. The instituto corporalis, also called investitura,
or installatio, is the putting of a titular in effective pos-
session of his benefice. Whereas canon law permits
a bishop to put himself in possession of his benefi-
ce (see Enthronization), in the case of minor benefi-
ces, the actual investiture is by a competent authority.
The bishop may punish anyone who takes possession of a benefice on his own authority, and the violent occupation of a benefice in possession of another ecclesiastical entails on the guilty party the loss of all right to that benefice. The right of investiture is quite analogous to archiepiscopal, but is now resorted to by the bishop, vicar-general, or the vicar, generally the ordinary dean (decanus christianitatis or fora-
neus). It is performed with certain symbolic cere-
monies, determined by local usage or by diocesan
statutes, such, for instance, as a solemn entry into the
parish and into the church, the handing over of the
church keys, a putting in possession of the high altar
of the church, the pulpits, confessional, etc. In some
countries there is a double installation the first by
the bishop or vicar-general, either by mere word of
mouth, or by some symbolic ceremony, as, for in-
stance, presenting a biretta; the second, which is then
a simple taking possession in the parish and con-
secrating in the solemn entry and other formalities
dependent on local custom. In some places custom has
even done away with the instituto corporalis properly
so called; the rights inherent to the putting in posses-
sion are acquired by the new titular to the benefice
by a simple visit to the benefice, for instance, to the
parish, with the intention of taking possession thereof,
provided such visit is made with the authority of the
bishop, thus precluding the possibility of self-inves-
titure. When the pope names the titular to a benefice,
lie always mentions those who are to put the benefi-
cies in possession.
The following are the effects of the instituto cor-
poralis: (1) From the moment he is put in possession
the beneficiary receives the revenues of his benefice.
(2) He enjoys all the rights resulting from the own-
ership and the possession of the benefice, and, in particu-
larly, from the right of taking possession in the parish
in order that the time necessary for a prescriptive right to the benefice counts. (3) The possessor can invoke in his favour the provisions of rules 35 and 36 of the Roman Chancery de annali,
and de triennali possessione. This privilege has lost
much of its importance since the conferring of ben-
efices on the initiative of local diocesan times. Formerly,
on account of various privileges, and the constant intervention of the Holy See in the collation of benefices, several ecclesiastics were not infrequently named to the same benefice. Should one of them happen to have been in possession of the benefice for a year, it would involve the right of the rival claimant to prove that the possessor had no right to the benefice; moreover, the latter was obliged to begin his suit within six months after his nomination to the benefice by the pope, and the trial was to be concluded within a year counting from the day when the actual possession was transferred to the courts (rule 36 of the Chan-
cery). These principles are still in force. The trienni-
nal possession guaranteed the benefice to the actual
incumbent in all actions in petitorio or in possess-
sorio to obtain a benefice brought by any claimant
whatsoever (rule 36 of the Chancery). (4) The
peaceful possession of a benefice entails ipso facto the
domestic peace and with the benefice, for a benefice
is a titular, but which would be incompatible with the
one he holds. (5) It is only from the day when bish-
ops and parish priests enter into possession of their
benefices that they can validly assist at marriages
celebrated in the diocese or in the parish (Decree Ne
temere, 2 August, 1907). Furthermore, in some dioceses the statutes declare invalid any exercise of

the powers of jurisdiction attached to a benefice, before
the actual installation in the benefice.
III. The instituto auctorizabilis is nothing but an
approbation required for the validity of acts of juris-
diction, granted by the bishop to a beneficiary in
view of his undertaking the care of souls (cura om-
marum). It is an act of the same nature as the ap-
probation which a bishop gives members of a religious
order for hearing confessions of persons not subject
to their authority, and without which the absolution
would be invalid; but there is this difference that in
the case of the instituto auctorizabilis the approbation
relates to the exercise of the ministerial functions
taken as a whole. It is the missio canonicorum indi-
cessible for the vicar-general or the vicar, and the
power of jurisdiction. This institution, which is
reserved to the bishop or his vicar-general and to those
possessing a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, is required
when the instituto tituli collatis given by the bishop himself implies the
instituto auctorizabilis, which, therefore, needs not to
be given by a special act.

Decretal of Gregory IX. bk. III, tit. 7. De institutionibus
Legati S. S. auctoris. bk. III, tit. 8. De institutione
Prompata bibliotheca, s. v. Instituo, IV (Paris, 1861), 701-12;
Hinschius, System des katholischen Kirchenrechs, II (Berlin.
1927), 694-5; bk. VI, tit. 2. promulgates the
romae, 1873, 595-434; Husserl, Archiv f"ur katholisches Kirchenrech,
LXXVIII (1890), 769-91, and LXXXV (1899), 327-9.
A. Van Hove.

Insurance. See Societies, Benevolent.

Intellect (Lat. intelligere—inter and legere—to
choose between, to discern; Gr. noēr; Ger. Vernunft,
Verstand; Fr. intellect; Ital. intelletto), the faculty of
thought. As understood in Catholic philosophical
language it signifies the higher, spiritual, cognitive
power of the soul. It is the mental faculty by action by sense, but transcends the latter in range.
Amongst its functions are attention, conception, judg-
ment, reasoning, reflection, and self-consciousness. All
these modes of activity exhibit a distinctly supra-
sensuous element, and reveal a cognitive faculty of a
higher order of certain mental actions and forms.
Harmony, therefore, with Catholic usage, we reserve
the terms intellect, intelligence, and intellectual to this
higher power and its operations, although many
modern psychologists are wont, with much resulting
confusion, to extend the application of these terms so
as also to include in them the functions of the animal
intellect. By thus restricting the use of these terms, the
inaccuracy of such phrases as “animal intelligence” is
avoided. Before such language may be legitimately
employed, it should be shown that the lower animals
are endowed with genuinely rational faculties, funda-
mentally one in kind with those of man. Catholic
philosophers, however they differ on minor points, as
a general body have held that intellect is a spiritual
faculty depending extrinsically, but not intrinsically,
on the bodily organism. The importance of a right
theory of intellect is twofold: on account of its bear-
ing on epistemology, or the doctrine of knowledge;
and because of its connexion with the question of the
spirituality of the soul.

History.—The view that the cognitive powers of the
mind, or faculties of knowledge, are of a double order
—the one lower, grosser, more intimately depending
on bodily organs, the other higher and of a more
abstract and spiritual nature—appeared very early,
though at first confusedly, in Greek thought. It was
in connexion with cosmological, rather than psy-
chological, theories that the difference between sen-
suous and rational knowledge was first emphasized.
On the one hand there seems to be constant change,
and, on the other hand, permanence in the world that
is revealed to us. The question: How is the apparent
conflict to be reconciled? or, Which is the true representation? forced itself on the speculative mind. Heraclitus insists on the reality of the changeable. All things are in motion, and Parmenides, Zeno, and the Eleatics argued that only the unchangeable being truly is. δεικτής, "sense," is the faculty by which changing phenomena are apprehended; ροώς, "thought," in" reason," "intellect," presents to us permanent, abiding being. The Sophists, with a strong appeal to the modern sceptical consequences of the apparent contradiction between the one and the many, the permanent and the changing, and emphasized the part contributed by the mind in knowledge. For Protagoras, "Man is the measure of all things", whilst with Gorgias the conclusion is: "Nothing is; nothing can be known; nothing can be expressed in speech". Socrates held that truth was innate in the mind antecedent to sensuous experience, but his chief contribution to the theory of knowledge was his insistence on the importance of the general concept or definition. It was Plato, however, who first realized the full significance of the classic concept of sensuous experience for the philosophy of the intellect; he also first explained the origin of the problem. The universe of being, as reported by reason, is one, eternal, immutable; as revealed by sense, it is a series of multiple changing phenomena. We apprehend the ῥουτική, the "intellectual world", two: ροώς, "intuitive reason", which reaches the ideas (see Idea); and λγις, "discursive reason", which by its proper process, viz. τωτισμοσ, "demonstration", attains only to διδακή, "conception". Plato thus set up two distinct intellectual faculties attaining to different sets of objects. The world of ideas is for Plato the real world; that of sense is only a poor shadowy imitation. Aristotle's doctrine on the intellect in its main outline is clear. The soul is possessed of two orders of cognitive faculty, τό ἀληθοειδές, "sensuous cognition", and τό διαιρετικός, "rational cognition". The sensuous faculty includes ροώς, "imagination", and μνήμη, "memory". The faculty of rational cognition includes ροώς and διδακή. These, however, are not so much two faculties as two functions of the same power. They roughly correspond to intellect and ratiocinative reason. For intellect the action is present in the sensuous faculty. The function of the intellect is to divest the object presented by sense of its material and individualizing conditions, and apprehend the universal and intelligible form embodied in the concrete physical reality. The outcome of the process is the generalization in the intellect of an intellectual form or representation of the intelligible being of the object (ἐπόμενος, ροώς). This act constitutes the intellect cognizant of the object in its universal nature. In this process intellect appears in a double character. On the one hand it exhibits itself as an active agent, in that it operates on the object presented by the sensuous faculty, and rendering it intelligible. On the other hand, as subject of the intellectual representation evolved, it manifests passivity, modifiability, and susceptibility to the reception of different forms. There is thus revealed in Aristotle's theory of intellectual cognition an active intellect (ἐπόμενος) and a passive intellect (ροώς ροώς). But how the activity and the passivity, what precisely is the nature of the distinction and relation between them, is one of the most irritatingly obscure points in the whole of Aristotle's works. The locus classicus is his "De Anima", III, v, where the subject is briefly dealt with. As the active intellect actuates the passive, it bears to it a relation similar to that of form to matter in physical bodies. The active intellect "illuminates" the object of sense, considering it intuitively as conceived as the result of the activity of light. It is pure energy without any potentiality, and its activity is continuous. It is separate, immortal, and eternal. The passive intellect, on the other hand, receives the forms abstracted by the active intellect and ideally becomes the object. The whole process, whose originating cause from the beginning are hopelessly divided as to Aristotle's own view on the nature of the ροώς ροώς (see Hammond). Theophrastus, who succeeded Aristotle as scholiarch of the Lyceum, accepted the two-fold intellect, but was unable to explain it. The great commentator, Alexander of Aphrodisias, interprets the ροώς ροώς as the activity of the Divine Intelligence. This view was adopted by many of the Arabian philosophers of the Middle Ages, who conceived it in a pantheistic sense. For many of them the active intellect is one universal reason illuminating all men. With Avicenna the passive intellect alone is individual. Avicenna confusing agens and intellectus possibilis as separate from the individual soul and as one in all men. The Schoolmen generally controverted the Arabian theories. Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas interpret intellectus agens and possibilis as merely distinct faculties or powers of the universal intellect. Thomas understands "separate" (χωριστά) and "pure" or "unmixed" (ἄξωτα) to signify that the intellect is distinct from matter and incorporeal. Interpreting Aristotle thus benevolently, and developing his doctrine, Aquinas teaches that the function of the active intellect is an abstractive operation on the data supplied by the sensuous faculties to form the species intelligibles in the intellectus possibilis. The intellectus possibilis thus actuated cognizes what is intelligible in the object. The act of cognition is the concept, or verbum mentale, by which is apprehended the universal nature or essence of the object prescinded from its individualizing conditions. The main features of the Aristotelian doctrine of intellect, and of its essential distinction from the faculty of sensuous cognition, were adhered to by the general body of the Schoolmen. Only the time we reach modern philosophy, especially in England, the radical distinction between the two orders of faculties begins to be lost sight of. Descartes, defending the spirituality of the soul, naturally supposes the intellect to be a spiritual faculty. Leibniz insists on both the spirituality and the separate efficiency of this faculty. As a consequence, the "Nil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu", he adds with much force, "nisi intellectus ipse", and urges spontaneity and innate activity as characteristics of the monad. From the break with Scholasticism, however, English philosophy drifted towards Sensationism and Materialism, subsequently influencing France and other countries in the same direction; as a consequence, the old conception of intellect as a spiritual faculty of the soul, and as a cognitive activity by which the universal, necessary, and immutable elements in knowledge are apprehended, was almost entirely lost. For Hobbes the mind is material, and all knowledge is ultimately sensuous. Locke's attack on innate ideas and intuitive knowledge, his reduction of various forms of intellectual cognition to complex amalgams of so-called simple ideas originating in sense perception, and his representation of the mind as a passive tabula rasa, in spite of his undeniable philosophical acumen and the discursive reason, paved the way for all modern Sensationism and Phenomenalism. Condillac, omitting Locke's "reflection", resolved all intellectual knowledge into Sensationism pure and simple. Hume, analysing all mental products into
sensuous impressions, vivid or faint, plus association due to custom, developed the sceptical consequences involved in Locke’s conception of the intellectual faculty, and carried philosophy back to the old conclusions of the Greek Sensationists and Sophists, but reinforced by a more subtle and acute psychology. All the main features of Hume’s psychology have been adopted by the whole Association of England, by the English, and by materialistic scientists so far as they have any philosophy or psychology at all. The essential distinction between intellect, or rational activity, and sens has in fact been completely lost sight of, and Scepticism and Agnosticism have logically followed. Kant recognized a distinction between sensation and the intellect, but maintained that the intellect is a different way from the old Aristotelian view, and looking on it as purely subjective, his system was developed into an idealism and scepticism differing in kind from that of Hume, but not very much more satisfactory. Still the neo-Kantian and Hegelian movement, which developed in Great Britain during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, has contributed much towards the reawakening of the recognition of the intellectual, or rational, element in all knowledge.

Fifth, Common Doctrine.—The teaching of Aristotle on intellect, as developed by Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas, has become, as we have said, in its main features the common doctrine of Catholic philosophers. We shall state it in brief outline. (1) Intellect is a cognitive faculty essentially different from sense and of a supra-organic order; that is, it is not exerted by, or intrinsically dependent on, a bodily organ, as sensation is. This proposition is proved by psychological analysis and study of the chief functions of intellect. These are conception, judgment, reasoning, reflection, and self-consciousness. All these activities involve elements essentially different from sensuous consciousness. In conception the mind forms universal ideas. These are different in kind from sensations and sensuous images. These latter are concrete and individual, truly representative of only one object, whilst the universal idea will apply with equal truth to any object of the class. This universal, being a representation of the likeness of nature, whilst the sensuous image changes from moment to moment. Thus the concept or universal idea of ‘gold’, or ‘triangle’, will with equal justice stand for any specimen, but the image represents truly only one individual. The sensuous faculty can be used in knowledge only for the moral activity only whatever it be, exists in a concrete, individualized form. In judgment the mind perceives the identity or discordance of two concepts. In reasoning it apprehends the logical nexus between conclusion and premises. In reflection and self-consciousness it turns back on itself in such a manner that there is perfect identity between the knowing subject and the subject known. But all these forms of consciousness are incompatible with the notion of a sensuous faculty, or one exerted by means of a bodily organ. The Sensationist psychologists, from Berkeley onwards, were unanimous in maintaining that the mind cannot form universal or abstract ideas. This would be true were the intellect not a spiritual faculty essentially distinct from sense. The simple fact is that they invariably confounded the image of the imagination, which is individualized, with the concept, or idea, of the intellect. When we employ universal terms in any description, they must have a meaning. The thought by which that meaning is apprehended in the mind is a universal idea.

The intellect presupposes sensation and operates on the materials supplied by the sensuous faculties. The beginning of consciousness with the infant is in sensation. This is at first felt, most probably, in a vague and indefinite form. But repetition of particular sensations and experiences of other sense data with them render their apprehension more and more definite as time goes on. Groups of sensations of different senses are aroused by particular objects and become united by the force of contiguous association. The awakening of any one of the group calls up the images of the others. The perception is thus being perfected. At a certain stage in the process of development the higher power of intellect begins to be evoked into activity, at first feebly and dimly. In the beginning the intellectual apprehension, like the sensations which preceded, is extremely vague. Its first acts are probably the cognition of objects revealed through the sense data, and the formation of ideas, such as ‘extended-thing’, ‘moving-thing’, ‘pressing-thing’, and the like. It takes in objects as wholes, before discriminating their parts. Repetition and variation of sense-impressions stimulates and sharpens attention. Pleasure or pain evokes interest, and the intellect concentrates on part of the sensuous experience, and the process of abstraction begins. Certain attributes are laid hold of, to the omission of others. Comparison and discrimination are also called into action, and the more accurate and perfect elaboration of concepts now proceeds rapidly. The notions of substances and accidents, of whole and part, and changing, are evolved with increasing distinctness. Generalization follows quickly upon abstraction. When an attribute or an object has been singled out and recognized as a thing distinct from its surroundings, an act of reflection renders the mind aware of the object as capable of indefinite realization and multiplication in other circumstances, and we have now the formally reflex universal idea.

The further activity of the intellect is fundamentally the same in kind, comparing, identifying, or discriminating. The activity of rationalization is merely a restatement of the judicial activity. The final stage in the elaboration of a concept is reached when it is embodied for further use in a general name. Words presuppose intellectual ideas, but register them and render them permanent. The intellect is also distinguished, according to its functions, as speculative or practical, and in this respect part of the sensuous fundamental relations of ideas, it is called speculative; when considering harmony with action, it is termed practical. The faculty, however, is the same in both cases. The faculty of conscience is in fact merely the practical intellect, or the intellect passing judgment on the moral stimulus which actuates the faculty of truth and falsity, and in its judicial acts it at the same time affirms the union of subject and predicate and the agreement between its own representation and the objective reality. Intellect also exhibits itself in the higher form of memory when there is conscious recognition of identity between the present and the past. To the intellect is due also the conception of self and personal identity. The fundamental difficulty with the whole Sensationist school, from Hume to Mill, in regard to the recognition of personality, is due to their ignoring the true nature of the faculty of intellect. Were there no such higher rational faculty in the mind, then the mind could never be known as anything more than a series of mental states. It is the intellect which enables the mind to apprehend itself as a unity, or unitary being. The ideas of the infinite, of space, time, and causality are all similarly the product of intellectual activity, being the formation of ideas by sense, and exercising a power of intuition, abstraction, identification, and discrimination. It is, accordingly, the absence of an adequate conception of intellect which has rendered the treatment of all these mental functions so defective in the English psychology of the last century.
INTENTION

(See also FACULTIES OF THE SOUL; DIALECTIC; EPISTEMOLOGY; EMPIRICISM; IDEALISM; POSITIVISM.)
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On nature and society, see: WARD, Philosophy of the Senses, 1 (London, 1884); MCCAIN, Examination of the Mill (London, 1885); E. L. M. M. Intuitions of the Mind (New York and London, 1901); De REDE, Mental Philosophy of Two Laws (Paris, 1885), bk. I, II, IV, V.

For the Sensationist view: BAIN, The Senses and the Intellet (London, 1880); Taine, De l'Intelligence (Paris, 1876).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Intendencia Oriental y Llanos de San Martin, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, in the province of Saint Martin, Colombia, South America, created 24 March, 1908, and entrusted to the Society of Mary. In place of this vicariate there were formerly two prefectures Apostolic, one created 23 June, 1903, and the other on 8 January, 1904, after negotiations (dating from 1902) between the Holy See and the Colombian Government for the evangelization of these vast provinces. Surrounded by the Cordilleras, and watered by the Batatas, Garagao, Guaviro, Humades, Meta, and Orinoco Rivers, the territory is still inhabited largely by the uncivilized natives, in number about 50,000, of whom scarcely 10,000 have been baptized.

U. BENIGN.

Intention (Lat. intendere, to stretch toward, to aim at) is an act of the will by which that faculty efficaciously desires to reach an end by employing the means. It is apparent from this notion that there is a sharply defined difference between intention and volition or even velleity. In the first instance there is a concentration of the will to the point of resolve which is wholly lacking in the others. With the purpose of determining the value of an action, it is customary to distinguish various sorts of intentions which could have prompted it.

First, there is the actual intention, operating, manifest presence of the intellect. Secondly, there is the virtual intention. Its force is borrowed entirely from a prior volition which is accounted as containing in some result produced by it. In other words, the virtual intention is not a present act of the will, but rather a power (virtus) come about as an effect of a former act, and now at work for the same object. This is why there is nothing wanting in a virtual, as contrasted with an actual, intention is not of course the element of will, but rather the attention of the intellect, and that particularly of the reflex kind. So, for example, a person having made up his mind to undertake a journey may during its progress make contingent upon it a fully probable thought. He will nevertheless be said to have all the while the virtual intention of reaching his destination. Thirdly, an habitual intention is one that once actually existed, but of the present continuance of which there is no positive trace; the most that can be said of it is that it has never been retracted. And fourthly, an interpretative intention is one that as a matter of fact has never been really elicited; there has been and is no actual movement of the will in the act. For Aristotle, the purpose which it is assumed a man would have had in a given contingency, had he been given thought to the matter.

It is a commonplace among moralists that the intention is the chief among the determinants of the character of an act. Hence, when one's motive is grievously bad, or even only slightly so, if it be the exclusive reason for doing something, then an act which is otherwise good is vitiated and reputed to be evil. An end which is only venially bad, and which at the same time does not contain the complete cause for acting, leaves the operation which in other respects was unassailable to be qualified as partly good and partly bad. A good intention can never hallow an action the content of which is wrong. Thus it never can be lawful to steal, even though one's intention be to aid the poor with the proceeds of the theft. The end does not justify the means. It may be noted here in passing that one state of matter under discussion, that the explicit and frequently renewed reference of one's actions to Almighty God is not now commonly thought to be necessary in order that they may be said to be morally good. The old-time controversy on this point has practically died out.

Besides affecting the goodness or badness of acts, intention may have much to do with their validity. Is it required, for instance, for the fulfilment of the law? The received doctrine is that, provided the subject is seriously minded to do what is prescribed, he need not have the intention of satisfying his obligation; and much less is it required that he should be inspired by the same motives as urged the legislator to enact the law. Theologians quote in this connection the saying, "Finis praecipit non cadit sub precepto" ("the end of the law does not fall under its binding force.") What has been said applies with even more truth to the class of obligations called real, enjoining for instance the payment of debts. For the discharge of these no intention at all is demanded, not even a conscious act. It is enough that the creditor gets his own.

The Church teaches very unequivocally that for the valid conferring of the sacraments, the minister must have the intention of doing at least what the Church does. This is laid down with great emphasis by the Council of Trent (see VII). The opinion once defended by such theologians as Cathearius and Salmeron that there need only be the intention to perform deliberately the external rite proper to each sacrament, and that, as long as this was true, the interior dissent of the minister from the mind of the Church would not invalidate the sacrament, no longer finds adherents. The common doctrine now is that a real internal intention to act as a minister of Christ, or to do what Christ instituted the sacraments to effect, in other words, to truly baptize, absolve, etc., is required. This intention need not necessarily be of the sort called actual. That would often be practically impossible. It is enough that it be virtual. Neither habitual nor interpretative intention in the minister will suffice for the validity of the sacrament. The truth is that here and now, when the sacrament is being conferred, neither of these intentions exists, and they can therefore exercise no determining influence upon what is done. To administer the sacraments with a conditional intention, which makes their effect contingent upon the event, is to confer them invalidly. This holds good for all the sacraments except matrimony, which, being a contract, is susceptible of such a limitation.
As to the recipients of the sacraments, it is certain that no intention is required in children who have not yet reached the age of reason, or in imbeciles, for the validity of those sacraments which they are capable of receiving, whether or not they may be in danger of death; but some intention is indispensable if the sacrament is not to be invalid. The reason is that our justification is not brought about without our co-operation, and that includes the rational will to profit by the means of sanctification. Much how much an intention is enough, is not always clear. In general, more in the way of intention will be demanded as the act of the receiver seem to enter into the making of the sacrament. So for penance and matrimony under ordinary conditions a virtual intention would appear to be required; for the other sacraments an habitual intent, sufficient if an unfulfilled person in danger of death the habitual intention may be implicit and still suffice for the validity of the sacraments that are then necessary or highly useful; that is, it may be contained in the more general purpose which a man has at some time during his life, and which he has never retracted, of availing himself of these means of salvation at so supreme a moment. For the gaining of indulgences the most that can probably be exacted is an habitual intention.

WILHELM AND SCANNELL, Manual of Catholic Theology (London, 1908); DE AUGUSTINIA, De re sacramentaria (Rome, 1889); BELLERINUS, Opus theologicum morale (Pisto, 1900); GENOCRO, Theologiae moralis institutiones (Leuven, 1896).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

**Intercession (Mediation).**—To intercede is to go or come between two parties, to plead before one of them on behalf of the other. In the New Testament, the word is used as the equivalent of τερευμάν (Vulg. interpellare, in Heb., vii, 25). “Mediation” means a standing in the midst between two (contending) parties, for the purpose of bringing them together (cf. mediator, médium, I Tim., ii, 5). In ecclesiastical usage both words are taken in the sense of the intervention primarily of Christ, and secondarily of the Blessed Virgin and the angels and saints, on behalf of men. It would be better, however, to restrict the word mediation to the action of Christ, and intercession to the action of the Blessed Virgin, the angels, and the saints. In this way we may briefly deal with: I, the Mediation of Christ; and at more length with, II, the intercession of the saints.

I. In considering the Mediation of Christ we must distinguish between His position and His office. As God-man He stands in the midst between God and man, partaking of the natures of both, and therefore, by that very fact, fitted to act as Mediator between them. He is, indeed, the Mediator in the absolute sense of the word, in a way that no one else can possibly be. “For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim., ii, 5). He is united to both: “The head of every man is Christ...” (I Cor., xi, 3). His Mediation belongs to Him as man, His human nature is the principium quo, but the value of His action is derived from the fact that it is a Divine Person Who acts. The main object of His mediation is to restore the friendship between God and man. This is attained first by the merit of grace and remission of sin, by means of the worship and satisfaction offered to God by and through Christ. But, besides bringing man nigh unto God, Christ brings God nigh unto man, by revealing to man Divine truths and commands—He is the Apostle sent by God to us and the High-Priest set over God’s house. In other words, the physical order the mere fact of Christ’s existence is in itself a mediation between God and man. By uniting our humanity to His Divinity He united us to God and God to us. As St. Ambrose says, “Christ become man that men might become gods” (“De Incarn., n. 54; of St. Augustine, “Serm. De Nativitate Dom.”; St. Thomas, III, Q. i, a. 2). And for this Christ prayed: “That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee...” (John, xvi, 21-23). The subject of Christ’s mediation belongs properly to the articles Atonement, Doctrine of the; Jesus Christ; Redemption (q. v.). See also St. Thomas, III, Q. xxvi; and the treatises on the Incarnation.

II. We shall here speak not only of intercession, but also of the invocation of the saints. The one indeed implies the other; we should not call upon the saints for aid unless they could help us. The foundation of both lies in the doctrine of the communion of saints (q. v.). In the article on this subject it has been shown that the unfulfilled prayers of the faithful in purgatory are one mystical body, with Christ for their head. All that is of interest to one part is of interest to the rest, and each helps the rest: we on earth by honouring and invoking the saints and praying for the souls in purgatory, and the saints in heaven by interceding for us. The Catholic doctrine of intercession and invocation is set forth by the Council of Trent, which teaches that “the saints who reign together with Christ offer up their own prayers to God for men. It is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, and to ask their help for obtaining grace through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, Who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour. Those persons think impiously who deny that the Saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to prayer falls upon each of us is idolatry, or that it is repugnant to the word of God, and is opposed to the honour of the one Mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ” (Sess. XXV). This had already been explained by St. Thomas: “Prayer is offered to a person in two ways: one as though to be granted by himself, another as to be obtained through him. In the first way we pray to God alone, because all our prayers ought to be directed to obtaining grace and glory which God alone gives, according to those words of the psalm (lxxxii, 12): ‘The Lord will give grace and glory.’ But in the second way we pray to the blessed angels and to the holy angels and to the blessed men; we learn our petition through them, but that by their prayers and merits our prayers may be efficacious. Wherefore it is said in the Apocalypse (viii, 4): ‘And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angel’” (Summ. Theol., II-II, Q. lxxxiii, a. 4). The reasonableness of the Catholic doctrine of intercession and invocation is further stated than in St. Jerome’s words: “If the Apostles and Martyrs, while still in the body, can pray for others, at a time when they must still be anxious for themselves, how much more after their crowns, victories, and triumphs are won! One man, Moses, obtains from God pardon for six hundred thousand men in arms; and Stephen, the imitator of the Lord, and the first martyr in Christ, begs forgiveness for his persecutors; and shall their power be less after having begun to be with Christ? The Apostle Paul declares that two hundred three score and sixteen souls, sailing with him, were freely given him; and, after he is dissolved and has begun to be with Christ, shall he lose his lips, and not be able to utter a word in behalf of those who throughout the whole world believed at his preaching of the Gospel? And shall the living dog Vigiliantius be better than that dead lion?” (“Col., i, 17; 1 Thess., iv, 13, 14.”)

The chief objections raised against the intercession and invocation of the saints are that these doctrines are opposed to the faith and trust which we should have in God alone: that they are a denial of the all-sufficient merits of Christ; and that they cannot
proven from Scripture and the Fathers. Thus Article xxii of the Anglican Church says: "The Romanish doctrine concerning the Invocation of Saints is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God." 

(1) In the article Adoration (q. v.) it has been clearly shown that the honour paid to angels and saints is entirely different from the supreme honour due to God alone, and is indeed paid to them only as His servants and friends. "By Honouring the Saints who have slept in the Lord, by invoking their intercession and venerating their relics and ashes, so far is the glory of God not being diminished, in proportion as the hope of men is thus more exalted and confirmed, and they are encouraged to the imitation of the Saints" (Cat. of the Council of Trent, pt. III, c. ii, q. 11). We can, of course, address our prayers directly to God, and He can hear us without the intervention of any creature. But this does not prevent us from asking the help of our fellow-creatures who may be more pleasing to Him than we are. It is not because our faith and trust in Him are weak, nor because His goodness and mercy to us are less; rather is it because we are encouraged by His precepts to approach Him at times through His servants, as we shall presently see. As pointed out by St. Thomas, we invoke the angels and saints in quite different language from that addressed to God. We ask Him to have mercy upon us and Himself to grant us whatever we require; whereas we ask the saints to pray for us, i.e. to join their petitions with ours. However, we should here bear in mind Bellarmine's remarks: "When we say that nothing should be asked of the saints but their prayer for us, the question is not about the words, but the sense of the words. For so far as the words go, it is lawful to say: 'St. Peter, pity me, save me, open for me the gates of heaven;' also: 'Great God, grant me health of body, patience, fortitude,' etc., provided that we mean 'save and pity me by praying for me;' 'grant me this or that by thy prayers and merits.' For so speaks Gregory of Nazianzus (Orat. xviii—according to others, xxiv—"De S. Cypriano" in P. G., XXXV, 1193; "Orat. de S. Athanasii. In Laud. S. Athanasii," Orat. xxxi, in P. G., XXXV, 1128;) in "De Sanet. Beatif.," I, 17. The supreme act of impetration, sacrifice, is never offered to any creature. "Although the Church has been accustomed at times to celebrate certain Masses in honour and memory of the saints, they have been held by way of sacrifice and offered unto them, but unto God alone, who crowned them; whence neither is the priest wont to say 'I offer sacrifice to thee, Peter, or Paul,' but, giving thanks to God for their victories, he implores their patronage, that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in heaven." (Council of Trent, Sent. XXII, c. iii.) The Collyridians, or Philomarianites, offered little cakes in sacrifice to the Mother of God; but the practice was condemned by St. Epiphanius (Hær., lxxix, in P. G., XL, 740); Leontius Byzaun., "Contra Nest. et Eutych.," III, 6, in P. G., L, 1154; and St. John of Damascus (Hær., lxxxix, in P. G., XXIV, 728).

(2) The doctrine of one Mediator, Christ, in no way excludes the invocation and intercession of saints. All merit indeed comes through Him; but this does not mean that saints who have sinned and are not worthy of salvation are not advocates to the Father for any one of us. The same Apostle who insists so strongly on the sole mediatorship of Christ, earnestly beseeches the prayers of his brethren: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, that ye work with me in your prayers for me to God" (Rom., xvi, 30); and he himself prays for them: "I give thanks to my God in every remembrance of you, always in all my prayers making supplication for you all" (Phil., i, 3, 4). If the prayers of the brethren on earth do not derogate from the glory and dignity of the Mediator, Christ, neither do the prayers of the saints in heaven. (3) As regards the proof from Holy Scripture and the Fathers, we can show that the principle and the practice of invoking the saints is clearly laid down in both. That the angels have an interest in the welfare of men is clear from Christ's words: "There shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance" (Luke, xv, 10). In verse 7 He says simply: "There shall be joy in heaven." Cf. Mt. xxiii, 37: "That the angels pray for men is plain from the vision of the Prophet Zacharias: "And the angel of the Lord answered, and said: O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem ... and the Lord answered the angel ... good words, comfortable words" (Zach., i, 12, 13). And the angel Raphael says: "When thou didst pray with tears ... I offered thy prayer to the Lord" (Tob., xii, 12). The combination of the prayers both of angels and saints is seen in the vision of St. John: "And another angel came, and stood before the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer it before the Lord of the earth, and before the golden altar, which is before the throne of God. And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God from the hand of the angel" (Apoc., viii, 3, 4). God Himself commanded Abimelech to have recourse to Abrahams' intercession: "He shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live ... And when Abraham prayed, God healed Abimelech" (Gen., xx, 7, 17). So, too, in the case of Job's friends He said: "Go to my servant Job, and offer for yourselves a holocaust; and my servant Job shall pray for you: his face I will accept" (Job, xliii, 8). Christ's intercession is instanced in passages in this same Book of Job: "Call now if there be any that will answer thee, and turn to some of the saints" (v, 1); "If there shall be an angel speaking for him ... He shall have mercy on him, and shall say: Deliver him, that he may not go down to corruption" (xxxii, 23). "They [the angels] appear as intercessors for men with God, bringing men's needs before Him, mediating in their behalf. This work is easily connected with their general office of labouring for the good of men" (Dillmann on Job, p. 44). Moses is constantly spoken of as "mediator"; "I am the mediator between God and you" (Deut., v, 23; cf. Gal., iii, 19, 20). It is true that in none of the passages of the Old Testament mention is made of prayer to the saints, i.e. holy men already departed from this life; but this is in keeping with the imperfect knowledge of the state of the dead, who were still in Limbo. The general principle of intercession and invocation of fellow-creatures is, however, stated in terms which admit of no denial; and this principle would in due course be applied to the saints as soon as their position was defined. In the New Testament the number of the saints already departed would be comparatively small in the early days. The greatest of the Fathers in the succeeding centuries speak plainly both of the doctrine and practice of intercession and invocation. "But not the High Priest [Christ] alone prays for those who pray sincerely, but also the angels ... as also the souls of the just who have sinned after this fashion: the "koumoussai, klovion pseushman, Origen, "De Oratienne", n. xi, in P. G., XI, 448). In many other places Origen uses similar expressions; indeed it may be said that there is hardly any treatise or homily in which he does not refer to the intercession of the angels and saints, e.g. T. Cyprian, writing to P. Corbulo, says: "Let each of us be mutually mindful of each other, let us ever pray for each other, and if one of us shall, by the speediness of
the Divine vouchsafement, depart hence first, let our love continue in the presence of the Lord, let not prayer for our brethren and sisters cease in the presence of the mercy of the Father” (Ep. ivii, in P. L., IV, 358). “To those who would faint stand, neither the guardianship of saints nor the defences of angels are wanting” (St. Hilary, “In Ps. cxxxvii,” n. 8, 6, in P. L., 682). “Do those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God, by their prayers and intercessions, may receive our petitions” (St. Cyril of Jerusalem, “Cat. Myst.”, v. in P. G., XXXIII, 1113). (See Renault, “Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio,” Paris, 1716.)

We readily admit that the doctrine of the intercession of the saints is a development from the teaching of Scripture and that the practice is open to abuse. But if the carefully-worded and wholesome decrees of the Council of Trent be adhered to, there is nothing in the doctrine or practice which deserves the condemnation expressed in Article xxii of the Anglican religion. Indeed the High Church Anglicans contend that it is not the invocation of saints that is here rejected, but only the “Romanian doctrine,” i.e. the excesses prevailing at the time and afterwards condemned by the Council of Trent. “In principle there is no question between me and my own self and any other portion of the Catholic Church... Let not that most ancient custom, common to the Universal Church, as well Greek as Latin, of addressing Angels and Saints in the way we have said, be condemned as impious, or as vain and foolish” [Forbes, Bishop of Brechin (Anglican), “Of the True Worship and Necessity of Praying to and for the Holy Trinity, bearing us all in remembrance, petitioning for us the remission of sins, and the fruition of an everlasting kingdom” (St. Gregory of Nyssa, “De vita Euphraemi”, in fin., P. G., XLVI, 560). “Mayest thou [Cyprian] look down from above propitiately upon us, and guide us in word and work, and [or shepherd with me] this sacred flock... gladdening us with a more perfect and clear illumination of the Holy Trinity, before Which thou standest” (St. Gregory of Naz., Orat. xvi—according to others, xxiv—of De S. Cypr., P. G., XXXV, 1193). “In like manner does Gregory pray to St. Athanasius (Orat. xxii. “In laud. S. Athan.”, P. G., XXXV, 1128). “O holy choir! O sacred band! O unbroken host of warriors! O common guardians of the human race! Ye gracious sharers of our cares! Ye co-operators in our prayer! Most powerful intercessors!” (St. Basil, “Hom. in XL Mart.”, P. G., XXXI, 524). “May Peter, who wept so efficaciously for himself, weep for us and turn towards us Christ’s benignant countenance” (St. Ambrose, “Hexaem.”, V, xxxv, n. 90, in P. L., XIV, 242). St. Jerome has been quoted above. St. John Chrysostom frequently speaks of invocation in his homilies on the saints, e.g. “When thou perceivest that God is chastising thee, fly not to His enemies... but to His friends, the martyrs, the saints, and those who were pleasing to Him, and who have great power” (αρτύττου, “baldness of speech”—Orat. VIII., “Adv. Jud.”, n. 6, in P. G., XLIV, 937). “He that wears the purple, layeth not in the steads begging of the saints to be his patrons with God; and he that wears the diadem be the Tent-maker and the Fisherman as patrons, even though they be dead” (“Hom. xxvi, in II. Ep. ad Cor.”, n. 5, in P. G., LXI, 581). “If the Lord’s table be we do not commemorate martyrs in the way that we do others who rest in peace so as to pray for them, but rather that they may pray for us that we may follow in their footsteps” (St. Augustine, “In Joam.”, tr. lxxxiv, in P. L., XXXIV, 1847). Prayers to the saints occur in almost all the ancient literatures. Thus in the Liturgy of St. Basil: “By the command of Thine only-begotten Son we communicate with the memory of Thy saints... by whose prayers and supplications have mercy upon us all, and deliver us for the sake of Thy holy name which is invoked upon us”. Cf. the Liturgy of Jerusalem, the Liturgy of St. Gregory, the Copt Liturgy of St. Cyril, etc. That those commemorations are not later additions is manifest from the words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem: “We then commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God by their prayers and intercessions may receive our petitions” (“Cat. Myst.”, v. in P. G., XXXIII, 1113). (See Renault, “Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio,” Paris, 1716.)

Intercession, Episcopal, the right to intercede for criminals, which was granted by the secular power to the bishops of the Early Church. This right originated rather in the great respect in which the episcopal dignity was held, than in any definite enactment. Reference to its existence is made in the seventh canon of the Council of Sardica about 344 (Mansi, “Collectio Amplissimae Conciliorum”, III. It is also mentioned by St. Augustine (Ep. cccxiv and cccxxi, in Migne, P. L., XXXIII, 365) and St. Jerome (Ep. in Migne, P. L., XCVII, 527-40), and by Socrates in his “Church History” (v. xiv, vii, xvii). St. Augustine repeatedly interceded for criminals with Macedonianus, who was then governor of Africa (Ep. clii—clii, in Migne, P. L., XXXIII, 652). Martin of Tours interceded with Emperor Theodosius I in 387 on behalf of the inhabitants of Antioch, who had wantonly destroyed the imperial statues in that city. St. Ambrose induced Emperor Theodosius I to enact a law which forbade the expropriation of property until thirty days after sentence had been passed. It was the purpose of this law to...
leave room for clemency and to prevent the punishing of the innocent [see Bossuet, "Galila Orthodoxa", pars I, lib. II, cap. v, in "Œuvres Complètes", XII (Bar-le-Duc, 1870), 98]. To enable them to exercise their right of intercession, the bishops had free access to the prisons (Codex Theodossi, app., cap. xiii). They were even exhort to the visit prisoners every Wednesday and Saturday, and investigate the cause of their imprisonment, and to admonish the supervisors of the prisons to treat those committed to their charge with Christian charity. In case the prison-keepers were found to be inhuman or remiss in their duty towards their prisoners, the bishops were to report them to the emperor. One of the bishops, which were almost unlimited in this respect, were somewhat regulated for the bishops of the Eastern Empire in "Codex Justiniani", lib. I, tit. 4: "De episcopali auditus"; for the bishops of the Western Empire in the "Edicta Theodoricæ", cap. xiv (Mon. Germ. Leg., V). Closely allied with the right of episcopal intercession was the right of asylum or sanctuary (see Right of Asylum), and the right and duty of the bishops to protect orphans, widows, and other unfortunate. Thus Theodoret, Bishop of Cy-rus, interceded with Empress Pulcheria in behalf of those who were in the care of the Third Council of Carthage, held in 399, requested the emperor to accede to the wishes of the bishops by appointing advocates to plead the causes of the poor before the courts, while the Council of Mâcon, held in 555, forbade all civil authorities to begin judicial proceedings against widows and orphans without previously notifying the bishop of the diocese to which the accused belonged.

**Klaus, Konziljahrbuch der christlichen Altstädte, I (Freiburg im Br., 1939), 318.**

**Bartholomeus, Gesch. der Kirchenl. Armenienpfl (Freiburg im Br., 1854), 133-9; Eales in Dictionary of Christian Antiquities (London, 1878-80), s. v.; Lallemand, Histoire de la Charité, I (Paris, 1900).**

---

MICHAIL OTT.

**Interdict (Lat. interdictum, from inter and dicere)**, originally in Roman law, an interlocutory edict of the priest, especially in matter affecting the right of possession; it still preserves this meaning in both Roman and canonic law. In present ecclesiastical use the word denotes, in general, a prohibition. In addition to the definite meaning it has when referring to the object of this article, the term is often loosely employed in a wider and rather untechnical sense. We speak of a priest, a church, or a practice of devotion as being, for example, in the interdict of the bishop of any particular place or of the pope. One who either by canon law or by the stricture of his ordinary is forbidden to exercise his sacerdotal functions; a church building that has been secularized, or one in which Divine service is temporarily suspended, because the edifice has incurred "pollution" or lost its consecration; finally, extraordinary practices of devotion are said to be interdicted. But, strictly speaking, interdict is applied only to persons and churches affected by the penal measure or censure called "interdict", and it is exclusively in this sense of the word that the subject is treated here. After explaining its nature and effect, we shall mention the interdicts in force by common canon law.

I. An interdict is a censure, or prohibition, excluding the faithful from participation in certain holy things (D'Annibale, "Summula", I, n. 369). These holy things are all those pertaining to Christian worship, and are divided into three classes: (1) the Divine Office, which includes the Mass and the Litany; all acts performed by clerics as such, and having reference to worship; (2) the sacraments, excepting those private administrations of those that are of necessity; (3) ecclesiastical burial, including all funeral services. This prohibition varies in degree, according to the different kinds of interdicts to be enumerated:

First, interdicts are either local or personal; the former affect territories or sacred buildings directly, and persons indirectly; the latter directly affect persons. Canonical authors add a third kind, the mixed interdict, which affects directly and immediately both persons and places; if, for instance, the interdict is issued against a town and its inhabitants, the latter are subject to it, even when they are outside of the place. The mixed interdict is poi. Local interdicts, like personal interdicts, may be general or particular. A general local interdict is one affecting a whole territory, district, town, etc., and this was the ordinary interdict of the Middle Ages; a particular local interdict is one affecting, for example, a specific chapel, or a specific individual. Often it is one falling on a given body or group of people as a class, e.g. on a chapter, the clergy or people of a town, of a community; a particular personal interdict is one affecting certain individuals as such, for instance, a given bishop, a given cleric. Finally, the interdict is total if the prohibition extends to all the sacred things mentioned above; otherwise it is called partial. A special kind of partial interdict is that which forbids one to enter a church, interdictum ab ingressu ecclesie, mentioned by certain texts. Omitting the mixed interdict, which does not form a distinct class, we have therefore: (1) the general local interdicts; (2) particular local interdicts; (3) the general personal interdicts; (4) particular personal interdicts; (5) prohibitions against entering a church. We may add (6) the prohibition obliging the clergy to abstain from celebrating the Divine offices, cessatio a divinis, a measure somewhat akin to a particular local interdict, only that it is not imposed on account of any crime on the part of those whom it affects. This short account shows us that under the same name are grouped penal measures rather different in nature, but having in common a prohibition of certain sacred things.

Interdict differs from excommunication, in that it does not cut off one from the communion of the faithful or from Christian society, though the acts of religion forbidden in both cases are almost identical. It differs from suspension also in this respect: the latter affects the powers of clerics, inasmuch as they are clerics, while the interdict affects the rights of the faithful as such, and does not directly affect clerics as such but only as members of the Church. Of course, it follows that the clergy cannot exercise their functions towards those under interdict, or in interdicted places or buildings, but their powers are not directly affected, as happens in case of suspension; their jurisdiction remains unaffected, which under excommunication an individual being punished, without imperilling the validity of his acts of jurisdiction. This shows that an interdict is more akin to excommunication than to suspension.

Whereas excommunication is exclusively a censure, intended to lead a guilty person back to repentance, an interdict, like suspension, may be imposed either as a censure or as a vindictive punishment. In both cases there must have been a grave crime, if the penalty has been inflicted for an indefinite period and with a view to making the guilty one amend his evil ways, it is imposed as a censure; if, however, it is imposed for a definite time, and no reparation is demanded of the individuals at fault, it is inflicted as a punishment. Consequently the interdicts still in vogue in virtue of the Constitution "Apostolis Sedis" and the Council of Trent are censures; whilst the interdict recently (1908) placed by Pius X on the town of Adria for disorderly conduct and immorality is a punishment. Strictly speaking, only the particular personal interdict is in all cases a perfect censure, because it alone affects definite persons, while the other interdicts do not affect the individuals except indirectly and inasmuch as they form part of a body or belong to the interdicted territory or place. That is also the reason why only personal particular interdicts, including the
prohibition to enter a church, suppose a personal fault. In all other cases, on the contrary, although a fault has been committed, and it is intended to punish the guilty persons or make them amend, the interdict may affect and does affect some who are innocent, because it is not aimed directly at the individual but at the moral body, e.g. a chapter, monastery, or all the inhabitants of a district or a town. If a chapter incur an interdict (Const. "Apost. Sedis"); interd., n. 1) for appealing to a future general council, the canons who did not vote for the forbidden resolution are, notwithstanding, obliged to observe the interdict. And the general local interdict suppressing all the churches in a town will with equal effect fall on the innocent as well as the guilty. Such interdicts are therefore inflicted for the faults of moral bodies, of public authorities as such, of a whole population, and not for the faults of private individuals.

Who have the power of imposing an interdict, and how does it cease? In general, the reader may be referred to CENSURES, ECCLESIASTICAL; and EXCOMMUNICATION. We shall add a few brief remarks. Any prelate having jurisdiction in foro externo can impose an interdict on his subjects or his territory. It may be provided for in the law and then, like other censures (q.v.), it is suspended or lifted. A personal interdict is removed by absolution; other interdicts are said to be "raised", but this does not imply any act relative to the individuals under interdict; when imposed as a punishment these interdicts may cease on the expiration of a definite time.

(1) A general local interdict is, therefore, for a whole population, town, province, or region, the almost complete suspension of the liturgical and sacramental Christian life. Examples of it exist as early as the ninth century, under the name of excommunication (see in particular the Council of Limoges of 1031). In 1213, during the time of the temple of the king of France, when Philip II Augustus repudiated Ingeburga to marry Agnes of Meran; and that on the Kingdom of England in 1208, to support the election of Stephen Langton to the See of Canterbury against the temporal power. This new resource was made vigorous use of. It will suffice to recall the interdict imposed in 1200 on the Kingdom of France, when Philip II Augustus repudiated Ingeburga to marry Agnes of Meran; and that on the Kingdom of England in 1208, to support the election of Stephen Langton to the See of Canterbury against the temporal power. This new resource was made vigorous use of. It will suffice to recall the interdict imposed in 1200 on the Kingdom of France, when Philip II Augustus repudiated Ingeburga to marry Agnes of Meran; and that on the Kingdom of England in 1208, to support the election of Stephen Langton to the See of Canterbury against the temporal power. This new resource was made vigorous use of. It will suffice to recall the interdict imposed in 1200 on the Kingdom of France, when Philip II Augustus repudiated Ingeburga to marry Agnes of Meran; and that on the Kingdom of England in 1208, to support the election of Stephen Langton to the See of Canterbury against the temporal power. This new resource was made vigorous use of.

(2) The particular local interdict is also raised by actual effects, but they are limited to the interdicted place or church. The above-mentioned mitigations, however, are not allowed. Whoever knowingly celebrates or causes to be celebrated the Divine offices in an interdicted place incurs ipso facto the prohibition against entering the church, and then the interdict becomes irregular (C. xviii, "De sent. excomm." in VI), but not if he administers a sacrament to an interdicted individual, as the law has not legislated for such a case.

(3) The general personal interdict, which we have seen, may be combined with the local interdict, has the same effects for all the persons who form or will form part of the group, community, or moral person under interdict; all the canons of a chapter, all the religious of a congregation, the inhabitants of a town, all those domiciled in the place, etc. They, however, escape from the interdict who are not members or who cease to be members of the body affected, e.g. a canon appointed to another benefice, a stranger who leaves the town, etc. But the mere change of locality has no liberating effect, and the interdict follows the individual members of the body wherever they may go.

(4) The particular personal interdict, which is a real censure, affects individuals much in the same way as excommunication. They may not assist at the Divine offices or at Mass, and if they are interdicted by reason of their shame of sin, they are even obliged to withdraw it is not necessary to suspend the service, since, after all, the interdict does not deprive them of the communion of the faithful. They may not demand to receive the sacraments, except Penance and the Viaticum, and it is not lawful to administer them. They are to be deprived of ecclesiastical burial, but Mass and the ordinaries may be said for them. A cleric violating the interdict becomes irregular.

(5) The interdict against entering the church is a real censure, intended to bring about the amendment of the erring one; it prohibits him from taking part in Divine service in the church and from being accorded any social service in it. But it is possible for the offender to withdraw if he had not incurred any censure; he can attend Divine service and receive the sacraments in a private oratory and pray in the church when service is not being held in it. The individual is absolved after due satisfaction for his fault.

(6) The cession from Divine service, cessatio a divinis, follows the rules of the local interdict, from which it differs, not in its effects, but only because the fault for which it is imposed is not the fault of the clerics who are prohibited from celebrating the Divine service. It forbids the holding of Divine service and the administration of the sacraments in a church at a fixed place. It is a manifestation of sorrow and a kind of reparation for a grievous wrong done to a holy place. This cessatio a divinis is not imposed ipso facto by the law; it is imposed by the ordinary when and under the conditions that he judges suitable.

II. There are at present five interdicts: fata sententia, two of which are mentioned in the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis", two decreed by the Council of Trent, and one added by the Constitution "Romano Pontifici" of 23 August, 1873:

(1) "Universities, colleges, and chapters, whatso- ever be their name, that appeal from the ordinances or mandates of the reigning Roman pontiff to a future general council, incur an interdict specially reserved to
the Roman pontiff." This interdict is imposed for the same crime as the specially reserved excommunication no. 4 (see EXCOMMUNICATION, VII, A, (a)), but the excommunication falls on the individuals, and the interdict on the group, or moral persons, by whatever name they be called, and who cannot be excommunicated as such.

(2) "Those who knowingly celebrate or cause to be celebrated the Divine offices in places interdicted by the ordinary or his delegate, or by the law; those who admit persons excommunicated by name to the Divine offices, the sacraments of the Church, or to ecclesiastical burial, incur pleno jure the interdict against entering the church, until they have made amends sufficient in the opinion of him whose order they have contemned." This interdict, which is borrowed, except for a few minor modifications, from c. viii, "De privilegiis", in VI of Boniface VIII, is therefore reserved to the competent prelate. Its object is to ensure the observance, on the one hand, of the local interdict, and, on the other, of excommunication by name (see EXCOMMUNICATION, vol. V, p. 690, sub-title Viandol and Tintori).

(3) The Council of Trent (Sess. VI, cap. i, "De Ref.") imposes on bishops the duty of residence; it prescribes that those who absent themselves without a sufficient reason for six continuous months are to be deprived of a quarter of their annual revenue; then of another quarter for a second six months' absence; after which, the council continued, "as their contumacy increases ... the metropolitan will be bound to denounce to the Roman pontiff, by letter or by messenger, within three months, his absent suffragan bishops, and the senior resident suffragan bishop will be obliged to denounce his absent metropolitan, under penalty of interdict against entering the church, incurred eo ipso." The obligation of denouncing begins, therefore, only after an entire year's absence, and the interdict is incurred only if the denunciation has not been made within the next three months.

(4) The Council of Trent (Sess. VII, cap. x, "De Ref.") forbids chapters, during the vacancy of a see, to grant dimissory letters within a year dating from the vacancy, unless to clerics who are archati, i.e. obliged to obtain ordination on account of a benefice; this prohibition carries with it the penalty of interdict. The Council of Trent having later (Sess. XXIV, cap. xvi, "De Ref.") obliged the chapter to name a vicar capitular, the interdict can only be incurred by the chapter only for dimissory letters granted during these eight days. It is disputed whether or not the vicar capitular would incur the interdict for this fault (Penneschi in Const. "Ap. Sedis", II, 469).

(5) The Constitution "Romanus Pontifex" aims at preserving the interests of the bishops and named by the civil authorities from undertaking the administration of their church under the name or title of vicar capitular. Besides the excommunication incurred by the chapters and the person elected (see EXCOMMUNICATION, sub-title Excommunications Proscribed in the Constitution "Ap. Sedis"), Pius IX imposes on "those among them who have received the episcopal order a suspension from the exercise of their pontifical powers and the interdict against entering the church, pleno jure and without any declaration."

Canonists usually treat of interdict in their commentaries on St. Thomas, Vol. II, Bo. V, Moralis, dealing with 14 aspects of the treatment on censures (De censura). One of the best works is that of Jahr, "De censura moralis" (3rd ed., 1905). For details consult the numerous commentaries on the Constitution Apostolica Sedis. Special works include ancient writers, Filial, De censura (Lyons, 1608); Suarez, De censura (Corinth, 1603); Altheier, De censura ecclesiastica (Rome, 1616). Among recent writers see Köhler, Der Kirchenstrafe in Kirchenrecht, v. v.; Wattenwyl, Die kirchlichen Sanktionsen (Mainz, 1899); Hilarius & Schneiders, Constitutiones et Decretalia (Munich, 1861); Neverkens, Geschichte und Strafrecht (Cologne, 1874); Taunton, The Laws of the Church (London, 1900), 5 v., Intercursi; Smith, Elements of Ecclesiastical Law (New York, 1884); Santelmann, Prozess. Jur. Canonici (New York, 1905); Lauterbach, Inst. Jus Eccl. (Freiburg, 1905), 525-532; Le Saute, De Jure Divi. Eccl. (Rome, 1900).

A. BOUDINSON.

Interest (Lat. interest; Fr. intérêt; Germ. Interesse). The mental state called interest has received much attention in recent psychological literature. This is largely due to the German philosopher Herbert (q. v.). The important position he has won for it in the theory of education makes it deserving of some treatment in The Catholic Encyclopedia. Psychologists have disputed as to the exact meaning to be assigned to the term and the precise nature of the mental state.

Psychology of Interest.—Interest has been variously defined as a kind of consciousness accompanying and stimulating attention, a feeling pleasant or painful directing attention—the pleasurable or painful aspect of a process of attention—and as identical with attention itself. Thus it may be said, I attend to what interests me; and, again, that to be just noticed and to attend are identical. The term interest is used also to indicate a permanent mental disposition. Thus I may have an interest in certain subjects, though they are not an object of my present attention. However interest be defined, and whether it be described as a cause of attention, as an aspect of attention, or as identical with attention, its special significance lies in its intensity of function, its mental activity of attention. Attention may be defined as cognitive or intellectual energy directed towards any object. It is essentially selective, it concentrates consciousness on part of the field of mental vision, whilst it ignores other parts. Attention is also progressive in character. It focuses and directs our mental effort—this in order to attain a clearer and more distinct view. It results in a deeper and more lasting impression, and therefore plays a vital part both in cognitive act and in the growth of knowledge as a whole. The English Associationist school of psychology and most Empiricists, in treating of the genesis of knowledge, seem to look on the intensity or frequency of the stimulus as the most influential factor in the process of cognition. As a matter of fact, what the mind takes in depends almost entirely on this selective action of attention.

Out of the total mass of impressions, streaming in at any moment through the various channels of sense, it is only those to which attention is directed that rise to the level of intellectual life, or take real hold of the mind. What these are will be determined by interest. We are interested in what is connected with our personal experience, especially in what is partly new, yet partly familiar. Pleasant feelings and painful feelings are original excitants of attention; there are other experiences also—neutral perhaps in themselves, but associated with these latter—which generate fear or hope, and so become interesting. Though our attention may be temporarily attracted by any sudden shock or unexpected impression of unusual intensity, we do not speak of this as interesting, and our attention soon wanes. Isolated experiences, except in so far as they may stimulate the intellect to seek to correlate them with some previous cognitions, do not easily hold the mind. Repeated efforts are required to keep our attention fixed on an unfamiliar branch of study (as e. g. a new language or science). But in proportion as each successive act of observation or understanding leaves a deposit in the form of an idea in the memory, ready to be awakened by partially similar experiences in the future, there is gradually built up in the mind a group or system of ideas constituting our abiding knowledge of the subject. Such series of experiences, with the group of ideas thus deposited in the memory, render similar acts of cognition easy and agreeable in the future.
In fact they develop a kind of appetite for future related experiences, which are henceforth assimilated, or, in Herbartian language, apperceived, with facility and satisfaction. The latent group of ideas bearing on a subject, while it may lie hidden in the sensory consciousness, may become the permanent disposition of the mind, whilst the feeling of the process of apperception, or assimilation, is interest viewed as a form of actual consciousness. But an event of a bizarre or novel character, which we may find difficulty in comprehending or assimilating with our ideas, may make clear our mind. The strange, the horrible, may thus awaken at least temporarily a keen, if morbid, interest. Still, in so far as such experiences may excite fear or anxiety, they come under the general principle that interest is associated with personal pleasure or pain.

Broadly speaking, then, all those things which arouse or sustain non-voluntary or spontaneous attention are interesting, whilst phenomena to which we can attend only with voluntary effort are uninteresting. The child is interested in its food and its play, also in any operations associated with pleasure or pain. In the past, the body is interested in its growth; in those exercises with which he has come to connect with his own well-being, and in branches of study which have already effected such a lodging in the mind that new ideas and items of information are readily assimilated and associated with what has gone before. Men are interested in those subjects which have been interwoven and connected with the main occupations of their lives.

Pedagogics.—The psychology of interest being thus understood, its capital importance in the work of education becomes obvious. It is in its insistence on the value of this mental and moral force, and its spiritual and practical treatment of it in application to the business of teaching, that Herbart's chief importance as an educationalist lies. In proportion as the teacher can awaken and sustain the interest of the pupil, so much greater will be the facility, the rapidity, and the tenacity of the mental acquisition of the latter. It must be admitted that, in beginning most branches of knowledge, a number of "dry" facts, which possess little interest of themselves for the child, have usually to be learned by sheer labour. The spontaneous attention of the pupil will not fix on and adhere with satisfaction to the ideas presented in the opening paragraphs. Here the teacher may be called upon to demand the effort of voluntary attention, even though it be not pleasant, on the part of the pupil. Still, he will wisely do his utmost to make some of the future utility of the immediate lesson intelligible to the student, and in this way attach media to interest to that which is dull and unattractive in itself. Moreover, as the protracted effort of attention to what is in itself uninteresting is fatiguing, he will keep the lessons in these subjects short at first, and vary the monotony by enlivening and useful bits of information, illustrations, comments, and the like, which will arrest the mind and attract attention to the substance of the lesson. At this stage the master aims at being an interesting teacher; he cannot as yet make his subject interesting, which, however, should be his ultimate goal.

But, as the student advances, there is being formed in his mind an increasing group of cognitions, a growing mass of ideas about this branch of study, which makes the entrance of each new idea connected with it easier and more welcome. There is a feeling of satisfaction as each new item fits into the old, and is assimilated or "apperceived" by the latter. The pupil begins to feel that the ideas he already possesses give him latitude and power to interest himself in the subject of his study. He has become conscious of an extension of this power with each enlargement of his knowledge, and the desire for more knowledge begins to manifest itself. Here we have apperceptive attention or immediate interest. To generate this immediate interest in the subject itself being a main object of the teacher, this purpose should determine his exposition of the subject as a whole, and also that the student shall feel himself interested from day of day. His exposition should be orderly, proceeding logically with proper divisions: the more important principles or ideas should be firmly fixed by repetition, the subdivisions located in their proper places, and their connexion with the heads under which they fall made clear. The main idea of the chapter or subject introduced into the mind of the pupil are built up into a rational or organised system. This secures greater command of what is already known, as well as greater facility in the reception of further knowledge, and so expedites the growth of interest. But besides this orderliness in the exposition there is the need of the matter, which might be formal and lifeless, the teacher must be continually adapting his instruction to the present condition of the pupil's mind. He must constantly keep in view what ideas the student has already acquired. He has to stir up the related topic of interest he must ensure that they shall excite the appetite of curiosity, when about to communicate further information; he has to show the connexion and bind the new item with the previous knowledge by comparison, illustration, and explanation. Finally, he is to be alive to every opportunity to generalise; and to show how the information is to be applied by setting suitable exercise or problems to be worked out by the pupil himself. He thus leads the pupil to realise his increase of power, which is one of the most effective means of fostering active interest both in the subject itself and in the relation of its various parts with the whole.

Wholesome instruction, especially since Herbart, insists on the value of interest not only as a means, but as an educational end in itself. For the Herbartian school the aim of education should be the formation of a man of "many-sided interest." This is to be attained by the judicious cultivation of the various faculties—intellectual, emotional, and moral—that is by the realization of man's entire being with all its aptitudes. It may be conceded that, with certain qualifications and reservations, there is a substantial amount of truth in this view. Worthy interests enable and enrich human life both in point of utility and beauty. But is it not necessary, physical, pampered, for exercise; man's activities will find an outlet; the capacities of his soul are given to be realized. Ceteris paribus, one good test of the educational value of any branch of study, and of the efficiency of the method by which it has been taught, is to be found in the permanence and actuality of interest that is by the realization of man's entire being with all its aptitudes. It may be conceded that, with certain qualifications and reservations, there is a substantial amount of truth in this view. Worthy interests enable and enrich human life both in point of utility and beauty. But is it not necessary, physical, pampered, for exercise; man's activities will find an outlet; the capacities of his soul are given to be realized. Ceteris paribus, one good test of the educational value of any branch of study, and of the efficiency of the method by which it has been taught, is to be found in the permanence and actuality of interest that
sided interest or culture, however rich and varied, constitutes morality or supplies for religion, still it may be readily acknowledged that a judicious equipment of worthy interests, intellectual, aesthetic, and social, is a powerful ally in the battle with evil passions, and also a precious means of human well-being with which a wisely planned scheme of education can equip the human soul.

See article on HERBART AND HERBARTIANISM, also HERBART, SCIENCE IN FINE ARTS (New York and London); STRUTT, Analytic Psychology (London, 1898-97); DE GARMO, Interest and Education (New York and London, 1903); ADAMS, Business Ethics (New York and London, v.); SANTILLÁN (Cambridge, 1883); JAMES, Talks to Teachers (New York and London, 1901), xi.

MICHAEL MAHER.

Interest.—The subject will be divided as follows: (1) notion of interest; (2) legitimacy of lending at interest; (3) just rate of interest.—(1) Interest is a value exacted or promised over and above the restitution of a borrowed capital. Moratory interest, that is interest due as an indemnity or a penalty for delay in payment, is distinguished from compensatory interest, which indemnifies the lender for the danger he really runs in losing his capital, the loss that he suffers or the gain that he might have made had he been investing himself of his capital during the period of the loan, and from lucrative interest, which is an emolument that the lender would not gain without lending. Interest originates in the loan of goods of consumption, which permits the borrower to expend or to destroy the things lent, on condition of giving back an equal number of the same kind or quality. The sum to be paid for the usage of an article, which must itself be given back, is called hire. Everything which is consumed by usage: corn, wine, oil, fruit, etc., can be the matter of a loan (former sense), but ordinarily it is a sum of money which is lent.

(2) Is it permitted to lend at interest? Formerly (see USURY) the Church rigorously condemned the exacting of anything over and above capital, except when, by reason of some special circumstance, the lender was in danger of losing his capital or could not advance his loan of money without exposing himself to a loss or to deprivation of a gain. These special reasons, which authorize the charging of interest, are called extrinsic titles. Besides these compensatory interests, the Church has likewise admitted moratory interest. In our day, when the general practice of lending at interest, that is to say, she authorizes the impost, without considering having to inquire if, on lending his money, he has suffered a loss or deprived himself of a gain, provided he demand a moderate interest for the money he lends. This demand is never unjust. Charity alone, not justice, can oblige anyone to make a gratuitous loan (see the replies of the Penitentiary and of the Holy Office since 1830). What is the reason for this change in the attitude of the Church towards the exacting of interest? As may be more fully seen in the article USURY, this difference is due to economical circumstances. The price of goods is regulated by common valuation, and the latter by the difficulty of their possession ordinarily brings in a given centre. Now, today, otherwise than formerly, one can commonly employ one's money fruitfully, at least by putting it into a syndicate. Hence, to-day, the mere possession of money means a certain value. Whoever hands over this possession can claim in return this value. Thus it is that one acts in demanding an interest.

(3) Even today one can still sin against justice by demanding too high an interest, or usury, as it is called. What interest then is just and moderate? Theoretically, and in an abstract way, the fair rate of interest is nearly that which, in a determined case, it nearly corresponds, for the interest being guaranteed, whilst the profit is uncertain, we must discount the value of an assurance premium from the average profit. Accordingly, in a determined centre, if those who sink their money in buildings, land, or industrial undertakings generally look for a profit of 6 per cent, the just rate of interest will be about 4 or 5 per cent. This rate covers the risks and ordinary inconveniences of lending. But if one had to run special risks or had to give up an extraordinary premium, one might in all justice exact a higher rate of interest. Such, therefore, is the theoretical rule. In practice, however, as even the answer of the Sacred Penitentiary shows (18 April, 1889), the best course is to conform to the average practice of just and honest men, precisely as one does with regard to other prices, and, as happens in the case of such prices, particular circumstances influence the rate of interest, either by increasing or lowering it. In this way, the security offered by advances to the governments of wealthy countries and those that cover mortgages diminish the rate for public-loans and loans on mortgage. On the contrary, the interest on shipping and mercantile business is higher than that in civil business, on account of the greater uncertainty in sea voyages and in commercial enterprises.

A. VERMEERSCH.

INTERIMS (Lat. interim, meanwhile), temporary settlements in matters of religion, entered into by Emperor Charles V (1519-56) with the Protestants.

I. THE INTERIM OF RATIBSON, published at the conclusion of the imperial diet, 29 July, 1541. It was based on the results of previous conferences between Catholics and Protestants, in which an agreement had been reached on the idea of justification and other points of doctrine. Consequently the imperial "recess" enacted that the adjustment of the religious question should be postponed until the next general council or imperial diet; that meanwhile the Protestants should not go beyond or against the articles agreed upon; that an ecclesiastical reform be inaugurated by the prelates; that the Peace of Nuremberg (1532) should be maintained; that monasteries and chapter-houses should remain intact; that the ecclesiastics should retain their possessions; that the Empire should be to one side; that all judicial proceedings in matters of religion should be suspended; that the imperial court of justice (Reichskammergericht) should remain as before; and that the recess of Augsburg (1530) should remain in force. Owing to the opposition of the Protestants, Charles V in a secret declaration made concessions to them, which practically nullified the recess. The articles agreed upon were to be accepted in the sense of their theologians; the monasteries and chapter-houses might be called on to inaugurate a reform; the ecclesiastics, monasteries, and chapter-houses, that had embraced the Confession of Augsburg, were to remain in the full possession of their property; the Protestants were not to compel the subjects of Catholic princes to embrace their Faith, but if anyone came to them spontaneously, he was not to be hindered; the members of the imperial and ecclesiastical body, if molested, if they turned Protestants; and the recess of Augsburg was to have force only in matters not appertaining to religion.

II. THE INTERIM OF AUGSBURG, published at the conclusion of the imperial diet, 30 June, 1548. In forty-six chapters, it comprised statements on matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical discipline. The points of doctrine were all explained in the sense of Catholic dogma, but couched in the mildest and
vaguest terms; and wherever it was feasible, the form and the concept approached the Protestant view of those subjects. In matters of ecclesiastical discipline two important concessions were made to the Protestants, viz., the marriage of the clergy, and Confirmation, both kinds of which were abolished. An imperial ordinance enjoined on the Catholic clergy the execution of reforms in the choice and ordination of ecclesiastics, the administration of the sacraments, and other similar matters.

III. The Internim Zella.—The Internim of Augsburg was meant principally for the Protestants, whom it was desired to return to the Catholic Faith was looked for; but nearly everywhere they very strongly opposed it. In order to make it less objectionable, a modification was introduced by Melanchthon and other Protestant divines, commissioned thereto by Elector Maurice of Saxony (1521–23). In a meeting held at Alt-Zella in November, 1548, they explained in a Protestant sense what they considered essential points of doctrine, e. g. justification and others; they accepted the non-essentials or adiaphora, such as confirmation, Mass, the use of candles, vestments, holy days, etc. The document then drawn up became known as the Internim of Zella and was published in December, 1548. In a similarInternim held at Leipzig in December, 1548, it was adopted by the estates of the Electorate of Saxony, and was then called the Internim of Leipzig, or the Great Internim.

Interdict. Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V. (Freiburg im Br., 1879); IDERM, Gesch. der Papste, V (Freiburg im Br., 1869); JANSEN-PASTOR, Geschichte des deutschen Rechts im 19. Jahrhundert (Heidelberg, 1896); KATZ in Kirchenies. (Freiburg im Br., 1899), s. v. Internim; ISSLEIB in Realency. für prot. Theol. (Leipzig, 1901), s. v. Internim.

FRANCIS J. SCHAFFER.

International Arbitration. See Papal Arbitration.

Internuncio (Lat. inter, between; nuntius, messenger), the name given in the Roman Curia to a diplomatic agent who, though not belonging to the five highest classes of the papal diplomatic service (legatus a latere, nuncio with full powers of a legatus a latere, legate, nuncio of the first class, and nuncio of the second class), is, nevertheless, chief of a legation (chef de mission). He may have several subordinates, and, on the other hand, his household may consist only of a private secretary. The nomination of internuncios is fixed by custom, but are, accredited indiscriminately to countries differing widely in ecclesiastical importance, e. g. Luxemburg, Chile, Holland, Brazil. Formerly the powers of an internuncio were necessarily extensive, owing to the lack of telegraph service and the slow postal deliveries; they are now almost entirely confined to routine work. In exceptional cases, extraordinary powers are given to the internuncio, when important affairs are in question. As conditions in the various countries to which internuncios are ordinarily sent differ considerably, their general powers are regulated accordingly; in consequence, no general statement of the duties of any particular internuncio can be made. Nor can the ecclesiastical dignity or position at court of the internuncio be determined with more exactitude. It is safe to say that they are always domestic prelates or titular archbishops. The simple prelate has always been the rule for the internuncio; but an exception was Mgr. Tarnasi. The internuncios accredited to South America in the last century were mostly titular archbishops. At present (summer of 1909), the only internuncios are those in Argentina and Chile, and both are titular archbishops. The earlier arrangements that internuncios should be the title of an Apostolic delegate and envoy extraordinary, no longer obtains. The last case of the kind occurred in Portugal about the middle of the nineteenth century.

Internuncios, when promoted, are appointed nuncios; in rare instances they become Apostolic delegates. Too much confidence must not be placed in earlier works on papal diplomacy, apropos of this office; according to the requirements of the moment, the curia sometimes decreases or diminishes both its scope and its powers.

PAUL MARIA BAUMGARTEN.

Interpretation of Holy Scripture. See Exegesis.

Intolerance. See Toleration.

Introduction. Biblical, a technical name which is usually applied to two distinct, but intimately connected, things. First, it designates the part of Scriptural science which is concerned with topics preliminary to the detailed study and correct exposition of Holy Writ. Next, it is given to a work in which these various topics are actually treated.

I. Scope and Divisions.—As is commonly admitted at the present day, the general object of Biblical introduction is to supply the student of the sacred books of the Old and New Testaments with the knowledge which is necessary, or at least very desirable, for the right interpretation of antiquity. Thus understood, the scope of an introduction to the inspired writings which make up the Bible is substantially that of an introduction to other writings of antiquity. An introduction helps materially the student of the text of these writings to know what is contained and in a precise manner the personal history and actual surroundings of the author to whom each writing is ascribed, to become acquainted with the date of composition and the general form and purpose of the various books were originally written, to realize distinctly the peculiar literary methods employed in their composition, to know something of the various fortunes (alterations, translations, etc.) which have befallen the text in the course of ages, etc. An introduction, too, whether the work for which it is designed be profane or sacred, has usually a limited scope. It is not supposed to treat of each and every topic the knowledge of which might be useful for the right understanding of the books in question. It is justly regarded as sufficient for all practical purposes, when, by the information which it actually imparts, it enables the student to have been taught carefully to start intelligently on the detailed study of their text. Owing, however, to the fact that the books of the Bible are not simply ancient, but also inspired, writings, the scope of Biblical introduction embraces the various questions which are connected with their inspired character, and which, of course, have no place in an introduction to merely human productions. For this same reason, too, certain topics—such as the questions of integrity and veracity—which naturally belong to treatises preliminary to the study of any ancient writing, assume a very special importance in Biblical introduction. A Biblical introduction is frequently and indeed aptly, divided into two parts, general and special, the former embracing the preliminary questions which concern the Bible as a whole, the latter being restricted to those which refer to the separate books of Holy Writ. The field of general introduction has grown so much that it is occupied by several different points by Biblical scholars. It no longer embraces a detailed description of the Oriental languages and of the Hellenistic Greek, but is universally limited, in regard to those languages, to a brief exposition of their leading characteristics. With regard to the questions which pertain to the chronology and chronology of the Bible, some scholars are still of the opinion that they should be dealt with in a general introduction to the study of the Holy Scrip-
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In this introductory section, the author discusses the nature of Biblical introduction. They believe that the sacred books which make up the Bible have been given divine authorship, and it is through the operation of the Holy Ghost Who inspired them. The history of the sacred books and the operation of the Holy Spirit in their composition should be studied as a whole.

The tendency to restrict the object of general introduction to a few questions, particularly those which help directly to determine the value and meaning of the Sacred Writings considered as a whole, is in point of fact, that object, as conceived especially by Catholic scholars, is limited to the great questions of the inspired and canonical character of the Scriptures, their original text and principal translations, the principles and history of their interpretation, and the names of sacred history, history of Biblical Revelation, Biblical theology, history of the religion of Israel. It thus appears that, at the present day, the tendency is to restrict the object of general introduction to a few questions, particularly to those which help directly to determine the value and meaning of the Sacred Writings considered as a whole.

In point of fact, the object of general introduction to the Bible, as the divine authority of the books of either Testament is established by the study of the general introduction to the Bible, the topics treated in the special introduction are chiefly those which bear on the human authority of the separate writings of the Bible. Hence the questions usually studied in connection with each book or with a small group of books, such as the Pentateuch, are those of authorship, unity, integrity, veracity, purpose, source of information, date and place of composition, etc. Instead of the divisions of Biblical introduction which have been set forth, numerous writers, particularly in Germany, adopt a very different grouping of the topics preliminary to the exegetical study of the Sacred Scripture. They devote a first section to the contents, date, authorship, etc., of the separate books, and a second section to a more or less brief statement of the canon, text and versions, etc., of the same books as interpreted collectively. Their division of the topics of Biblical introduction leaves no room for hermeneutics, or scientific exposition of the principles of exegesis, and in this respect, at least, is inferior to the division of Biblical introduction into general and special, with its comprehensive subdivisions.

II. Nature and Method of Treatment. Catholic scholars justly regard Biblical introduction as a theological science. They are indeed fully aware of the possibility of viewing it in a different light, of identifying it with a literary history of the various books of Holy Writ, and they know that this is actually done by many writers outside of the Church, who are satisfied with applying to the Holy Scriptures the general principles of historical criticism. But they rightly think that in so doing these writers lose sight of essential differences which exist between the Bible and merely human literature, and which should be taken into account in defining the nature of Biblical introduction. Considered in their actual origin, the sacred books which make up the Bible have been given divine authorship which must needs differentiate Biblical introduction from all mere literary history, and impart to it a distinctly theological character. In view of this, Biblical introduction must be conceived as an historical elucidation, not simply of the human and outward origin and characteristics of the sacred records, but also of that which makes them sacred books, viz., the operation of the Holy Ghost Who inspired them. Again, of all existing literature, the Bible alone has been entrusted to the guardianship of a Divinely constituted society, whose plain duty it is to ensure the right understanding and correct exegetical interpretation of God, by seeing that the topics preliminary to its exegesis be fittingly treated by Biblical introduction. Whence it readily follows that Biblical introduction is, by its very nature, a theological discipline, promoting, under the authoritative guidance of the Church, the accurate knowledge of Divine Revelation embodied in Holy Writ. For these and other reasons, Catholic scholars positively refuse to reduce Biblical introduction to a mere literary history of the various books which make up the Bible, and strenuously maintain its essential character as a theological science.

III. History. As a distinct theological discipline, Biblical introduction is indeed of a comparatively recent origin. Centuries, however, before its exact object and proper method of study had been fixed, attempts had been made on the part of some, and occasionally some material which may be utilized for the treatment of the questions which pertain to Biblical introduction. Of the same general nature are the writings of St. Jerome, although his prefaces to the various books of Scripture, some of his treatises and of his letters deal explicitly with certain introductory topics. St. Augustine's important work, "De Doct.
trinitā Christianā", is chiefly a hermeneutical treatise, and deals with only a few questions of introduction in book II, chapters vii.–xv. One of the writers most frequently mentioned in the first period of the history of Biblical introduction is a certain Greek, Adrian (d. about A. D. 450), who probably is the same as the Adrian addressed by St. Nilus as a monk and a priest. He certainly belonged to the Antiochene school of exegesis, and was apparently a pupil of St. John Chrysostom. He is the author of a work entitled Ἐνεργητὴς εἰς τὰς Θεὰς Γραφάς, "Introduction to the Divine Scriptures", which has indeed supplied the specific name of introduction for the theological science treating of topics preliminary to the study of Holy Writ, but which, in fact, is simply a hermeneutical treatise dealing with the style of the sacred writers and the figurative expressions of the Bible (P. G. XC VIII). The other principal writers of that period are: St. Eucherius of Lyons (d. about 450), whose two books, "Instructiones ad Salomonum filium", are rather a hermeneutical than an introductory work; the Benedictine Cassiodorus (d. about 562), whose treatise De institutione Divinarum Scripturarum serves as an introduction to the views of earlier writers and gives an important list of Biblical interpreters, chiefly Latin; the African bishop Junilius (d. about 552), who belongs to the school of Naisibis, and whose "Institutio regularia divinae legis" resembles most a Biblical introduction in the sense of the question to the study of the text (G. St. Ev.; Mürner, Die Bibliotheca sancta ex preci pipes Catholicos Ecclesiæ in auctoribus collecta, and treatises in eight books of the sacred writers and their works, of the best manner of translating and explaining Holy Writ, and gives a copious list of Biblical interpreters. Among the Catholic authors on introduction who soon followed Sixtus the following deserve a special mention: Arias Montanus (d. 1598), whose "Prolegomena" in his Polyglott (Antwerp, 1572) forms a valuable introduction; Salmeron (d. 1585), whose "Prolegomena Bibliæ" appears in the first volume of his works (Mââras, 1588). Sermontis (d. 1606) and Honorius (Antwerp, 1625) was selected by Migne as the most suitable general introduction with which to begin his "Sacra Scripturae Cursus Complectus"; the Oratorian Lami (d. 1715), the learned writer of the "Apparatus ad Bibliæ sacra" (Paris, 1687); the Bene-
dictine Martianay (d. 1717); and the able theologian Ellies Dupin (d. 1719). Meantime the Protestants, somewhat belated by doctrinal bias, brought forth certain manuals in the first period of the history of Biblical introduction which perhaps might be mentioned those of Rivet (Dordrecht, 1618); Walther (Leipzig, 1638); Calov (Wittenberg, 1643); Brian Walton (London, 1637); and Heidegger (Zurich, 1651). The first scholar to depart from the unsatisfactory method of treating topics preliminary to the study of Holy Writ, which had hitherto prevailed, and which had made some of the writings of his immediate predecessors dogmatic treatises rather than works on Biblical introduction, was the French Oratorian Richard Simon (1638–1712). According to him the Sacred Books, no less than the various Biblical translations and commentaries, are literary products which must be the impress of the ideas and the methods of composition prevalent at the time when they were written, so that, to view and appreciate these works aright, one should study them carefully in themselves and in the light of the historical events under which they came into existence. A study at once historical and critical connected also to him the best means for disposing of unsound theories, and for vindicating the inspired character of the Bible, which had been recently impugned by Hobbes and Spinoza. Hence the name of "Histoire Critique", which he gave to his epoch-making introduction to the matrices of the study of the text (Rotterdam, 1689), versions (Rotterdam, 1690), and commentaries (Rotterdam, 1893) of the New Testament. Simon's methods and conclusions were at first strenuously opposed, and afterwards set aside by Catholics and by Protestants alike. The most noteworthy works of the eighteenth century on introduction, on the basis of the ancient method, are, among Catholics, those of Calmet (Paris, 1707–20); Goldhagen (Mainz, 1755–68); Fabrié (Rome, 1772); Marchini (Turin, 1777); and Mayer (Vienna, 1789); and, among Protestants, those of Hody (Oxford, 1705); Carpsow (Leipzig, 1721–28); J. D. Michaelis (Göttingen, 1750; Hamburg, 1787).

The true method of Biblical introduction set forth and applied by Simon was not destined, however, to be discarded forever. The rationalists were the first to use it, or rather to abuse it, for their anti-dogmatic purposes. Even in the eighteenth century, they rid those more or less affected by rationalistic tendencies, have very often openly, and at times with rare ability, treated Biblical introduction as a mere literary history of the Sacred Writings. As belonging to the critical school, the following writers on introduction may be mentioned: Scholler (d. 1791); Eichholtz (d. 1827); de Wette (d. 1849); Bleek (d. 1589); Vatke (d. 1582); Riehm (d. 1888); Kuenen (d. 1891); Reuss (d. 1891); Scholten; Hilgenfeld; Wellhausen; W. R. Smith (d. 1894); S. Davidson (d. 1898); Strack; Wildeboer; E. Kautsch; P. E. Koenig; Jülicher; Cornell; Baudissin; H. Holtz; Bacon; Baier; Caster; Kent; Moffatt; Von Soden; Pfeiffer; to whom may be added, as occupying in the main similar positions, B. Weiss; Salmon; Driver; A. B. Davidson (d. 1902); Curtiss (d. 1904); Ottley; Kirpatrick; Ryle; Briggs; Bennett; Adeney; C. H. H. Wright; McFadyen; and Geden. The following are the principal Protestant writers who meantime have striven to stay the progress of the critical school by treating the questions of Biblical introduction on conservative lines: Heneganberg (d. 1898); Hofmann (d. 1877); Hävernick (d. 1845); Keil (d. 1888); Bissell; Glag; Godet (d. 1900); R. C. H. Keen (d. 1902); Harman; Loy; Sandy; Green (d. 1900); Dods; Kerr; Burkitt; Zehn; Mackay; Urquhart; and Orr.

During the same period Catholics have produced numerous works on Biblical introduction, and used in them, in various degree, the historico-critical method
of investigation. These works may be briefly given under four general heads, as follows: (a) General Introduction to Holy Writ: Dixon, "Intro. to the Sacred Scriptures" (Dublin, 1852); Trochon, "Introd. générale" (Paris, 1856–57); Chauvin, "Leçons d'int. générale" (Paris, 1867); Breen, "General and Critical History of Old Testament" (Philadelphia, 1893); Gigot, "General Intro. to the H. Script." (New York, 1899); Telch, "Introd. Generalis in Scripturam Sacram" (Ratisbon, 1908). (b) General and Special Intro. to both Testaments: Alber, "Institutiones Scrip. Sac. Antiq. et Novi Test." (Budapest, 1901); Paul Scholi, "Allgemeine Einleitung in das heilige Buch der N. T." (Cologne, 1845–48); Claire, "Introd. historiq. et critiq. aux Livres de l'A. et du N. T." (Paris, 1835)—Haneberg, "Geschichte der bibl. Offenbarung als Einleitung ins alte und neue Testament." (Ratisbon, 1849); Gilly, "Précis d'Intro. générale et particulière à l'Écrit. Sac." (Nîmes, 1867; Lamy, "Intro. in Sac. Scripturam" (Mecchin, 1867); Danto, "Hist. Revelationis divinae V. T." (Vienna, 1862); Idem, "Hist. Rev. divinae V. T." (Vienna, 1867); Kaulen, "Einleitung in die heilige Schrift des A. und N.T." (Freiburg im Br., 1870); Vigouroux and Baevers, "Manuel Biblique" (Paris, 1879); Ubaldi, "Genealogia del Sacro-Biblico" (Rome, 1881). (c)rela-

ively, "Intro. historica et critica in U. T. libros" (Paris, 1885–87); Trochon and Lesètre, "Intro. à l'Étude de l'Écrit. Sainte." (Paris, 1889–90); Barry, "The Tradition of Scripture." (New York, 1906). (d) Special Intro. to the Old Testament: John, Einleitung in die alttestamentliche Bücher des A. Bundes" (Vienna, 1793); Ackermann, "Intro. in lib. sacros V. T." (Vienna, 1825–9); Herbst, "Hist. Krit. Einleitung in die heilige Schriften des A. T." (Karlsruhe, 1840–44); Reusch, "Lehrbuch der Einl. in das A. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1864); Zschokke, "Hist. sacrae V. T. in die heil. Bücher des A. Bundes" (Vienna, 1840); Stecker, "Einl. in das heilige Buch der N. T." (Innsbruck, 1810); Unterkircher, "Einl. in die B. des N. T." (Innsbruck, 1810); Hug, "Einl. in die heil. Schriften des N. T." (Tubingen, 1808); Reithmayer "Einl. in die kanon. B. des N. T." (Ratisbon, 1832); Maier, "Einl. in die Schrif. des N. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1856); Güntner, "Intro. in sacros N. T. libros" (Prague, 1863); Langen, "Grundriss der Einleitung des N. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1868); Aebi, "Einl. in das N. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1877); Trenkle, "Einl. in das N. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1877); Schaefer, "Einl. in das N. T." (Paderborn, 1888); Bollinger, "Einl. in das N. T." (Freiburg im Br., 1901); Jacques, "Histoire des Livres du N. T." (Paris, 1904–09); Brassac, "Nouveau Testament" (Paris, 1905, 1909), twelfth recast edition of vols. III and IV of Vigouroux's "Manuel Biblique." (e) Introduction to the books recently published by Jewish scholars the following may be mentioned: J. Fürst, "Geschichte der biblischen Literatur und des jüd.-hebräischen Schriften" (Leipzig, 1867–70); Cassel, "Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur" (Berlin, 1872–73); J. S. Bloch, "Studien zur Geschichte der Sammlung der A. Literatur" (Leipzig, 1875); A. Geiger, "Lehrbuch der jüd. biblischen Schriften" (Berlin, 1877); Woge, "Histoire de la Bible et de l'Exégèse biblique jusqu'à nos jours" (Paris, 1881). Besides the separate works on Biblical introduction which have been mentioned, valuable contributions to that branch of Scriptural science are found in the articles in the Dictionaries of the Bible and the general encyclopedias already published or yet issuing.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.
Intrusion (Lat. intrudere), the act by which unlawful possession of an ecclesiastical benefice is taken. It comprises, therefore, the ignominious act of intrusion, which is the reception of the benefice at the hands of him who has the right to bestow it by canon law. The necessity of proper canonical institution rests primarily on certain passages of the New Testament (John, x, 1; Hebr., v, 4), in which a legitimate mission from properly constituted authority is described. This is postulated. This is reaffirmed by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXXIII, can. vii), and in the "Corpus Juris Canonici" it is decreed: "An ecclesiastical benefice may not be taken possession of without canonical institution (cap. i, De reg. jur., in vi). Intrusion does not necessarily signify the employment of force in entering upon a benefice. To constitute him an intruder or usurper in the ecclesiastical sense, it is sufficient that the person has no true canonical title to the benefice when he takes possession. Historical examples of intrusion on a large scale are not wanting. To pass over the many violations of the Church's right during the investiture struggle, at all times we find wholesale intrusion practised in France in the reigns of Louis XIV and Napoleon I, when ecclesiastics, nominated to episcopal see but whose elections were never confirmed by the pope, ruled the dioceses into which they were thus intruded. Pius IX, in his Constitution "Romani Pontifex", decreed extraordinary communication and privation of dignities against members of a cathedral chapel who hand over the administration of a diocese to one who, although nominated, has not yet presented his letters of canonical institution. When laymen have the right of presentation to a benefice, the confirmation of ecclesiastical authority is necessary before actual possession can be obtained. The nominee who does not wait for this canonical induction is an intruder.

The definition is also extended to persons who, having been repelled even unjustly by their ecclesiastical superiors, seek the aid of the civil power to obtain possession under pretext of abuse. As an intruder has no true title to receive the revenues of the benefice which he uncanonically holds, he is bound in conscience to make restitution of what are ill-gotten gains to the lawful titular. Even if the latter die, it does not legalise his position; the intruder's possession is invalid and restitution must be made to the true titular's lawful successor in the benefice. To remove the irregularity incurred by intrusion, the papal power must be invoked, as the censure is reserved to the Holy See. A dispensation from such an irregularity is the more difficult to obtain in proportion to the falsity of the title invoked or the employment of violence in entering on the benefice. Canonists also extend the term intrusion to the keeping possession of a benefice by a hitherto lawful possessor, after it has been vacated by violation of certain decrees of the Church. Thus, titulare of one benefice who fraudulently present himself for examination in a concursus to obtain a benefice for another by impersonating him, who obtain a benefice for others on the understanding that they are to be rewarded for it, or who seek a benefice with the intention of resigning it to another with a secret provision that they are to receive a pension from its revenues, lose the right to their own benefices, which thus canoonically become vacant. By retaining possession of them in such cases, they become intruders.


William H. W. Fanning.

Intuition (Lat. intruere), to look into, is a psychological and philosophical term which designates the

Of the medieval commentators, see especially Durandus, "Rationale Diermorum Officiorum", iv, 5; Benedict XIV, "De S.

Mass Sacramentis, i, 4; Duchesne, "Origines du culte chrétien" (Paris, 1868), 154-156. Grim, "Don et Justice Menseum" (in Br., 1897), 946-57.

Adrian Fortescu.
process of immediate apprehension or perception of an actual fact, being, or relation between two terms, and its results. Hence the words Intuition or Intuitionism mean those systems in philosophy which consider intuition as the fundamental process of our knowledge or at least give to intuition a large place (the Scottish school); and the words Intuitive Mechanics in the Ethical System of Helveticus denote those philosophical theories which base morality on an intuitive apprehension of the moral principles and laws, or consider intuition as capable of distinguishing the moral qualities of our actions (Shaftesbury, Hutcheson, Reid, Dugald Stewart). As an element of educational method intuition means the grasp of knowledge by conquest, or by the light of the soul on its own substance in intuition. The immediate perception of sensuous or material objects by our senses is sensuous or empirical intuition; the immediate apprehension of intellectual or immaterial objects by our intelligence is called intellectual intuition. It may be remarked that Kant calls empirical intuitions our knowledge of objects through sensation, and pure intuition our perception of space and time as the forms a priori of sensibility. Again, our intuitions may be called external or internal, according as the objects perceived are external objects or internal objects or acts. Kant, however, defines intuition as the experience of the object; but observable and experienced element of knowledge is easily seen if we observe that it is intuition which furnishes us with the first experimental data as well as with the primary concepts and the fundamental judgments or principles which are the primitive elements and the foundation of every scientific and philosophical speculation. This importance, however, has been falsely exaggerated by some modern philosophers to an extent which tends to destroy both supernatural religion and the validity of human reason. There has been an attempt, on their part, to make of intuition, under Cartesian names, the central and fundamental element of our power of acquiring knowledge, and the only process or operation that can put us into contact with reality. So we have the creation or intuitions of the ego and non ego in the philosophy of Fichte; the intuition or intellectual vision of God claimed by the Ontologists in natural theology (see Omnipotence. W. James's 'Varieties of Religious Experience'). Bergson's philosophy of pure intuition; the experience of experiential consciousness of the Divine of the Modernists (Encyclical 'Pascendi gregis'). According to the Ontologists, our knowledge is immediate and necessary and universal, as well as our idea of the Infinite, are possible only through an antecedent intuition of God present in us. Other philosophers start from the principle that human reasoning is unable to give us the knowledge of things in themselves. The data of sensation, our intellectual concepts, and the conclusions reached through the process of discursive reasoning do not, they say, primarily represent reality; but acting under diverse influences such as those of our usual and practical needs, common sense and discursive reason result in a deformation of reality; the value of their data and conclusions is one of practical usefulness rather than one of true representation (see PRAGMATISM). Intuition alone, they maintain, is able to put us in communication with reality and give us a true knowledge of things. Especially in regard to religious truths, some insist, it is only through intuition and intimate experiences that truth is known. "God," says the Protestant A. Sabatier in his "Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion," p. 379, "is not a phenomenon which can be observed outside of the ego, a truth to be demonstrated by logical reasoning. He who does not feel Him in his heart, will never find Him outside. . . . We never become aware of our piosity without at the same time feeling a religious emotion and perceiving in this very emotion, more or less obscurely, the object and the cause of religion, namely, God." The arguments used by the Schoolmen to prove the existence of God, say the Modernists, have now lost all their value; it is by the religious feeling, by an intuition of the heart that we apprehend God (Encyc.). "Pascendi gregis" and "Il programma dei modernisti".

Such theories have their source in the principle of absolute subjectivism and relativism—the most fundamental error in philosophy. Starting with Kant's proposition that we cannot know things as they are in themselves but only as they appear to us, this is, under the subjective condition human nature necessarily imposes on them, they arrive at the conclusion that our rational knowledge is subjectively relative; that its concepts, principles, and process of reasoning are therefore essentially unable to reach external and transcendental realities. Hence their recourse to intuition and immannence (see IMMATERIAL). But it is easy to show that if intuition is necessary in every act of knowledge, it remains essentially insufficient in our present life, for scientific and philosophical reflection. In our knowledge of nature we start from observations and from these only; but observations and data are verified by a series of inductions and deductions. In our knowledge of God, we may indeed start from our nature and from our insufficiency and aspirations, but if we want to know Him we have to demonstrate, by discursive reasoning, His existence as an external and transcendent Cause and Supreme End. We may, indeed, in Ethics, have an intuition of the notion of duty, of the need of a sanction; but these intuitive notions have no moral value if they are not connected with the existence of a Supreme Ruler and Judge, and this connexion can be known only through reasoning. The true nature, place, and value of intuition in human knowledge are admirably put forth in the Scholastic theory of knowledge. For the Schoolmen the intuitive act of intellectual knowledge is, by its nature, the most perfect act of knowledge, since it is an immediate apprehension of and contact with reality in its concrete existence, and our supreme reward in the supernatural order will consist in the intuitive apprehension of God by our intelligence: the beatific vision. But in our present conditions of earthly life, our knowledge must of necessity make use of concepts and reasoning. All our knowledge has its starting-point in the intuitive data of sense experience; but in order to penetrate the mysteries of these data, their laws and causes, we must have recourse to abstraction and discursive reasoning. It is also through these processes and through them alone that we can arrive at the notion of immaterial beings and of God himself (St. Thomas, "Contra Gentes") I, 12; "Summa Theol.," I, q. xxiv—xxvi). Our mind has the intuition of primary principles (intellectus), but their application, in order to give us a scientific and philosophical knowledge of things, is subject to the laws of abstraction and successive reasoning (ratio, discursus, cf. I, q. xvi, a. 3; II—II, q. xii, a. 5, ad 2um). Such a necessity is, as it were, a normal defect of human intelligence; it is the natural limit which determines the place of the human mind in the scale of intellectual beings.

Concepts and reasoning therefore are in themselves inferior to intuition; but they are the normal processes of human knowledge. They are not, however, a deformation of reality, though they are an imperfect and inadequate representation of reality—and the more so according to the excellency of the objects represented—there are a true representation of it.

St. Thomas, QQ. Disp. De veritate; MAEBER, Psychology, ch. xiii and xv (Stonyhurst Series, 5th ed. London, 1901); ROUSSELOT, L'Intellectualisme de St. Thomas (Paris, 1908); PIAT, Innova-
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INUIT. See Eskimo.

Investiture, Canonical (Lat. investitura, from investire, to clothe), the act by which a suzerain granted a fief to his vassal, and the ceremonies which accompanied that grant. From the middle of the eleventh century, and perhaps during the first half of the twelfth, this custom became general in the Church, and the ceremonies by which princes granted to bishops and abbots, besides their titles, the possessions which constituted their benefices, and the political rights which they were to exercise (see Investitures, Conflict of). The putting in possession was done after the investiture by enthronization (q. v.). The decrees use the word investitura to signify the concession of an ecclesiastical benefice; only since the thirteenth century has it signified the act of putting one in possession of such a benefice. This is the sense in which it is now used; it is synonymous with Inst. et actio corporalis. (See Institution, Canonical; Installation.)

Investitures. Conflict of (Ger. Investiturstreit), the terminus technicus for the great struggle between the popes and the German kings Henry IV and Henry V during the period between 1073 and 1111. The investiture was in truth only the occasion of this conflict; the real issue, at least at the height of the contest, was whether the imperial or the papal power was to be supreme in Christendom. The powerful and ardent pope, Gregory VII, sought in all earnestness to realize the King of God on earth under the guidance of the papacy. As successor of the Apostles of Christ, he claimed supreme authority in both spiritual and secular affairs. It seemed to this noble idealism that the successor of Peter could never act otherwise than according to the dictates of justice, goodness, and truth. In this spirit he claimed for the papacy supremacy over emperor, kings, and princes. But during the Middle Ages a rivalry had always existed between the popes and the emperors, twin representatives, so to speak, of authority. Henry III, the father of the young king, had even reduced the papacy to complete submission, a situation which Gregory now strove to reverse by crushing the imperial power and setting in its place the papacy. A long and bitter struggle was therefore unavoidable.

It first arose through the prohibition of investitures, a propos of the ecclesiastical reforms set afoot by Gregory. In 1074 he had renewed the heavier penalty for the violation of the prohibition, given in a solemn synod at Laon in 1073 (Can. 6). The synod of Laon was attended by the representatives of the imperial government and by several bishops. Gregory sent his legate, Benedict of Pavia, a Roman nobleman, to the assembly, as the synod was to be held at Rome. The Lateran Synod of 1075, however, set aside the provisions of the decree of 1073. The synod of 1076, also called Annenberg, was attended by the representatives of the German emperors and of many bishops. The emperor invited the pope to an interview, but the latter refused. The pope held his synods, and three papal legates travelled to Germany. A few bishops were placed in the service of the empire, and others were refused the benefices which they had been invested in. This led to a violent contest. It was finally settled by a convention in the synod of Bologna, where the emperor and the pope agreed to a compromise. The pope, however, renewed the prohibition of the investiture of bishops and the refusal of benefices to emperors. The struggle continued. The first session of the council of Worms (1076) was open to the emperor, and the prohibition of investitures was confirmed. The pope, however, interfered in the election of the archbishop of Trier and the bishop of Cologne. The imperial synod at Mainz (1077) upheld the prohibition of investitures. On the other hand, the synod of Pisa (1077) confirmed the provisions of the synod of Worms in connection with the empire. Thus the struggle continued.
property of the Church, and thus to break down the opposition of the clergy. Gregory at the Lenten (Roman) Synod of 1075 withdrew “from the king the right of dispensing of bishoprics in future, and relieved all lay persons of the investiture of churches.” As early as the Anti-Investiture legislation had been enacted, but had never been enforced. Investiture at this period meant that on the death of a bishop or abbot, the king was accustomed to select a successor and to bestow on him the ring and staff with the words: Accipe ecclesiam (accept this church). Henry III was wont to consider the ecclesiastical fate of the candidate: Henry IV, on the other hand, declared in 1073: “We have sold the churches”. Since Otto the Great (936–72) the bishops had been princes of the empire, had secured many privileges, and had become to a great extent feudal lords over great districts of the imperial territory. The control of these great units of economic and military power was for the king a question of primary importance, affecting as it did the foundations and even the existence of the imperial authority; in those days men had not yet learned to distinguish between the grant of the episcopal office and the grant of its temporalities (regalia). Thus minded, Henry IV held that it was impossible for him to acknowledge the papal prohibition of investiture. We must bear carefully in mind that in the given circumstances there was a certain justification for both parties: the pope’s object was to save the Church from the dangers that arose from the undue influence of the laity, and especially of the king, in strictly ecclesiastical affairs; the king, on the other hand, considered that he was contending for the indispensable means of civil government, apart from whose supreme authority was at that period inconceivable.

Ignoring the prohibition of Gregory, as also the latter’s effort at a mitigation of the same, Henry continued to appoint bishops in Germany and in Italy. Towards the end of December, 1075, Gregory delivered his ultimatum: the king was called upon to observe the papal decree, as based on the laws and teachings of the Fathers; otherwise, at the following Lenten Synod, he would be not only “excommunicated until he had given proper satisfaction, but also deprived of his kingdom without hope of recovering it”. Sharp reproval of his libertinism was added. If the pope had given way somewhat too freely to his feelings, the king gave still fierer vent to his anger. At the Diet of Worms (January, 1076), Gregory, amid atrocious calumnies, was deposed by twenty-six bishops on the ground that his elevation was irregular, and that consequently he had never been pope. Henry therefore addressed a letter to “Hildebrand, no longer pope but a false monk”: “If you consider the grace of God, with all my bishops say to thee: ‘Descend! Descend, thou ever accursed!’” If the king believed that such a deposition, which he was unable to enforce, was of any effect, he must have been very blind. At the Lenten Synod in Rome (1076) Gregory sat in judgment, and in the letter to the Patriarch of the Apostles, declared: “I depose him from the government of the whole Kingdom of Germany and Italy, release all Christians from their oath of allegiance, forbid him to be obeyed as king... and as thy successor bind him with the fetters of anathema.” It availed little that the king answered him with ban. His chief enemies, the Saxons and the lay princes of the empire, espoused the cause of the pope, while his bishops were divided in their allegiance, and the mass of his people deserted him. The age was yet too deeply conscious that there could be no Christian Church without communion with the papacy. The power of the empire was very great, and in October a diet of the princes at Tribur obliged Henry to apologize humbly to the pope, to promise for the future obedience and reparation, and to refrain from all actual government, seeing that he was excommunicate. They decreed also that if within a year and a day the excommunication was not removed, Henry should forfeit his crown. Finally, they resolved that the pope should be invited to visit Germany in the following spring to settle the conflict between the king and the princes. Elated at this victory Gregory set out immediately for the north.

To the general astonishment, Henry now proposed to present himself as a penitent before the pope, and thereby obtain pardon. He crossed Mont Cenis in the depth of winter and was soon at the Castle of Canossa, whither Gregory had withdrawn on learning of the king’s approach. Henry spent three days at the entrance to the fortress, barefoot and in the garb of a penitent. That he actually stood the whole time on ice and snow is of course a romantic exaggeration. He was finally admitted to the papal presence, and pledged himself to recognize the mediation and decision of the pope in the quarrel with the princes, and was then freed from excommunication (January, 1077). This famous event has been countless times described, and from very divergent points of view. Through Bismarck, Canossa became a proverbial term to indicate the humiliation of the civil power before the ambitious and masterful Church. Recently, on the other hand, not a few have seen in it a glorious triumph for Henry. When the facts are carefully weighed, it will appear that in his priestly capacity the pope yielded reluctantly and unwillingly, while, on the other hand, the political success of his concession was null. Henry had now the advantage, since, released from excommunication, he was again free to act. Comparing, however, the power which thirty years earlier Henry III had exercised over the papacy, we may yet agree with those historians who see in Canossa the aeme of the career of Gregory VII.

The German supporters of the pope ignored the reconciliation, and proceeded in March, 1077, to elect a new king, Rudolf of Rheinfelden. This was the signal for the civil war during which Gregory sought to act as arbiter between the rival kings and their overlords to award the crown. By artful diplomacy Henry held off, until 1080, any decisive action. Considering his position sufficiently secure, he then demanded that the
pope should excommunicate his rival, otherwise he would set up an antipope. Gregory answered by excommunicating and deposing Henry for the second time at the Lenten Synod of 1080. It was declared at the same time that clergy and people should ignore all oaths on the pope; moreover, it was believed that the second excommunication was not justified. Gregory's party was thus greatly weakened. At the Synod of Brixen (June, 1080) the king's bishops listened to ridiculous charges and exaggerations, and deposed the pope, excommunicated him, and elected as antipope Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, otherwise a learned and blameless man. Gregory had relied on the support of the Normans in Southern Italy and of the German enemies of the king, but the former sent him assistance. Thus when in October, 1080, his rival for the throne was slain in battle, Henry turned his thoughts on the papacy. Four times, from 1081 to 1084, he assaulted Rome, in 1083 captured the Leonine City, and in 1084, after an unsuccessful attempt at a compromise, gained possession of the entire city.

The deposition of Gregory and the election of Gui bert, who now called himself Clement III, was confirmed, and on May 1084, Henry crowned emperor by his antipope. The Normans arrived too late to prevent these events, and moreover proceeded to plunder the town so mercilessly that Gregory lost the allegiance of the Romans and was compelled to withdraw southward with his Norman and the death of the most eminent defeat, and an indemnity at Salerno (25 May, 1085), after another ineffectual renewal of excommunication against his opponents. Though he died amid disappointment and failure, he had done indispensible pioneer work and set in motion forces and principles that were to dominate succeeding centuries.

There was much confusion on all sides. In 1081 a new rival for the crown, the insignificant Count Herman of Salm, had been chosen, but he died in 1088. Most of the bishops held with the king, and were thus excommunicate; in Saxony only was the Government dominant. Many of the occupying. Both parties called their rivals perjurers and traitors, nor did either side discriminate nicely in the choice and use of weapons. Negotiations met with no success, while the synod of the Gregorians at Quedlinburg (April, 1085) showed no inclination to modify the principles which they represented. The king, therefore, resolved to crush his rivals by force. At the Council of Mainz (April, 1085) fifteen Gregorian bishops were deposed, and their sees entrusted to adherents of the royal party. A fresh rebellion of the Saxons and Bavarians forced the king's bishops to fly, but the death of the most eminent defeat, and an indemnity at Salerno (25 May, 1085), after another ineffectual renewal of excommunication against his opponents. Though he died amid disappointment and failure, he had done indispensible pioneer work and set in motion forces and principles that were to dominate succeeding centuries.
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had received the imperial crown. In this way war soon broke out again, during which the cause of the king suffered a decline. The antipope's bishops gradually deserted him in answer to Urban's advantageous offers of reconciliation; the royal authority in Italy disappeared, while in the Defections of 1101 Constantine, the wife of Henry suffered an additional humiliation. The new crusading movement, on the other hand, rallied many to the assistance of the papacy. In 1094 and 1095 Urban renewed the excommunication of Henry, Guibert, and their supporters. When the pope died (1099), followed by the antipope (1100), the majority of the crowned emperor; on the contrary, the course of events had won a complete victory. The subsequent antipopes of the Guibertian party in Italy were of no importance. Urban was succeeded by a less able ruler, Paschal II (1099-1118), whom Henry at first inclined to recognize. The political horizon meanwhile began to look more favorable for the king, who was now universally acknowledged in Germany. He was anxious to secure in addition ecclesiastical peace, sought to procure the removal of his excommunication, and publicly declared his intention of making a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre. This, however, pope, and compelled the renunciation of the right of investiture, still obstinately claimed by Henry. In 1102 Paschal renewed the anathema against the emperor. The revolt of his son (Henry V), and the latter's alliance with the princes who were dissatisfied with the imperial policy, brought matters to a crisis and occasioned the greatest suffering to the sorely tried emperor, who was now ignominiously outwitted and overcome by his son. A decisive struggle was rendered unnecessary by the death of Henry IV in 1106. He had untriedly defended the inherited rights of the royal office, and had never had a rival.

From the beginning Henry V had enjoyed the support of the pope, who had relieved him of excommunication and had set aside his oath of allegiance to his father. At and after the Pentecost Synod of Nordhausen, in 1105, the king dispelled the last remnants of the schism by deposing the imperial occupants of the episcopal sees. The questions, however, which lay at the root of the whole conflict were not yet decided, and time soon showed that, in the matter of investitures, Henry was the true heir of his father's policy. Cold, calculating, and ambitious, the new monarch had no idea of withdrawing the royal claims in this respect. He entered into negotiations with Eugenius III (Guazella in 1106, and at Troyes in 1107), he continued to invest with the biskops of the church. The German clergy raised no protest, and made it evident in this way that their earlier refusal of obedience to the emperor arose from the fact of his excommunication, not from any resentment occasioned by his interference in the affairs of the Church. In 1108 excommunication was pronounced upon the giver and receiver (dans et accipiens) of investiture, and thus affected the king himself. As Henry had now set his heart on being crowned emperor, this decision precipitated the final struggle. In 1113 the king marched with a strong army on Rome. Eager to avoid another conflict, Paschal attempted a radical solution of the question at issue; the German clergy, he decided, were to restore to the king all their estates and privileges and to maintain themselves on tithes and donations; whereas the empire was interested only in the overlordship of these domains, might easily dispense with the investiture of the clergy. On this understanding peace was established at Sutri between pope and king. Paschal, who had been a monk before his elevation, undoubtedly executed in good faith the renunciation of the secular power of the Church. It was a step towards the Church was a spiritual institution, and as such had no concern with earthly affairs.

The king, however, cannot have doubted for a moment that the papal renunciation would fail before the opposition of both ecclesiastical and secular princes. Henry V was mean and deceitful, and sought to entrap the pope. The king having renounced his claim to investiture, the pope in 1112, on 12 February, returned all temporalities to the Crown, but thereby raised (as Henry had foreseen) such a storm of opposition from the German princes that he was forced to recognize the futility of this attempt at settlement. The king then demanded that the right of investiture be restored, and that he should be elected to succeed the deposed emperor, and he, presumptuously seized him and thirteen cardinals, and hurried them away from the new infuriated city. To regain his freedom, Paschal was forced, after two months imprisonment, to accede to Henry's demands. He granted the king unconditional investiture as an imperial privilege, crowned him emperor, and promised on oath not to excommunicate him for what had occurred.

Henry had thus secured by force a notable success, but it could have no long duration. The more ardent members of the Gregorian party rebuked the 'heretic' pope, and compelled him to rescind the position into which he had been forced. The Lateran Synod of 1112 renewed the decrees of Gregory and Urban against investiture. Paschal did not wish to withdraw his promise directly, but the Council of Vienna, having declared the imperial privilege (privilege, derivatively, a private law) a praemunire (a vicious law), and as such null and void, it also excommunicated the emperor. The pope did not, however, break off all intercourse with Henry, for whom the struggle began to assume a threatening aspect, since now, as previously under his father, the difficulties raised by ecclesiastical opposition were aggravated by rebellion of the princes. The insipid selfishness of the emperor, his mean and odious personality, made enemies on every side. Even his bishops now opposed him, seeing themselves threatened by him and believing him set on sole mastery. In 1114 at Beauvais, and in 1116 at Reims, Cologne, Goslar, and a second time at Cologne, excommunication of the emperor was repeated by papal legates. Imperial and irreconcilable bishops, who refused to join the papal party, were removed from their sees. The emperor's forces were defeated simultaneously on the Rhine and in Saxony. In 1116 Henry agreed to enter into negotiations with the pope, but no agreement was arrived at, as on this occasion Paschal refused to enter into a conference with the emperor.

After Paschal's death (1118) even his tolerant successor, Gelasius II (1118-1124), could not prevent the situation from becoming daily more entangled. Having demanded recognition of the privilege of 1111 and been referred by Gelasius to a general council, Henry made a hopeless attempt to revive the universally detested sedition by appointing as antipope, under the name of Gregory VIII, Burdinus, Archbishop of Calais (Portugal), and he accordingly excommunicated the pope. In 1119 Gelasius was succeeded by Guido of Vienna as Callistus II (1119-24); he had already excommunicated the emperor in 1112. Reconciliation seemed, therefore, more remote than ever. Callistus, however, regarded the peace of the Church as the first and as the exclusive aim of the popes, and better terms with the German princes, was likewise eager for peace, negotiations were opened. A basis for compromise lay in the distinction between the ecclesiastical and the secular elements in the appointment of bishops. This mode of settlement had already been discussed at the councils of Tours and in France, e.g. by Ivo of Chartres, as early as 1099. The bestowal of the ecclesiastical office was sharply distinguished from the investiture with imperial domains.
As symbols of ecclesiastical installation, the ring and staff were suggested; the sceptre served as the symbol of investiture with the temporalities of the see. The chronological order of the formalities raised a new difficulty; on the imperial side it was demanded that investiture with the temporalities should precede consecration, while the papal representatives naturally claimed that consecration should precede investiture. If the investiture were performed, the emperor, refusing the temporalities could prevent consecration; in the other case, investiture was merely a confirmation of the appointment. By 1119 the articles of peace were agreed upon at Mouzon and were to be ratified by the Synod of Reims. At the last moment, however, negotiations were broken off, and the act of renewed the excommunication of the emperor. But the German princes succeeded in reopening the proceedings, and peace was finally arranged between the legates of the pope, the emperor, and the princes on 23 September, 1122. This peace is usually known as the Concordat of Worms, or the "Pactum Calixtinum."

In the document of peace, Henry yields up "to God and his Holy Apostles Peter and Paul and to the Holy Catholic Church all investitures with ring and staff, and allows in all Churches of his kingdom and empire ecclesiastical election and free consecration*. On the other hand it was agreed that his children had belted him Henry by the Grace of God Roman Emperor, that the election of bishops and abbots in the German Empire in so far as they belong to the Kingdom of Germany, shall take place in his presence, without simony or the employment of any constraint. Should any discord arise between the parties, the emperor shall, after hearing the advice and verdict of the metropolitans and other bishops of the province, lend his approval and support to the better side. The elected candidate shall receive from him the temporalities (regalia) with the sceptre, and shall discharge all obligations entailed by such reception. In other portions of the empire, the consecrated candidate shall within six months receive the regalia by means of the sceptre, and shall fulfill towards him the obligations implied by this ceremony. From these arrangements is excepted all that belongs to the Roman Church (i.e. the Papal States). The different parts of the empire were therefore differently treated: in Germany the power of the prince was balanced by the power of the Church, in Italy and Burgundy it followed the consecration and within the succeeding six months. The king was deprived of his unrestricted power in the appointment of bishops, but the Church also failed to secure the full exclusion of every alien influence. The investiture with the ring and sceptre was a compromise, in which each party made concessions.

Important for the king were the toleration of his presence at the election (præsentia regis), which lent him a possible influence over the electors, and of investiture before consecration, whereby the elevation of an archbishop or a bishop was rendered difficult or even impossible. The extreme ecclesiastical party, who condemned investitures and secular influence in elections under any form, were dissatisfied with these concessions from the very outset and would have been highly pleased, if Callistus had refused to confirm the Concordat.

In appraising the significance of this agreement it remains to be seen whether it was intended as a temporary truce or an enduring peace. Doubts might very well be (and indeed have been) entertained on this matter, since formally the document is drawn up only for Henry V. But a close examination of our sources of information and documents has shown that it is erroneous to maintain that the Concordat enjoyed but a passing recognition and was of small importance. Not only by the contracting parties, but also by their contemporaries, the compact was regarded as an enduring fundamental law. It was solemnly recognized not only as an imperial statute, but as a law of the Church by the Lateran Council of 1123. We also know from the history of Reichenberg, who was present at the Lateran, that in addition to the imperial document, which has been held was alone read, that of the pope was also read and sanctioned. As Gerhoh was one of the chief opponents of the Concordat, his evidence in favour of an unpleasant truth cannot be doubted. That the Concordat was not possible perpetual binding power, to neither party, of course, intended—and the Concordat was very far from securing such continued recognition, since it reveals at most the anxiety of the Church for peace, under the pressure of certain circumstances. By new legislative act the provisions were modified. Under King John (1135–40) and at the beginning of the reign of Conrad III (1138–55) the Concordat was still unchallenged and was observed in its entirety. In 1139, however, Innocent II, in the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Rome, confined the privilege of electing the bishop to the cathedral chapter and the representatives of the regular clergy, and made no mention of lay participation in the election. The ecclesiastical party assumed that this provision annulled the king's participation in elections and his right to decide in the case of an equally divided vote of the electors. If their opinion was correct, the Church could again exercise the temporal power that they had in the first instance to bear the brunt of the fight. Had they suffered defeat, the others could never have engaged in the contest with the Church. The Conflict in England.—In England the conflict is part of the history of Anselm of Canterbury (q.v.). When the pontiff (1103–11) and the emperor (1105–11) proposed the singlehanded for the canon law against king, nobility, and clergy. William the Conqueror (1066–87) had constituted himself sovereign lord of the Church in England; he ratified the decisions of the synods, appointed bishops and abbots, determined how the pope should be chosen, and forbade all intercourse without his permission. The Church in England was therefore practically a national Church, in spite of its nominal dependence on Rome. Anselm's contest with William II (1087–1100) was concerned with other matters, but during his residence in France and Italy he was one of the supporters of ecclesiastical reform, and, being required on his return to take the oath of fealty to the new king (Henry I, 1100–35) and receive the bishopric from his hands, he refused to comply. This led to the outbreak of the investiture quarrel. The king despatched successive embassies to the pope to obtain the annulment of the Concordat, but without success. In his reply to the king in his letters to Anselm, Paschal strictly forbade both the oath of fealty and all investitures by laymen. Henry then forbade Anselm, who was visiting Rome, to return to England, and seized his revenues, whereupon, in 1105, the pope excommunicated the councillors of the king and all prelates who re-
ceived investiture at his hands. In the same year, however, an agreement was arrived at, and was ratified by the pope in 1106, and by the Parliament in London in 1107. According to this concordat, the king renounced his claims to investiture, but the oath of fealty was still exacted. In the appointment of the higher dignitaries of the Church, however, the king still retained the greatest influence. The election took place in the royal palace, and, whenever a candidate for a bishopric was proposed, he simply proposed another, who was then always elected. The chosen candidate thereafter swore the oath of fealty, which always preceded the consecration. The separation of the ecclesiastical office from the temporal was the sole object attained, an achievement of great importance.

In France the question of investiture was not of such importance for the State as to give rise to any violent contention. The bishops had neither such power nor such extensive domains as in Germany, and but a certain number of the bishops and abbots were invested by the king, while many others were appointed and invested by the nobles of the kingdom. Counts and the dukes (i.e. for the so-called mediates bishoprics). The bishoprics were often dealt with in a very arbitrary manner, being frequently sold, presented as a gift, and bestowed upon kinmen. After the reconciliation between the pope and king, in 1104, the rights of the apostles restored, and free election became the established rule. The king retained, however, the right of ratification, and exacted, usually after the consecration, the oath of fealty from the candidate before he entered on the use of the temporalities. After some minor conflicts, these conditions were extended to the mediates bishoprics. In some cases, e.g. in Gascony and Aquitaine, the bishop entered into immediate possession of the temporalities on the ratification of his election. It was in France, therefore, that the requirements of the Church were most completely fulfilled.
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KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Invitatorium.—The Invitatorium or as the word implies, is the invitation addressed to the faithful to come and take part in the Divine Office. The psalm "Venite" has been used for this purpose from the earliest times. In the Life of St. Porphyrius of Gaza we read that this saint, wishing the people to join in prayer, caused the "Venite exultemus Domino" to be sung, and replied to that effect: "The same to you." In the Benedictine Office the "Venite exultemus Domino" is recited daily at the beginning of the offices in the night Office and is called the Invitatorium. It is never omitted, but the antiphons that follow each verse are changed according to whether or not a ferial or a saint's Office is being recited. Three antiphons are repeated twice each night, the psalm and once after the "Glória Patri". The Rule of St. Benedict calls this psalm the Invitatorium, while the Rule of the Master (Magister Amonus, a Frankish author of the seventh century) calls it the Responsorum hortationis. The Mosarabic Liturgy makes use of an expressive word: sonus, as if to signify the bell that calls to the church. The most ancient Roman Liturgy uses the Latin word Invitatorium; for it is omitted in the primitive liturgy, which is represented in our days by that of the last three days of Holy Week. If we find it in the Office of the Dead, it is because it was introduced at a later period. The Council of Constance (1381) mentions the "Venite" to be simple, and to be used in the Office of the Dead. This same canon, in speaking of the manner of reciting the Invitatorium, employs the very words of the Rule of St. Benedict, which shows clearly that the use of this psalm was closely connected with the monastic Office.

The Invitatorium was introduced slowly, like the preceding psalm: "Domine quid multiplicesancti". This was to enable the monks who were coming to the vigil to arrive in time for the beginning of the Office. Indeed, it really seems that these two preliminary psalms (Ps. iii. and xcvii.) were the prayers said privately by the monks while rising and coming to choir: "Ecce ego eam in quo exsurrincti." It is possible that in the course of time the custom was introduced of reciting them aloud in choir, while awaiting the arrival of those who were late, and thus, after a while, they were inserted in the Office itself. In effect, the psalm "Venite" would seem to be addressed to the monks who were coming to the vigil rather than to those who were already there. At Rome, on the feast of the Epiphany, there was no Invitatorium. The psalmody began, and still begins, with the psalms of the first nocturn and their antiphons. "Hodie non cantamus Invitatorium sed absolu incipium" (To-day we chant not the Invitatory but begin without it) is an instruction in a rubric of the Vatican antiphoner. The psalm "Venite" was recited with its own antiphon in its proper place, that is to say, the last of the psalms of the second nocturn. Later this psalm became the first psalm of the third nocturn, and the antiphon was repeated just as when it was used at the Invitatorium. Amalarius and Durandus of Mende try as usual to explain it mystically, but the most probable explanation is that the Invitatorium was suppressed because the psalm was recited later and they did not wish to recite it twice in the same Office.

The Benedicite Breviary, which had hymns for its third nocturn, had not the same reason for excluding it and so retained it on the feast of the Epiphany. We see, nevertheless, that, before the ninth century, the Roman Liturgy had not the Invitatorium, at least not as regularly as the Benedictine Liturgy. It is likely that it was first introduced out of imitation of the monastic practice, on those days alone on which the people assisted at the vigil, when the Invitatorium would thus be addressed to some one. The "Ordines Romani" inform us that, on great festivals, two nocturnal offices were celebrated: one, without the Invitatorium, was recited by the priest in his chapel; the other with the Invitatorium, at which the people assisted. Amalarius tells us that in his time only the Office for the vigil of Sunday had the Invitatorium, the ferial Office had not, because the people did not assist at it. On the feast of the Commemoration of the Dead the Invitatorium was recited, because the faithful came that day to pray for the deceased, but this brings us to a much later date. Most likely the origin of the Invitatorium is to be found in the call by which the monks were awakened: "Veniite adoremus Dominum", which soon became the anthem or the refrain of the psalm "Venite exultemus Domino" which this prayer naturally recalled. Amalarius calls our attention to a peculiarity of fact. On week-days the Invitatorium was recited without the insertion of the antiphon: "Invitatorium diebus festivis hebdomadis sine modulatione Antiphone
solet dicit." The version of the psalm "Venite exultemus" used in the Breviary is that of the ancient Roman psalter, which differs in some passages from the Vulgate.

H. Leclercq.

Iona, School of.—Iona is the modern name derived by change of letter from Adamnan's Ionu; in Bede it is Hii; the Gaelic form is always I or Y, which becomes Hy by prefixing the eponymic h. This rugged, storm-swept island, three miles long and one in average breadth, and about a mile distant from the Ross of Mull, was next to Armagh the greatest centre of Gaelic Christianity—the latter was Patrick's city and primatial see; the former Columba's monastic city, a "primatial island", and the light of all the North. Yet closely connected with Ireland for at least 600 years, it may be described as an Irish island in the Scottish seas. Columba, born in 521, landed with twelve of his monks at the southern ex-

of Kella" be his own work, and he was engaged in copying one of the psalms when, overtaken by mortal illness, he directed his nephew Baithen to write the rest. And we are told, too, that Baithen during his brief abbacy of three years in succession to Columba was, like his master, engaged in "writing, praying and teaching up to the hour of his happy death". When asked about the learning of Baithen, Fintan one of his monks replied: "Be assured that he had no equal on this side of the Alps in his knowledge of Sacred Scripture, and in the profundity of his science"; and he was at once a pupil and a professor of the School of Iona. Language like this might be considered exaggerated if we did not possess the writings of Adamnan, the ninth abbot and the most illustrious scholar of Iona.

Adamnan, otherwise Eunan, a native of Drumhorne, in County Donegal, and a tribal relative of Columba, was educated from his youth in Iona, and it
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tremity of the island—ever since called Porta Churraich, or the Bay of the Island—on Whiteun Eve, 12 May, 563. Whether he came to do penance for his share in the battle of Culdurnhime two years before or, as the Irish "Life" says, "to preach the Gospel to the men of Alba and to the Britons and to the Saxons"—which in any case was his primary purpose—we cannot now determine. It appears that he got a grant of the island from his relative Conall, King of Dalriada, which was afterwards confirmed by Brude, King of the Picts, when the latter was converted by the preaching of Columba, who immediately set to work to build his monastery, more Scotorum, of earth, timber, and wicker-work. Hence not a trace now remains of those perishable buildings—all the existing ruins are medieval. A Celtic monastery consisted of a group of beehive cells around a central church or oratory, the other principal buildings being the common refectory or kitchen, the library or scriptorium, the abbot's house, and the guest-house. Adamnan, after Columba himself the brightest ornament of the School of Iona, in his "Life" of the founder, makes explicit references to the tabula, waxen tablets for writing; to the pens and styles, graphia and calami, and to the ink-horn, cornicula atramenti, to be found in the scriptorium. Columba was certainly a most accomplished scribe if the "Book

may be said that all his learning was the learning of Iona. His "Life of Columba", written at the request of the brotherhood, in Latin, not in Gaelic, is on the whole one of the most valuable works of the Western Church of the seventh century that have come down to us. He gives us more accurate and authentic information of the Gaelic Churches in Ireland and Scotland than any other writer, not excepting even Venereal Bede, who described him as "a good and wise man, and most nobly instructed in the knowledge of the Scriptures". But he was much more. We know from his writings that he was an accomplished Latin scholar, a Gaelic scholar too. Gaul was his mother tongue—while he had a considerable acquaintance with Greek and some even with Hebrew. He was, moreover, painstaking, judicious, and careful in citing his authorities. He has also left us an admirable treatise "On the Holy Places" in Palestine which he compiled from the narrative of a shipwrecked French bishop named Arculfus, who returning from the Holy Land was cast on the shores of Iona. This is an invaluable treatise from which Bede has extracted long passages for his history, showing that its authority was as great in his own day as it has ever since continued to be in the estimation of scholars. This learned man was a true monk, and like Columba himself took a share in the manual labour of the monas-
tery. With his own strong arms he helped to cut down as many oak trees in one of the neighbouring islands—perhaps Erraid—as sufficed to load twelve boats, and no doubt he had a share in building the boats and framing the monastic cells, like the cell of Columba, which was, he tells us, tabula suffulta, framed of planks, and harundine tecta, thatched with reeds.

During the century that closed with the death of Adamnan, Iona was in its glory: Columba and his monks had converted to the faith the whole of Pictland, and they also spread their influence to Ireland and the North of Saxonland. Aidan, Finan, and Colman were men whose well-deserved eulogy has been recorded by Venerable Bede. The unhappy disputes about the frontal tombs and the true time for celebrating Easter, caused much disturbance during the seventh century both in Iona itself and in its daughter houses. Even when Ireland and England had given up the strife and adopted the Roman Easter, the monks of Iona, true to the traditions of their sainted founder, still clung tenaciously to the old Easter. And so late as 716, when Iona itself conformed to the Roman usage, some of the daughter houses in Pictland stubbornly held to the ancient discipline. This stubbornness brought about a few years later the expulsion of the Columban monks from Pictland by Nechtan, King of the Picts, who had accepted the Roman discipline.

The ninth century brought woe and disaster to both Iona and Lindisfarne from the pagan Danes who ravaged all the British coasts. In 793 they destroyed the Church of Lindisfarne with great rapine and slaughter. In 795 they made their first attack on Iona, but the monks on that occasion appear to have escaped with their lives. But in 806 sixty-eight of the community were slain at Port na Mairtir, on the eastern shore of the island, and the white sands somewhat north were the scene of the massacre of another band of martyrs. A few years later again, in 814, Abbot Cellach found it necessary to transfer the primacy of the Columban Order from Iona—which Adamnan calls "this our primatial island"—to the monastery of Kells in Ireland, bringing with him the shrine containing Columba's relics which was however brought back to Iona. In 823 there was a further massacre of Iona monks, namely of St. Blaithmac who refused to give up the shrine, and his holy companions. Blaithmac's heroic death was celebrated in Latin verse by Walafridus Strabo, Abbot of Reichenschau, South Germany. In 908 St. Andrews was formally recognized as the primatial see of Scotland, from which year we may date the disappearance of Iona's insular primacy. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, 1204, the ancient Celtic monastery finally disappeared, and a new Benedictine one was established by authority of the pope—but the original ground—the Redig Odhrin—was still regarded as the holiest ground in Scotland, and is now crowded with the inscribed tomb-stones of the kings, chieftains and prelates who rest beneath.

Ionian Islands a group of seven islands (whence the name Heptanesus, by which they are also designated) and a number of islets scattered over the Ionian Sea to the west of Greece, between 36° and 40° N. lat., and 19° and 23° E. long. The seven islands are: Corfu (Korfu, Corfu), Paxi, Lefkada or Santa Maura, Ithaca or Thikai, Cephalonia, Zante or Zacynthus, and Cerego or Cythera. Of the islets the most important are: Antipaxos, Othones, and Anticythera or Cerigo. The Ionian Isles have a total area of about 1089 square miles. The population amounts to 261,930, among them being 6615 Catholics of the Latin Rite, while the remainder, with the exception of a few thousand Jews and a small number of Mussulmans, belong to the Greek Orthodox Church. The climate of the islands is in general very mild and salubrious, and, in spite of the mountainous character of the land, there is a fairly extensive output of cotton, wine, oil, and raisins. The Ionian Isles are frequently mentioned or described by the ancient Greek and Latin authors, for whom they had many mythological associations. Many remains of antiquity are even to-day found on these islands (Riemann, "Recherches archéologiques sur les îles ionniennes", Paris, 1879-80). They all remained under Byzantine rule until about the end of the eleventh century, when the Normans of the Two Sicilies obtained possession of Corfu. In 1386 Venice took the islands, and retained them until the middle of the eighteenth century. The Treaty of Campo Formio in 1797 gave them to France, which formed them into the three provinces of Ithaca, Corfu, and the Ægean Sea. In 1799 the Russian fleet seized the Ionian Isles, and they were constituted a small state tributary to Turkey, but in 1807 the Treaty of Amiens declared them free under the protectorate of Russia. In 1807 the Peace of Tilsit gave them back to France, and General Berthier was installed as their governor. The Second Treaty of Paris (November, 1815) placed them under English protection. An aristocratic government was then once more recognized; the legislative functions were vested in a chamber of seventy deputies, eleven nominated by the Government and fifty-nine elected by the people; the executive power belonged to a Senate consisting of a president, appointed by the protecting power, and five senators elected for five years by the deputies from their own body. An English lord commissioner controlled foreign relations and the police. England enjoyed the right of garrisoning the forts and of military administration. After the French Revolution of 1848, an insurrection broke out in Cephalonia with the object of uniting the islands to Greece, but was rigorously repressed by England in 1849. From that time, however, the first vote of the Chamber, whenever it assembled, was in favour of the union with Greece, after which vote it was immediately dissolved.
The English Government, after sending Mr. Gladstone to investigate the feeling of the population, at last decided to surrender the islands to Greece. King George I, upon ascending the throne at Athens, in 1863, consented to succeed Otho I only upon England’s undertaking to cede the Ionian Archipelago to the Hellenic Kingdom. This cession was effected between 21 May and 2 June, 1864. The Ionian Isles have since then formed the three nomarchies, or departments, of Corfu, Cephalonia, and Zante. Cerigo alone has been incorporated in the continental nomarchy of Messenia.

The Ionian Isles must have received the Gospel at a comparatively early date. The first known Bishop of Corfu is Apollodorus, or Alethodorus, who assisted at the Council of Nicaea in 325 (Gelzer, "Patrum nicenorum nomina", LXIII, no. 198; see also the list of ancient Greek bishops in Lequien, II, 232–5).

After the consummation of the Eastern Schism, the Ionian bishoprics remained in the power of the schismatics. Until 1260 the archipelago of the seven islands counted scarcely any Catholics. Under the domination of the House of Anjou, Catholicism made some progress there, and this was continued from 1386 to 1797 under Venetian rule. In the thirteenth century Zante and Cephalonia were made Latin bishoprics, suffragan to Corinth until 1796. These two dioceses (Zante and Cephalonia) were then made one and suffragan to Corfu, which was then raised to the status of an archbishopric (see the list of Latin bishops of the three sees in Lequien, III, 377–82, 889–92; completed by Gams, 399, 430, and Eulobel, I, 217). The political vicissitudes through which the Ionian Archipelago passed during the nineteenth century brought about the Catholic missions, which, however, suffered less after 1850. At the time of the cession of the islands to Greece in 1864, the Hellenic Government promised to secure to the three Latin bishoprics their former rights and privileges. The Archdiocese of Corfu (which, besides the island of that name, comprises the islands and islets of Merlera, Phano, Samothrace, Paxos, and Antipaxos, as well as a few places in Epirus on the mainland between the towns of Parga and Sássina) is now governed by a resident archbishop, who is at the same time Administrator Apostolic of the Diocese of Zante-Cephalonia. This last diocese comprises, besides the two islands from which it derives its name, those of Santa Maria Leucasa (or Leucadia), Ithaca, and Cerigo. The archdiocese numbers about 6000 Catholics, all of the Latin Rite; the Diocese of Zante-Cephalonia, 615 (Missiones catholicae, 1907, 145–7). (See Corfu, Archdiocese of; Zante-Cephalonia, Diocese of.) The Orthodox hierarchy until 1900 consisted of seven dioceses, one for each of the principal islands of the Ionian Archipelago; since then it has numbered but five, that of Paxos having been suppressed, and the two titles of Leucasa and Ithaca united into one. Formerly dependent on the Phanar of Constantinople, the ecclesiastical eparchies of the ancient septinsular republic became connected in 1866 with the Holy Synod of Athens, to which they are still subject (Thiéry, "L’Église de Grèce" in "Echos d’Orient", III (1899–1900), 288 sqq.). (See Greece.)
IOWA is one of the North Central States of the American Union, and is about midway between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. It lies between two great rivers, the Mississippi and the Missouri; the Mississippi forming its eastern boundary and separating it from the States of Illinois and Wisconsin; the Missouri and its chief tributary, the Big Sioux, forming its western boundary, and separating it from the States of Nebraska and South Dakota. It extends from 40° 36' to 43° 30' north latitude.

In the south-east corner, in Lee County, the boundary projects below the parallel, following the channel of the Des Moines River down to its junction with the Mississippi. The state is 310 miles from east to west and 210 miles from north to south, and has an area of 56,025 square miles, or 35,855,900 acres, being nearly the same size as Wisconsin or Illinois.

Physical Characteristics.—The surface of the state is an undulating prairie, part of the Great Central Plain of North America. It rises gradually from the south-east corner, where the lowest point is but 444 feet above the sea-level, towards the north-west, to the Divide (an elevated plain beginning in Dickinson County in the north-western part of the state), where the highest point (1094 feet) is reached. The ridge of the Divide crosses the state from north to south, parallel with the western boundary and about 60 miles east of it, until it reaches Adair County, whence it sweeps eastwards to Appanoose County. That part of the state east of the Divide, comprising over two-thirds of its surface, is drained by rivers flowing in a south-easterly direction into the Mississippi and its tributaries. The principal rivers of this system are the Upper Iowa, Turkey, Maquoketa, Wapapinicon, Cedar, Skunk, and Des Moines. Of these the Des Moines is by far the largest and most important, rising in Minnesota and flowing diagonally across the entire state. West of the Divide the rivers flow southwesterly into the Missouri and its tributaries, and, as the watershed is near the western boundary of the state, the rivers have shorter courses and a more rapid flow than those of the eastern system. The principal western rivers are the Big Sioux, Rock, Floyd, Little Sioux, Boyer, and Nishnabotna. The principal lakes of Iowa are Spirit Lake, which is the largest, Lake Okoboji, a popular summer resort, Clear Lake, and Storm Lake. These are small but beautiful sheets of water situated in the north-western part of the state which is an extension of the lake region of Minnesota. Along the largest rivers are valleys from one to ten miles in width, bordered by
irregular lines of bluffs. The picturesque ravines and bold rocky bluffs, ranging in height from 200 to 400 feet, along the Mississippi from Dubuque northwards, lend to that portion of the river a striking beauty all its own. There is but little native forest in the state, the timber being chiefly confined to the valleys of the rivers and the bordering bluffs. It was found that all deciduous trees thrive on the soil of the prairies; by special legislation, offering fiscal privileges, the farmers were encouraged to plant, and now woodland groves near the farmhouses are seen in all parts of the state, adding picturesqueness to the scenery. The principal trees are oak, chestnut, ash, elm, hickory, bass, walnut, poplar, box, elder, cedar, and varieties of oak. There are no mesomalic bottomlands in the state; the air is dry and invigorating, and the general climatic influences salubrious. During the last ten years (1899 to 1908 inclusive) the average extremes of temperature were 102° above to 31° below zero; the average mean temperature was 48° above zero. During the same time the average rainfall was 33 inches. For the year 1908, the mean temperature was 49.5°; the highest temperature was 101° (3 August) in Mahaska and Wapello Counties in the southern part of the state; the lowest temperature recorded for the year was 15° below zero (29 January) in Emmet and Winnebago Counties in the northern part of the state. The average amount of rain and melted snow for the year was 35.26 inches.

Industries and General Social Conditions.—Iowa has less waste land than any other of the United States, 97 per cent of its surface being tillable. The soil of the greater part of the state consists of a dark drift loam from two to five feet deep and of wonderful fertility. In the western part of the state is found the bluff soil, or loess, believed to be the deposit of the winds from the plains of Kansas and Dakota; this soil is a rich, coarse, loamy loam, favorable to the growth of fruit trees. The soil of the river valleys consists of waste carried down from higher levels, and is known as alluvium; it is the richest soil in the state. Because of the richness of its soil Iowa has long held a leading place among the agricultural states of the Union. Travelers over the state cannot but be impressed by the sight of its vast fields of Indian corn and oats. More than one-half of its population are engaged in farming. The value of the agricultural products of the state in 1908, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, was $212,528,000. This included 36,160,000 bushels of Indian corn, valued at $149,477,000, and 110,444,000 bushels of oats, valued at $46,386,000. The state ranks first in the production of oats and in the number of swine; second only to Illinois in the production of corn, second to Texas in the number of neat cattle, second to New York in the number of dairy cows, and second to Illinois in the number of horses. Iowa is famous for its dairy products, and the State Department of Agriculture estimates the value of these products for the year 1908 at $44,500,000.

The most important mineral deposit in the state is bituminous coal; the coal-field is an area of approximately 20,000 square miles in the southern and central parts of the state. The output in 1908 was 7,149,517 tons, valued at $11,772,228. Gypsum for stucco and plaster is found in Webster County, and clay for tile- and brick-making is abundant. In the year 1908 the value of clay products was $4,075,600. possess in the vicinity of Dubuque, and attracted the first white people to the state, and which became known as the Mines of Spain, is still yielding lead and zinc ore. The manufactures of the state are steadily increasing, because of its growth and prosperity, and the possession of native coal. The value of the output of manufactures for the last statutory year, 1905, was $160,572,313. The Missisippi is now the only river navigable for large boats, the shifting channel and sand-bars of the Missouri constituting great obstacles to navigation. But the facilities for transportation are excellent, the state being covered by a network of railways, including seven great trunk lines. The total mileage of railways in the state, in 1908, was 9,980.82 and the total value of electric interurban railways was $24,018. According to Federal estimates made in 1908, the population of Iowa was 2,196,970. By the last State Census (1905) the population—2,210,050—was made up of: 1,264,443 native whites of native parentage; 668,352 native whites of foreign parentage; 228,296 foreign-born; and 3,758 Chinese. The number of foreign-born, however, is the smallest of all the states, being 53 Chinese in the state; but 39 per cent of the foreign-born population were born in Germany. Added to the immigrants from Germany, those from Sweden, Norway, and Denmark make 63 per cent of the foreign-born population derived from Teutonic races. Eight per cent of the foreign-born came from Ireland. Most of the native-born population are descendants of immigrants from the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. There were many Frenchmen among the earliest settlers (Bishop Loras preached sermons in the cathedral in French as well as in English), but there are few of that race but few descendants. The state. Prior to 1853, the immigrants from foreign countries were largely from Ireland and Germany, with the Irish in the majority; these immigrants settled in the eastern part of the state, and there were among them a large proportion of Catholics. But since that year the immigration has largely been from the Teutonic nations. The State Census of 1905 gives the membership of the four leading Churches as follows: Methodist Episcopal, 162,688; Catholic, 138,000; Lutheran, 91,889; Presbyterian, 47,765. According to Federal estimates in 1908, Des Moines, the capital city, had a population of 28,717; the next largest cities in order are Dubuque, Sioux City, and Davenport.

An admirably organized system of public schools exists throughout the state, generous provision for that purpose having been made by the State Constitution. The schools are supported chiefly by local taxation and the interest on the permanent school fund. Education is compulsory, the parents and guardians of children between the ages of seven and fourteen years inclusive being compelled to send them to some public, parochial, or private school for the term week. The school term is of the usual six weeks. By statute passed in 1909, the attendance of the children during these sixteen weeks is excused for such time as they are attending religious service or receiving religious instruction. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction has general supervision of the public schools. In each county there is elected a county superintendent. Some of the townships of the counties constitute each a single district having one or two central schools, but generally the townships are subdivided into subdistricts and independent districts; where the latter consist of cities, the schools are managed by the city. No religious instruction is given, the Bible is not extended from any public school or institution, but no pupil can be required to read it contrary to the wishes of his parent or guardian.

In 1903 the number of schoolhouses was 13,914, the number of teachers 27,950, the enrolment of students 1,063,026. In 1908 the city and county school systems, for the purpose of education $1,930,363. There are 534 high schools in the state in which the course of study, generally speaking, covers four years. The State University, the head of the public school system, is located at Iowa City. It was established in 1847; in 1908 it had 104 professors and instructors, and 2,315 students enrolled. The State also maintains
the College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, at Ames, and the Normal School at Cedar Falls. There are also 12 further institutions, besides the universities, of higher educational institutions. The Juvenile Court Law has been for several years in force in Iowa. Under the provisions of the law, offending children under the age of sixteen years are no longer treated as criminals, nor confined in jails. They, as well as neglected, helpless, and delinquent children, and, under the supervision of probationary officers, are kept in their own or other homes, or sent to the State Industrial Schools. Many girls are sent to the Houses of the Good Shepherd.

Catholic Education.—Through the unremitting zeal of Bishop Dubuque and his predecessors in office, and their labours among the clergy and people, the cause of Catholic religious education has so advanced that parochial schools exist in all the parishes of considerable size in the state, and are taught chiefly by religious orders. In the year 1809, there were in the state 839 pupils attending the parochial schools. These schools are supplemeted by 36 academies and high schools in which 5812 students are taught; and to complete the system are two diocesan colleges: St. Joseph's College, at Dubuque, with 280 students, and St. Ambrose College, at Davenport, with 167 students. The metropolitan city of the archdiocese, where the enrolled number of pupils attending the public schools is 4084, the number attending the parochial schools is 3000. The city is surrounded by a cordon of Catholic institutions, educational and charitable, and has become widely known as a centre of Catholic education.

History.—The first white man who saw Iowa was the French Jesuit Father Marquette and Louis Joliet, who on the 17th day of June, 1673, coming down the mouth of the Wisconsin River, discovered the Mississippi and faced the picturesque bluffs of the Iowa shore. The first landing on Iowa territory recorded by Father Marquette in his journal was near Montrose, in Lee County, where he had a peaceful and memorable meeting with the natives. One hundred and fifteen years passed away from the time of Father Marquette’s discovery until the first white settlement was made within the limits of the state. In 1788 Dubuque, the French Canadian, was granted from the Indians a grant of land, in which to mine for lead; it extended seven leagues along the west bank of the Mississippi and was three leagues in width, including the territory on which now stands the city of Dubuque. This grant was afterwards confirmed by Barbé de Marigny, governor of the Spanish province of Louisiana, and the strip of land became known as the Mines of Spain. Here Dubuque, with ten other Canadians, and aided by the Indians, operated the mines until his death in 1810, when the whites were driven out. Dubuque was buried on the top of an isolated bluff overlooking the city, a location that has always been kept. The city, from the present limits of the city of Dubuque, and a large cross marked his grave for many years. This became a well-known landmark to river men on the upper Mississippi, and is mentioned in books of travel. In 1832, in the territory east of the Mississippi, occurred the war with the Indians known as the Black Hawk War. This resulted in a treaty, made in the same year, by which the Indians relinquished that part of Iowa known as the Black Hawk Purchase, containing six million acres of land, lying immediately west of the Mississippi River, about ninety miles in width, and north of the Missouri River. Through the purchase, the first concession of territory in Iowa by the Indians, it was the first which opened any portion of the land for settlement by the whites. Settlements were made in 1833 at Dubuque and at other points near the Mississippi River. Within ten years the title to practically all of the state was secured by treaties with the Indians. Attracted by glowing accounts of the richness of the soil, immigrants came pouring in from the New England states, New York, Illinois, Ohio, Kentucky, North Carolina, Missouri, and from other states.

In 1834 that part of the Louisiana Purchase now included in the State of Iowa was made a part of the Territory of Michigan, in 1836 it was attached to, and made a part of, the new Territory of Wisconsin, and in 1838 was established separately as the Territory of Iowa. On 22 December of 1846, it was admitted to the Union as the twenty-ninth State, being the fourth state created out of the Louisiana Purchase. In 1854 the first railroad was built from Davenport west, and railroad-building then extended rapidly. In the same year was passed a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors which, with some amendments, is still on the statute books. In 1857 the state adopted a revised Constitution which, with a few amendments, is still the law. The progress of the state was checked by the Civil War, at the close of which, however, immigration recommenced, and population and wealth increased. Although the population in 1860 was less than 700,000, the state furnished, during the Civil War, 75,519 volunteers.

The Church in Iowa.—The first Mass celebrated within the limits of Iowa was said in the year 1833, by the Rev. C. P. Fitzemorris, of Galena, Illinois, in the home of Patrick Quigley, who was the first Catholic in the state. The first Catholic church in the state was built at Dubuque by the celebrated Dominican missionary, Samuel Mazzuchelli, in 1836. On 10 December, 1837, the Very Rev. Mathias Loras, Vicar-General of the Diocese of Mobile, Alabama, was consecrated first Bishop of Dubuque. Bishop Loras was a native of Lyons, France, and was a worthy comrade of Bl. Jean-Baptiste Vianney, the celebrated Curé of Ars. Going to France for priests and financial aid, Bishop Loras arrived in Dubuque with two priests and four deacons on the 19th day of April, 1839. His diocese included all the territory between the Mississippi River and the Mississippi Rivers, from the northern limit of the State of Missouri to the British Possessions. In his diocese he found but three churches and one priest, Father Mazzuchelli. The indefatigable labours of Bishop Loras in personally attending to the spiritual wants of the scattered settlers in his vast territory, in building churches and procuring cemeteries, and in insuring the immigration from the Eastern States and from Europe, have secured him a high rank among the pioneer missionaries and church-builders of this country. In 1843, he brought from Philadelphia the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who established their mother-house and convent at Dubuque and were widely known as successful teachers. In 1849 he gave a home to the Trappist monks from Mount Melleray, Ireland, who founded the Abbey of New Melleray, still in existence, twelve miles from Dubuque. When he died (19 February, 1858) there were within the limits of the State of Iowa, 46 priests, 60 churches, and a Catholic population of 54,000. In 1850 the territory north of the State of Iowa had been formed into the Diocese of St. Paul. He was succeeded by his coadjutor, the Rt. Rev. Clement Smyth, who had been Prior of New Melleray Abbey. Bishop Smyth was a man of great scholarly attainments and was the founder of the school for young men which still flourishes in the Abbey of Mount Melleray, Ireland. His uniform courtesy and gentleness won all hearts; and he was noted for his ardent patriotism during the strenuous days of the Civil War. During his short episcopacy he established the work of Bishop Loras and died 23 September, 1865, lamented by priests and people.

On 30 September, 1866, in St. Raphael’s Cathedral, Dubuque, the Rev. John Hennessy, pastor of St. Joseph’s church, St. Joseph, Missouri, was consecrated Bishop of Dubuque. Bishop Hennessy was renowned as a pupil orator, and was the man of rare
The best of feeling exists amongst the different denominations, and there is but little bigotry anywhere in the state. The Constitution provides that no person shall be by law compelled in any case to attend religious worship, or to contribute to the support of any establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and that no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office, or public trust, and no person shall be deprived of any of his rights, privileges, or capacities, or disqualified from the performance of any of his duties in the public or private character, by any opinion or rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion. By statute, the disturbance of public worship is punished by fine or imprisonment, and the breach of Sunday by "carrying firearms, discharging guns, or pistols, or throwing any other weapon, and in any manner disturbing a worshipping assembly or private family, or buying or selling property of any kind, or engaging in any labour except that of necessity or charity" is punished by fine and imprisonment. In general all stores in cities and towns are closed on Sunday. The punishment in case of violation is a fine not exceeding $50, and if daily sessions are opened with prayer. In addition to Sunday, the only days which are recognized as religious holidays are Christmas and Thanksgiving Day. By statute, no minister of the Gospel, or priest of any denomination is allowed, in giving testimony, to disclose any confidential communications properly entrusted to him in his professional capacity and proper to enable him to discharge the functions of his office according to the usual course of practice or discipline. The statutes of the state provide that any three or more persons of full age, a majority of whom shall be citizens, may incorporate themselves for the establishment of churches, colleges, seminaries, temperance societies, or organizations of a benevolent, charitable, or religious character. Any corporation so organized may take and hold by gift, purchase, devise, or bequest, real and personal property for purposes appropriate to its creation. The corporation shall exist for a term of years not exceeding 99 years, and not leased or otherwise used with a view to pecuniary profit, are exempt from taxation. Cemeteries are also exempt. The State imposes what is called a collateral inheritance tax of 5 per cent on all property within the state which passes, by will, or by the statutes of after death, of the grantor, to collateral heirs or strangers to the blood. From this tax are exempt bequests or deeds to charitable, educational, or religious institutions within the state, and, by a statute passed in 1909, there is also exempt from this tax "any bequest not to exceed $300 to and in favour of any person having for its purpose the performance of any religious service to be performed for and in behalf of decedent or any person named in his or her last will, or any cemetery associations," thus exempting bequests for Masses. Clergymen are excused from jury service, and the Constitution of the state provides "that no person in the civil service shall be compelled to do military duty in time of peace."
Ipolyi, Arnold (family name originally Stummer), Bishop of Grosswardein (Nagy-Várás), b. at Ipolykessy, 20 Oct., 1823; d. at Grosswardein, 2 December, 1886. At the age of thirteen years he entered the ranks of the alumni of the Archidiocese of Gran (Esztergom), studied two years in the Emerichianum at Pressburg (Posony), and two years at Szombathely (Szent-Miklós), and finished at the Pasmaneum at Vienna, where he attended lectures on theology for four years. In 1844 he entered the seminary of Gran, took minor orders in 1845, and was ordained priest in 1847. From 1845 to 1847 he acted as tutor in the family of Baron Mednyánszky, was then curate at Komornó-Szent-Peter (Komáróm-Szent-Peter), in 1848 preacher at Pressburg, in 1849 spent a short time as tutor in the family of Count Palffy, and became in this year parish priest of Zobor. Even before his ordination he concerned himself with historical and artistic matters. In 1853, the work "Mythologie" came out, as the first fruit of his work, in which he treats of the ancient religion of Hungary. Although the work won the prize offered by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the author afterwards withdrew it from the press, so that at the present time it is very rare. In 1886 Ipolyi became parish priest at Török-Szent-Miklós. Accompanied by Franz Kubiinyi and Emerich Henschlmann, he made in 1882 a journey to Constantinople, where he discovered the remainder of the library of Matthias Corvinus. In 1865 he was made canon of Eger, and in 1880 director of the Central Ecclesiastical Seminary at Pressburg; in 1871 he became Bishop of Neusohl (Bejerezs-Bánánya), and in 1886 Bishop of Grosswardein, where he died on 2 December of the same year. Ipolyi was member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, as well as a member of different learned societies at home and abroad. He was one of the founders and at first vice-president, then president, of the Hungarian Historical Society. His literary activity extended into the provinces of history, art, history, archeology, and Christian art. He enriched the Hungarian National Gallery with sixty valuable paintings. He bequeathed to the State a library of 3,000 volumes, for the purpose of founding a museum, his collections which had been brought together with a great expert knowledge of art. Of his literary works, in addition to his "Mythologie", the following are well known: "Biography of Michael Veressmari", an author of the seventeenth century (Budapest, 1873); the "Codex epistolarius Nicolai Oláh" in the "Monumenta Hungarica Historiae: Scriptorium", XXV (Budapest, 1876); the "Biographie der Christina Nyáry von Beda" (Budapest, 1887), in Hungarian; also the "Historische und kunsthistorische Beschreibung der ungarischen Kroninsignien" (Budapest, 1886), in Hungarian. A list of his literary works has appeared in five volumes (Budapest, 1887).

A. ALDÁSY.
attention of the Archbishop Alexander de' Medici (afterwards Leo XI), who gave him the church of Sta Lucia al Prato in which to carry on his work. He divided his time between his trade of silk-weaving and the religious instruction of poor children and adults, and at sixteen felt impelled to found a society for this purpose. He opened the great door of Christian Doctrine under the invocation of Sts. Francis and Lucy. It was divided into fifteen classes, according to the age and religious knowledge of the pupils, each class being governed by special rules and assisting in the instruction of the class below. The members of the first class were admitted to the congregation after a good confession.

Ippolito was indefatigable in his work, collecting alms from the wealthy Florentines, which he distributed among the poor, founding and reorganizing branches of his congregation, which spread to Volterra, Lucca, Pistoia, Modena, etc. He introduced the practice of nocturnal adoration to draw the people from the theatre and sinful amusements. In Florence, the members of his congregation, by reason of their modesty, were called Van Chedoni. Ippolito was the object of violent persecution, envy and malice accusing him of sharing the errors of Luther, of introducing new rules and reforms. One of his spiritual sons accused him before the pope and Grand Duke Cosimo of excessive severity, but the charge was not sustained, and Ippolito's congregation was declared to be for God's glory and the public good. Shortly before the holy man's death the grand duke founded a chapter for the custody of the order. Ippolito died on a pilgrimage to Loreto to place his foundation under the protection of the Blessed Virgin. The statutes of the congregation were approved by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, and confirmed by Leo XII in a decree of 17 September, 1824. The founder wasBeatified by the same pontiff, 13 May, 1825. His ascetical works, written for the government and direction of his congregation, had been approved by Benedict XIV in 1747, and were published at Rome in 1831, together with a brief life of the saint by Canon Antonio Santelli.

BRIEFSCHRIFTEl KIRCHENF. 8. V. DOCTORIAIR. BLANCHE M. KELLY.

**Ipsus**, a titular see of Phrygia Salutaris, suffragan of Synnada. The locality was famous as the scene of the great battle fought in 301 b. c. between the successors of Alexander, in which Antigonus was slain and his kingdom divided between his rivals. As Ipsos or Hypsos the city is mentioned by Hierocles and George of Cyprus and in most of the medieval "Notitiae episcopatuum". Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, 1, 480–481) found the title of bishop of Ipsos (or Ipsia) of Chalcedon in 451; George, at the Seventh Council in 787; Photius and Thomas at the Councils of Constantinople in 868 and 878. The city was situated at the junction of two roads, one leading to Byzantium and the other towards Sardes; the exact site has not been identified. Its Modern geographers identify Ipsos with the ruins of Ipilis-Hisar, or Iskenderiye ("Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia", Oxford, 1897, 748), with those of Tehai, 82 miles from Apamea.

S. VAILHE.

**IRELAND.**—GEOGRAPHY.—Ireland lies in the Atlantic Ocean, west of Great Britain, from which it is separated in the north-east by the North Channel, in the east by the Irish Sea, and in the south-east by St. George's Channel. Situated between the fifty-first and fifty-sixth degrees of latitude, and between the fifth and eleventh parallels of longitude (Greenwich), its greatest length is 302 miles, its greatest breadth 174 miles, its area 32,535 square miles. It is divided into four provinces, these being subdivided into thirty-two counties. In the centre the country is a level plain; towards the west it becomes mountains, and towards the south it becomes highlands. Its rivers and bays are numerous, also its bogs; its climate is mild, though unduly moist. In minerals it is not wealthy like Great Britain, but its soil is generally more fertile, and is specially suitable for agriculture and pasturage.

Prior to the County Hills it was known by the various names of Ierna, Juverna, Hiberna, Ogygia, and Insifal or the Isle of Destiny. It was also called Bamba and Erin, and lastly Scotia, or the country of the Scots. From the eleventh century, however, the name Scotia was exclusively applied to Caledonia, the latter country having been peoples in the sixth century by a Scottish colony from Ireland. Henceforth Ireland was often called Scotia Major and sometimes Ireland, until, after the eleventh century, the name Scotia was dropped and Ireland alone remained. Even yet it is sometimes called Erin, chiefly by the chieftains and old poets. Situated in the far west, out of the beaten paths of commercial activity, it was little known to the ancients. Festus Avienus wrote that it was two days' sail from Britain. Pliny thought that it was part of Britain and not an island at all; Strabo that it was near Britain, and that its inhabitants were cannibals and that Caesar saw that it was west of Britain, and about half its size. Agricola behold its coastline from the opposite shores of Caledonia, and had thought of accepting the invitation of an Irish chief to come and conquer it, believing he could do so with a single legion. But he left Ireland unvisited and unoccupied. He left only record that in soil and climate it resembled Britain, and that its harbours were then well known to foreign merchants.

But if we have not any detailed description from his lively pen, the native chroniclers have furnished us with abundant materials, and, if all they say be true, we can understand the remark of Camden that Ireland was rightly called Ogygia, or the Ancient Island, because, in comparison, the antiquity of all other nations is in its infancy. Passing by the absurd story that it was peopled before the Deluge, we are told that, beginning with the time of the several successive waves of colonization rolled westward to its shores. First came Partholus with 1000 followers; after which came the Nemedians, the Firbolgs, and the Tuatha-de-Dananns, and lastly the Milesians or Scots. In addition, there were the Fomorians, a people of uncertain origin, whose chief occupation was piracy and war, and whose attacks on the various settlers were incessant. These and the Milesians excepted, the different colonists came from Greece, and all were of the same race. The Milesians came from Scythia; and from that country to Egypt, from Egypt to Spain, and thence to Ireland. There is much in this that is very interesting. His narrative, however, is brief and not at all in detail. The name Scot which they bore was derived from Scotia, daughter of Pharaoh of Egypt, the wife of one of their chiefs; from their chief Milichd they got the name Milesians, and from another chief Goidel they were sometimes called Gedelians, or Gaels. The wars and battles of these colonists are highly fabulous, and the Partholons, Nemedians, and Fomorians belong rather to mythology than to history. So also do the Dananns, though sometimes they are taken as a real people, of superior knowledge and skill, the builders of those prehistoric sepulchral mounds by the Boyne, at Dowth, Knowth, and Newgrange. The Firbolgs, however, must probably be regarded as a mixture of the Dananns; or perhaps those who warlike Belge of Gaul whom Caesar encountered in battle. And the Milesians certainly belong to history, though the date of their arrival in
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Ireland is unknown. They were Celts, and probably came from Gaul to Britain, and from Britain to Ireland, rather than direct from Spain. Under the leadership of Heremon and Heber they soon became masters of the island. Some of the Firbolges, it is said, crossed the sea to the Isles of Arran, where they built the ancient city of Inverness. All events before the reign of Cimbaeth (300 B.C.) are uncertain. Even after the dawn of the Christian Era fact and fiction are interwoven and events are often shrouded in the shadows and mists. Such, for instance, are the exploits of Cuchulainn and Finn Maclemhail. Nor have many of these early kings been remarkable, if we except Conn of the Hundred Battles, who lived in the first century after Christ; Cormac, who lived a century later; Tuathal, who established the Feis of Tara; Niall, who invaded Britain; and Dathl, who in the fifth century lost his life at the foot of the Alps.

The Irish were then pagans, but not barbarians. Their roads were indeed ill-constructed, their wooden dwellings rude, the dress of their lower orders scanty, their implements of agriculture and war primitive, and so were their land vehicles and the boats in which they traversed the sea. On the other hand, some of their swords and shields showed some skill in metal-working, and their war-like and commercial voyages to Britain and Gaul argue some proficiency in shipbuilding and navigation. They certainly loved music; and, besides their inscribed Ogham writing, they had a knowledge of letters. There was a high-king of Ireland (arrai), and subject to him were the provincial kings and chiefs of tribes. Each of these received a tribute from his immediate inferior, and even in a scant the political and legal administration was complete. There was the druid who explained religion, the brehon who dispensed justice, the brughaid or public hotelkeeper, the bard who sang the praises of his chief or urged his kinsmen to battle; and each was an official and had his appointed allotment of land. Kings, though taken from one family, were elective, the tanist or heir-apparent being frequently not the nearest relation of him who reigned. This peculiarity, together with general love for which the lands were periodically redistributed, impeded industry and settled government. Nor was there any legislative assembly, and the Brehon law under which Ireland lived was judge-made law. Sometimes the ardrí's tribute remained unpaid and his authority nominal; but if he was a strong man he exacted obedience and tribute. The Boro tribute levied on the King of Leinster was excessive and unjust, and led to many evils. The pagan Irish believed in Druidism (q. v.), resembling somewhat the Druidism Caesar saw in Gaul; but the pagan creed of the Irish was indefinite and their gods do not stand in a clear array. They held the immortality and the transmigration of souls, worshipped the sun and moon, and, with an inferior worship, mountains, rivers, and wells. And they sacrificed to idols, one of which, Crom Cruach, they are said to have propitiated with human sacrifices. They also believed in fairies, holding that the Tuatha-de-Dananns, when defeated by the Milesians, retired into the bosom of the mountains, where they held their fairy revels. One of the women fairies (the banshee) watched the fortunes of great families, and when a great misadventure was impending, the doomed family was warned at night by her mournful wail.

EARLY CHRISTIAN PERIOD.—Intercourse with Britain and the Continent through commerce and war sufficiently accounts for the introduction of Christianity before the fifth century. There must have been then a considerable number of Christians in Ireland; for in 430 Palladius (q. v.), a bishop and native of Britain, was sent by Pope Celestine to the Scots believing in Christ. Palladius, however, did little, and almost immediately returned to Britain, and in 432 the same pope sent St. Patrick (q. v.). He is the Apostle of Ireland, but this does not imply that he found Ireland altogether pagan and left it altogether Christian. It is however quite true that when St. Patrick did come paganism was the predominant belief, and that at his death it had been supplanted as such by Christianity. The extraordinary work which St. Patrick did, as well as his own attractive personal character, has furnished him with many biographers; and even in recent years his life and works have engaged popular interest. But in spite of all that has been written many things in his life are still doubtful and obscure. It is still doubtful when and where he was born, how he spent his life between his first leaving Ireland and his return, and in what year he died. It has been maintained that he never existed; that he and Palladius were the same man; that he was a counterfeit of St. Patrick; and others. This contradistinction and exaggerations have encouraged the scoffer to sneer; and Gibbon was sure that in the sixty-six lives of St. Patrick there must have been sixty-six thousand lies. In reality there seems no solid reason for rejecting the traditional account, viz., that St. Patrick was born at Dumbarton in Scotland about 372; that he was captured and brought to Ireland by the Irish king, Niall; that he was sold as a slave to an Ulster chief Milcho, whom he served for six years; that he then escaped and went back to his own people; that in repeated visions he, a pious Christian, heard the plaintive cry of the pagan Irish inviting him to come amongst them; that, believing he was called by God to do so, he went first to the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, then to that of St. Germanus of Auxerre, after which he went to Léins and to Rome; and then, being consecrated bishop, he was sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland, where he arrived in 432. Patrick

From Wicklow, where he landed, his course is traced to Antrim; back by Downpatrick, near which he converted Dichu and got from him a grant of land for his first church at Saul; thence by Dunkalk, where Benjamin was converted; and to Sian, where in sight of Tara itself he lighted the house at midnight. The druids pointed out to the ardrí the heinousness of the offence, for during the great pagan festival then being celebrated it was death to light any fire except at
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Which Crom Cruach, they are said to have propitiated with human sacrifices. They also believed in fairies, holding that the Tuatha-de-Dananns, when defeated by the Milesians, retired into the bosom of the mountains, where they held their fairy revels. One of the women fairies (the banshee) watched the fortunes of great families, and when a great misadventure was impending, the doomed family was warned at night by her mournful wail.

EARLY CHRISTIAN PERIOD.—Intercourse with Britain and the Continent through commerce and war sufficiently accounts for the introduction of Christianity before the fifth century. There must have been then a considerable number of Christians in Ireland; for in 430 Palladius (q. v.), a bishop and native of Britain, was sent by Pope Celestine to the Scots believing in Christ. Palladius, however, did little, and almost immediately returned to Britain, and in 432 the same pope sent St. Patrick (q. v.). He is the Apostle of Ireland, but this does not imply that he found Ireland altogether pagan and left it altogether Christian. It is however quite true that when St. Patrick did come paganism was the predominant belief, and that at his death it had been supplanted as such by Christianity. The extraordinary work which St. Patrick did, as well as his own attractive personal character, has furnished him with many biographers; and even in recent years his life and works have engaged popular interest. But in spite of all that has been written many things in his life are still doubtful and obscure. It is still doubtful when and where he was born, how he spent his life between his first leaving Ireland and his return, and in what year he died. It has been maintained that he never existed; that he and Palladius were the same man; that he was a counterfeit of St. Patrick; and others. This contradistinction and exaggerations have encouraged the scoffer to sneer; and Gibbon was sure that in the sixty-six lives of St. Patrick there must have been sixty-six thousand lies. In reality there seems no solid reason for rejecting the traditional account, viz., that St. Patrick was born at Dumbarton in Scotland about 372; that he was captured and brought to Ireland by the Irish king, Niall; that he was sold as a slave to an Ulster chief Milcho, whom he served for six years; that he then escaped and went back to his own people; that in repeated visions he, a pious Christian, heard the plaintive cry of the pagan Irish inviting him to come amongst them; that, believing he was called by God to do so, he went first to the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, then to that of St. Germanus of Auxerre, after which he went to Léins and to Rome; and then, being consecrated bishop, he was sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland, where he arrived in 432. Patrick

From Wicklow, where he landed, his course is traced to Antrim; back by Downpatrick, near which he converted Dichu and got from him a grant of land for his first church at Saul; thence by Dunkalk, where Benjamin was converted; and to Sian, where in sight of Tara itself he lighted the house at midnight. The druids pointed out to the ardrí the heinousness of the offence, for during the great pagan festival then being celebrated it was death to light any fire except at
Tara. But St. Patrick came to Tara itself, baptized the chief poet, and even the ardi; then marched north and destroyed at Loughcrew the dolmen, from which he entered Connaught, and remained there for seven years. Passing from Connaught to Ulster, he went through Donegal, Tyrone, and Antrim, consecrated Macarten Bishop of Monaghan, and Fiacco Bishop of Sligo; after which he entered Munster. His women, when he would them to himself at Saul in 493. His early captivity in Ireland interfered seriously with his education, and in his Confession and in his Epistle to Caroticus, both of which have survived the wreck of ages, we can discover no graces of style. But we see his great familiarity with the Scripture. And the more he adhered to his studies of prayer, his confidence in God, his zeal, his invincible courage. But while putting his entire trust in God, and giving Him all the glory, he rejected no human aid. Entering into a pagan territory he first preached to the chief men, knowing that when they were converted the people would follow. Wonderful indeed was his labour, and wonderful its results. He preached in almost every district in Ireland, confounded in argument the druids and won the people from their side; he built, it is said, 365 churches and consecrated an equal number of bishops, established schools and convents, and held synods; and when he died, the machinery of his operation, fully equal to the task of confirming in the faith those already converted and of bringing those yet in darkness into the Christian fold.

One of the apostle's first anxieties was to provide a native ministry. For this purpose he selected the leading men—chiefs, bricriu, bards—men likely to attract the respect of the people, and these, after little training and often with little education, he ordained. Thus equipped the priest went among the people, with his catechism, missal, and ritual, the bishop having in addition his crozier and bell. In a short time, however, these primitive conditions ceased. About 450 a college was established at Armagh under Benignus; other schools arose at Kildare, Noendrum, and Louth; and by the end of the fifth century these colleges sent forth a sufficient supply of trained priests. Supported by a grant of land from the chief of the clan or sept and by voluntary offerings, the bishop and priests lived together, preached to the people, administered the sacraments, settled their disputes, sat in their banquet halls. To many ardent natures this state of things was abhorrent. Fleeing from men, they sought for solitude and silence, by the barren mountain or in the recessed glen, they lived on the scantiest allowance of food, the water for their drink, a few wattles covered with sods for their houses, they spent their time in mortification and prayer. Literally they were monks, for they were alone with God. But their retreats were soon invaded by others anxious to share their raptures and learn wisdom at their feet. Each newcomer built his little hut, a church was erected, a grant of land obtained, their master became abbot, and perhaps bishop; and thus arose monastic establishments the fame of which soon spread throughout Europe. Noted examples in the sixth century were Clonard, founded by St. Finian, Clonfert by St. Brendan, Bangor by St. Comgall, Clonmacnoise by St. Kieran, Arran by St. Enda; and, in the seventh century, Lismore by St. Carthage and Glendalough by St. Kevin.

There were still bardic schools, as there was still paganism, but in the seventh century paganism had all but disappeared, and the bards were taught by the monastic schools. Frequenting by the best of the Irish, and by students from abroad, these latter diffused knowledge over western Europe, and Ireland received and merits the title of Island of Saints and Scholars. The holy men who laboured with St. Patrick and immediately succeeded him were mostly bishops and founders of churches; those of the sixth century were of the monastic order; those of the seventh century were secular; all the rest were men who loved solitude, silence, continued prayer, and the most rigid austerities. Nor were the women behindhand in this contest for holiness. St. Brigid is a name still dear to Ireland, and she, as well as St. Eta, St. Fancha and others, founded many convents tenanted by pious women. In later times the nuns did not do less well to the natures and wills of Christ. In the number of its sacraments, in its veneration for the Blessed Virgin, in its belief in the Mass and in Purgatory, in its obedience to the See of Rome, the creed of the early Irish Church was the Catholic creed of to-day (see Celtic Bible). Abroad as well as at home Irish Christian zeal was displayed. In 563 St. Columba, a native of Donegal, accompanied by a few companions, crossed the sea to Caledonia and founded a monastery on the desolate island of Iona. Fresh arrivals came from Ireland; the monastery with Columba as its abbot was soon a flourishing institution, from which the Dalriatian Churches rapidly spread, and the Grampians were evangelized; and when Columba died in 597, Christianity had been preached and received in every district in Caledonia, and in every island along its western coast. In the next century Iona had so prospered that its abbot, St. Adamnan, wrote in excellent Latin the "Life of St. Columba," the best biography of which the Middle Ages can boast. From Iona had gone south the Irish Aidan and his Irish companions to compete with and even exceed in zeal the Roman missionaries under St. Augustine, and to evangelize Northumbria, Mercia, and Essex; and if Irish zeal had already worn thin in Iona, equal zeal was now displayed on the desolate isle of Lindisfarne. Nor was this all. In 590 St. Columbanus, a student of Bangor, accompanied by twelve companions, arrived in France and established the monastery of Luxeuil, the parent of many monasteries, then in the county of Bregenz, and finally founded the monastery of Bobbio, which as a centre of knowledge and piety was long the light of northern Italy. And meantime his friend and fellow-student St. Gall laboured with conspicuous success in Switzerland, St. Fridolin along the Rhine, St. Fiacre near Meaux, St. Gallian at Wissenburg, St. Martin at Mayence, St. Sagittarius on the Meige, St. Cathal in southern Italy. And when Charlemagne reigned (771–814), Irishmen were at his court, "men incomparably skilled in human learning."

In the civil history of the period only a few facts stand out prominently. About 560, in consequence of a quarrel with the ardi Diarmuid about the right of sanctuary, St. Columba and Rhodanus (Reudan) of Lorcha publicly cursed Tara, an unpatriotic act which dealt a fatal blow at the prospect of a strong central government by blotting with maledictions its acknowledged seat. Nearly thirty years later the National Convention of Drumceat restrained the insolence and curtailed the privileges of the bards. In 684 Ireland was invaded by the King of Northumbia, though no permanent conquest followed. And in 697 the last Feis of Tara was held, at which, through the influence of Adamnan, women were interdicted from attending in actual array. At the same time the ardi Finae, at the instance of St. Moling, renounced for himself and his successors the Boru tribute. As the eighth century neared its close, religion and learning still flourished; but unexpected dangers approached and a new enemy came, before whose assaults monk and monastery and saint and scholar disappeared.
These invaders were the Danes from the coasts of Scandinavia. Pagans and pirates, they loved plunder and war, and both on land and sea were formidable foes. Like the fabled Fomorians of earlier times they had a genius for devastation. Descending from their ships along the coasts of western Europe, they murdered, razed, and robbed without mercy, and made slaves of others. The decree of synods were often flouted, and the new diocesan boundaries ignored.

The Anglo-Normans.—In Henry II of England an unexpected reformer appeared. The murderer of Thomas à Becket seemed ill-fitted for the role, but he undertook it, and in the year of his reign (1164) he procured a Bull from the English church and an Act of Parliament IV authorizing him to proceed to Ireland "to check the torrent of wickedness, to reform evil manners, to sow the seeds of virtue." The many troubles of his extensive kingdom thwarted his plans for years. But in 1169 Macmurrough, King of Leinster, driven from his kingdom sought his aid, and then Arden's Bull was remembered. A first contingent of Anglo-Normans came to Ireland in 1169 under Fitzgerald, a stronger force under Strongbow (de Clare, Earl of Pembroke) in 1170, and in 1171 Henry himself landed at Waterford and proceeded to Dublin, where he spent the winter, and received the submission of all the Irish chiefs, except those of Tyrconnell and Tyrowen. These submissions, however, aggravated rather than lessened existing ills. The Irish chiefs submitted to Henry as to a powerful ardrí, still preserving their privileges and rights under Brecon law. Henry, on his side, regarded them as prelates holding the lands of their tribes by military service and in accordance with feudal law. Thus a conflict between the clan system and feudalism arose. Exercising his executive rights, Henry divided the country into so many great fiefs, giving Meath to de Lacy, Leinster to Strongbow, while de Courcy was encouraged to conquer Ulster, and Connaught. At a later date the de Burgos settled in Galway, the FitzGeralds in Kildare and Desmond, the Butlers in Osseary.

The new Anglo-Irish lords soon outgrew the position of English subjects, and to the natives became tyrannical and overbearing. Ignoring the many evidences of culture in Ireland, he promulgated his own system of tithes, his high crosses, his illuminated manuscripts, his shrines and crosiers, the scholars that had abed lustre on her schools, the saints that had hallowed her valleys, the missionaries that had spread her fame throughout Europe—ignoring all these, they despised the Irish as rude and barbarous, despoiled their language, their laws, their dress, their arms; and, while not recognizing the Brehon law, they refused Irishmen the status of English subjects or the protection of English law. At last, despairing of union among their own chiefs, or of justices from Irish viceroy or English king, the oppressed Irish invited Edward Bruce from Scotland. In 1315 he landed in Ireland and was crowned king. Successful at first, his allies beyond the Shannon were almost annihilated in the battle of Athenry (1316); and two years later he was himself defeated and slain at Faughart. His ruin had been effected by a combination of the Anglo-Irish lords, and this still further inflated their pride. Titles rewarded them. Birmingham became Lord of Athenry and Earl of Louth, Fitzgerald Earl of Kildare, his kinsman Earl of Desmond, de Burgo Earl of Ulster, Butler Earl of Ormond. But these titles only increased their inroads and disloyalty. For Bruce was a heavy blow to the cause of church reform. Nor could so many evils be cured in a single life, or by the labours of a single man; and in spite of his efforts and the efforts of others the decree of synods were often flouted, and the new diocesan boundaries ignored.

Meanwhile the de Burgos in Connaught changed
their name to Burke, and became Irish chiefs; many others followed their example; even the ennobled Butlers and Fitzgeralds used the Irish language, dress, and customs, and were as turbulent as the worst of the native chiefs. To recall these colonists to their allegiance the Statute of Kilkenney made it penal to use Irish in public or private, or lastly to reside with the mere Irish, or the conferring of benefices on the native-born. But the barriers of race could not be maintained, and the intermarrying of Irish with Anglo-Irish went on. The long war with France, followed by the Wars of the Roses, diverted the attention of England from Irish affairs; and the viceroy feebly supported from England, was too weak to chastise these powerful lords or put penal laws in force. The hostility of native chiefs was bought off by the payment of “black rents”. The loyal colonists confined to a small district near Dublin, called “the Pale”, shivered behind its encircling rampart; and when the sixteenth century dawned, English power in Ireland had almost disappeared. Those within the Pale were impoverished by grasping officials and by the payment of “black rents”. Outside the Pale the country was held by sixty chiefs of Irish descent and thirty of English descent, each making peace or war as he pleased. LORD DEARING. The clergy of Irish descent were very numerous; those of English descent; the religious houses were corrupt, their priors and abbots great landholders with seats in Parliament, and more attached to secular than to religious concerns; the great monastic schools had disappeared, the greatest of them all, Clonmacnoise, being in ruins; preaching was neglected except by the mendicant orders, and these were utterly unable to cope with the disorders which prevailed.

THE TUDOR PERIOD.—Occupied with English and Continental affairs, Henry VIII, in the beginning of his reign had little care for Ireland; it was not until he was a quarter of a century on the throne were Irish affairs taken seriously in hand. The king was then in middle age, no longer the defender of the Faith against Luther, but, like Luther, a rebel against Rome; no longer generous or attractive in character, but rather a cruel, capricious tyrant, whom it was dangerous to provoke and fatal to disobey. In England his hands were reddened with the best blood of the land; and in Ireland the fate of the Fitzgeralds, following the rebellion of Silken Thomas, struck Irish and Anglo-Irish alike with such terror that all hastened to peace, and the heir apparent of his ancestors, became Earl of Tyrone; Burke became Earl of Clanrickard, O'Brien Earl of Thomond, Fitzpatrick Lord of Osory; the Earl of Desmond and the other Anglo-Irish nobles were pardoned all their offenses, and at a Parliament in Dublin (1541) Anglo-Irish and Irish attended. And Henry, who like his predecessors had been hitherto but Lord of Ireland (Domus Hibernia), was now unanimously given the higher title of king. This Parliament also passed the Act of Supremacy by which Henry was invested with spiritual jurisdiction, and, in substitution for the Lutheran religion, decreed that the Roman-Catholic be continued the only true religion. The doctors of the clergy refused to agree to this measure, the irate monarch deprived them of the right of voting, and in revenge confiscated church lands and suppressed monasteries, in some cases shed the blood of their inmates, in the remaining cases sent them forth hence. Henry, however, returned, and won the people from their faith. The apostate friar Browne, whom Henry made Archbishop of Dublin, the apostate Staples, Bishop of Meath, and Henry himself, stained with so many adulteries and murders, had but poor credentials as preachers of reform; whatever time-serving chief might do, the clergy and people continued to mutter and to whisper of the varying tenets of his creed. His successor, an ardent Protestant, tried hard to make Ireland Protestant, but the sickly plant which he sowed was uprooted by the Catholic Mary, and at Elizabeth's accession all Ireland was Catholic.

Like her father Henry, the young queen was a cruel and capricious tyrant, and in her war with Shane O'Neill, the ablest of the Irish chiefs, she did not spare the people to enslave, or lastly to put them to the sword. The viceroy, a sincere Protestant nor a willing persecutor of the Catholics; and though she re-enacted the Act of Supremacy and passed the Act of Uniformity, making Protestantism the state creed, she refused to have these acts rigorously enforced. But when the pope and the Spanish king, tossed against her, and the Irish Catholics were found in alliance with both, she yielded to her ministers and concluded, with them, that a Catholic was necessarily a disloyal subject. Henceforth toleration gave way to persecution. The tortures inflicted on O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, and O'Bely, Bishop of Mayo, the Spaniards murdered in cold blood at Smerwick, the desolation of Munster during Desmond's rebellion, showed how cruel her rule could be. Far more formidable than the rebellion of Desmond, or even than that of Shane O'Neill, was the rebellion of Hugh O'Neile, Earl of Tyrone. No such able Irish chief had appeared since Brian Boru. Cool, cautious, vigilant, he bided his time, and how to wait patiently for results. Never impulsive, never boastful, wise in council and wary in speech, from his long residence in London in his youth he learned dissimulation, and was as crafty as the craftiest English minister. Repeatedly he foil in the queen's diplomatic council that he had the capability in England, and at the Yellow Ford (1598) gained the greatest victory ever won in Ireland over English arms. What he might have done had he been loyally supported it is hard to say. For nearly ten years he continued the war; he continued it after his Spanish allies had been defeated and himself invested with the title of Chief assistant, O'Donnell, had been struck down by an assassin's hand; after Carew had subdued Munster, and Mountjoy had turned Ulster into a desert; after the Irish chiefs had gone over to the enemy. And when he submitted it was only on condition of being guaranteed his titles and lands; and by that time Elizabeth, who hated him so much and so longed for his destruction, had breathed her last.

UNDER THE STUARTS.—James I (1603—25) was the first of the Stuart line, and from the son of Mary Stuart the Irish Catholics expected much. They were promised the old liberties which Pope Paul III had promised to Elizabeth, and in the cities which rejoiced that "Jezabel was dead", and that now they could practise their religion openly, were warned by Mountjoy that James was a good Protestant and as such would have no toleration of popery. Salisbury, who had poisoned the mind of the queen against the Catholics, was equally successful with her successor, with the result that persecution continued. Proclamations were issued ordering the clergy to quit the kingdom; those who remained were hunted down; O'Devany, Bishop of Down, and others were done to death. The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were revoked, the Act of Oblivion, under which participants in the late rebellion were pardoned, was often forgotten or ignored. English law, which for the first time was extended to all Ireland, was used by corrupt officials to oppress rather than to protect the people. The Earl of Tyrone and the Earl of Tyrconnell (Norry O'Donnell) were so spoofed in the country, believing that their lives were in danger; and to all their pleas for justice the king's response was to slander their characters and confiscate their lands. It is indeed true that Irish jurors found the ears guilty of high treason, and an Irish Parliament, representing all Ireland, abolished them. But these results were obtained by carefully packing the juries, and by the creation of small boroughs which sent
creatures of the king to represent them in Parliament. And the Catholic members were accused of having enacted a fresh batch of penal laws. Thus, aided by corrupt juries and a complaisant Parliament, James I was enabled to plant the confiscated lands of Ulster with English Protestants and Scotch Presbyterians. Other plantations had fared badly. That of King’s and Queen’s County in Mary’s reign had decayed; and the revoltation of Munster after the Desmond war had been swept away in the tide of O’Neill’s victories. The plantation of Ulster was more thorough and effective than either of these. Whole districts were given to the settlers, and these, supported by a Protestant Government, soon grew into a powerful force. In Munster, where the colonists were driven from the richer to the poorer lands, looked helplessly on, hating those colonists for whose sake they had been despoiled.

Under the new king, Charles I (1625-49), the policy of persecution and plantation was continued. Under pretence of advancing the public interest and increasing the king’s revenue, a crowd of hungry adventurers spread themselves over the land, inquiring into the title by which lands were held. With venal judges, venal juries, and sympathetic officials to aid them, good titles were declared bad, and lands seized, and the adventurers were made sharers in the spoil. The O’Byrnes were thus deprived of their lands in Wicklow, and similar confiscations and plantations took place in Wexford, King’s County, Leitrim, Westmeath, and Longford. Hoping to protect themselves against such robbery, the Catholics offered the king a subsidy of £120,000 in exchange for certain privileges called “graces”, which among other things would give them indefeasible titles to their estates. These “graces”, granted by the king, were to have the sanction of Parliament to make them good. The money was paid, but the “graces” were withheld, and the viceroy, Stapleton, proceeded to Connaught to confiscate and plant the whole province. The projected plantation was ultimately abandoned; but the sense of injustice remained. All over the country were insecurity, anxiety, unrest, and disaffection; Irish and Anglo-Irish were equally menaced. Seeing the futility of appealing to a helpless Parliament, a despotic viceroy, or a perfidious king, the nation took up arms.

To describe the rebellion as the “massacre of 1641” is unjust. The details of cruel murders committed and horrible tortures inflicted by the rebels are mischievously untrue. On the other hand, it is true that the Protestants suffered grievous wrong, and that many of them died of famine, either of those who fell in war. The Catholics wanted the planters’ lands; when driven away in wintry weather, without money, or food, or sufficient clothes, many planters perished of hunger and cold. Others fell by the avenging hand of some infuriated Catholic whom they might have wronged in the days of their power. Many fell defending their property or the property and lives of their friends. The plan of the rebel leaders, of whom Roger Moore was chief, was to capture the garrison towns by a simultaneous attack. But they failed to capture Dublin Castle, containing large stores of arms, owing to the imprudence of Colonel MacMahon. He imparted the secret to a disreputable Irishman named O’Connolly, who at once informed the Castle authorities, with the result that the Castle defences were strengthened, and MacMahon and others arrested and promptly executed. In Ulster, however, the whole open conflict took place in the rebel hands, and Munster and Connaught soon joined the rebellion, as did the Catholics of the Pale, unable to obtain any toleration of their religion, or security of their property, or even of their lives. Before the new year was advanced the Catholic Bishops declared the rebellion just, and the Catholics formed a confederation which, from its meeting place, was called the “Confederation of Kilkenny”. Composed of clergy and laity its members swore to be loyal to the king, to strive for the free exercise of their religion, and to defend the lives, liberties, and possessions of all who took the Confederate oath. Supreme executive authority was vested in a supreme council; there were provincial councils also, all these bodies deriving their powers from an elective body called the “General Assembly”.

The Supreme Council exercised all the powers of government, administered justice, raised taxes, formed armies, appointed generals. One of the best-known of these officers was General Preston, who commanded in Leinster, having come from abroad with a good supply of arms and ammunition, and with 500 trained officers. A more remarkable man still was General Owen Roe O’Neill, nephew of the great Earl of Tyrone, who took command in Ulster, and whose defence of Arras against the French caused him to be recognized as one of the first soldiers in Europe. He also, like Preston, brought officers, arms, and ammunition to Ireland. At a later stage came Rinuccini, the pope’s nuncio, bringing with him a supply of money. Meanwhile, civil war raged in England between king and Parliament; the Government at Dublin, ill supplied from across the Channel, was ill fitted to crush a powerful rebellion, and, in 1646, O’Neill won the great victory of Benburb. But the strength of which this victory was the outcome was counterbalanced by elements of weakness. The Catholics of Ulster and those of the Pale did not agree; neither did Generals O’Neill and Preston. The Supreme Council, with a feeble old man, Lord Mountgarret, at its head, and four provincial generals instead of a commander-in-chief, was ill suited for the vigorous prosecution of a war. Moreover, the influence of the Marquis of Ormond was a fatal cause of discord. A personal friend of the king, and charged by him with the command of his army and with the conduct of negotiations, a Protestant with Catholic friends on the Supreme Council, his desire ought to have been to bring Catholic and Royalist together. But his hatred of the Catholics was such that he would grant them no terms, even when ordered to do so by His Majesty. The Catholics’ professions of loyalty he despised, and his great diplomatic abilities were used to sow dissensions in their councils and to thwart their plans. Yet the Supreme Council, dominated by an Ormondist faction, continued fruitless negotiations, with agree to a cessation when they themselves were strong and their opponents weak, and agreed to a peace with him in spite of the victory of Benburb, and in spite of the remonstrances of the nuncio and of General O’Neill. Nor did they cease
these relations with him even after he had treacherously surrendered Dublin to the Parliament (1647), and left the country. On the contrary, they still put faith in him, entered into a fresh peace with him in 1648. The scene he returned to the king executed in the Royalist viceroy they received him in state at Kilkenny. In disgust, General O'Neill came to a temporary agreement with the Parliamentary general, and Rinuccini, despairing of Ireland, returned to Rome.

The Civil War in England was then over. The Royalists of Ireland who could not be reconciled to the new order of things were banished. The monarchy was replaced by a commonwealth; and in August, 1649, Oliver Cromwell came to Ireland with 10,000 men. Ormond meanwhile had rallied his supporters, and, with the greater part of the Catholics of Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, the Protestants of the Pale and of Munster, and great part of the Ulster Presbyterians, his strength was considerable. His obstinate bigotry would not allow him to make terms with the Ulster army, and he thus lost the support of General O'Neill at a critical time. Early in August he had been disastrously beaten by the Puritan general Jones, at Rashinnes; in consequence he offered no opposition when the Protestant troops, who could not be induced to relieve Drogheda. It was soon captured by Cromwell and his garrison put to the sword. A month later the same fate befell Wexford. Waterford repelled Cromwell's attack, and Clonmel and Kilkenny offered him a stout resistance; but other towns were easily captured voluntarily with the consent of their inhabitants who left Ireland, in May, 1650, Munster and Leinster were in his hands. His successors, Ireton and Ludlow, within two years reduced the remaining provinces. Meanwhile Owen Roe O'Neill had died after making terms with Ormond, but before meeting with Cromwell. The Catholic Bishops, however, repudiated Ormond, who then left Ireland. Some negotiation subsequently between Lord Clanricarde and the Duke of Lorraine came to nothing, and the long war was ended in which more than half the inhabitants of the country had lost their lives.

In the beginning of the rebellion many Englishmen subscribed money to put it down, stipulating in return for a share of the lands to be forfeited, and thus hatred of the Catholics was mingled with hope of gain. The English Parliament accepted the money on the terms proposed, and the subscribers became known as "suckers," because the money was to be paid in money on Irish land. When the rebellion was over, the problem was to provide the lands promised, and also to provide lands for the soldiers who were in arrears of pay. It was a difficult problem. There was an Act for Settling Ireland, and an Act for the Satisfaction of Adventurers in Lands and Arrears due to the soldiers and other public Debts; there was a High Court of Justice to determine who were guilty of rebellion; there were soldiers who had got special terms when laying down their arms; and there were those who had never had a share in the rebellion, but had merely lived in the times of peace during the war. The best of the lands east of the Shannon were for adventurers and soldiers, the dispossessed being driven to Connaught. To determine where the planters were to be settled and where the transplanted, and what amount they were to get, there were commissions, and committees, and surveys, and courts of claims. Nor was it till 1658 that the Cromwellian Settlement was complete, and even then many of the transplanted protested their innocence of any share in the rebellion, and many of the adventurers and soldiers complained that they had been defrauded of their due. In the amount of suffering it entailed and wrong inflicted the whole of Ireland, far greater died of the plague than of the war.

But it failed to make Ireland either English or Protestant, and in setting up a system of alien landlords and native tenants it proved the curse of Ireland and the fruitful parent of many ills.

To the Irish Cromwell's death in 1658 was welcome news, all the more so because Charles II (1660-85) was restored. For their attachment to the cause of the latter they had suffered much; and now the Catholics hoped to recover their lands which the Irish soldier abroad felt equally assured that the recovery of their lands and homes was at hand. They soon learned that Stuart gratitute meant little and that Stuart promises were written on sand. Had Charles been free to act, the Cromwellian Settlement would have been swept away. The Irish Catholics hated the Puritans more than he loved the Puritans. But the planters were a dangerous body to provoke, sustained as they were by the English Parliament and by the king's chief adviser, Ormond, who indeed hated the Cromwellians, but hated the Catholics much more. Some attempt, however, was made to right the wrong that had been done, and by the Act of Settlement six hundred innocent Catholics were restored to their lands. Many more would have been restored had the court of claims been allowed to continue its sittings. The irate planters wanted to know what was to become of them if the despised papists thus got back their lands; but the king refused all commands to the court to relieve them. They continued to suffer for a time, and some who had been wronged were able to have the law in their favor, but the law was then abandoned while the Catholics were abandoned to their fate. Before the rebellion two-thirds of the lands of the country were in the hands of the latter; after the Act of Settlement scarcely one-third was left them, a sweeping confiscation especially in the case of men who were denied even the justice of a trial. After this toleration of the Catholics was but a small concession. Not, however, during the whole of Charles's reign; for Ormond, now a duke, filled the office of viceroy for many years; he at least would maintain Protestant ascendancy, and exclude the Catholics from the bench and the corporations. In the English Council and in Parliament he bitterly attacked and defeated the proposed revision of the Act of Settlement. He does not appear to have had any sympathy with the lying tales of Oates and Bedloe, or with the storm of persecution which followed, and he disapproved of the murder of the adherents of Catholicism. But the Catholic Church continued, and was in no way chilled by advancing age. One of the last acts of Charles was to dismiss him from office as an enemy to toleration. The king himself soon after died in the Catholic Faith, and James II, an avowed Catholic, succeeded, the first Catholic sovereign since the death of Mary Tudor.

Religious toleration had then made little progress throughout Europe, and England, aggressively Protestant, looked with special disfavour on Catholicism. In these circumstances James II should have moved with caution. He should have taken account of national prejudices and of the respect established institutions; while conscientiously practising his own religion, he should have sought for no favour for it, at least until the nation was in a more tolerant and yielding mood. Instead of this, and in defiance of English bigotry and English law, he appointed Catholics to high civil and military offices, opened the corporations and the universities to them, had a papal nuncio at his court, and issued a Declaration of Indulgence suspending the penal laws. When the Protestant bishops refused to have this declaration read from their pulpits he prosecuted them. Their accu tal was the signal for revolt, and James, deserted by all classes, having left the English throne to William of Orange, whom the Protestants invited from Holland. Meanwhile sweeping changes had been effected in Ireland by the viceroy, the Duke of Tyrconnell, a militant Catholic and a special favour
ite of King James. Protestant magistrates, sheriffs, and judges had been displaced to make room for Catholics; the army and corporations underwent similar changes; and the Act of Settlement was to be repealed. Timid Protestants trembling for their lives fled to England; others formed centres of resistance to the viceroy in Ulster and Connaught, and, in Ulster, De Burgo and Enniskillen expelled the Catholics and closed their gates against the viceroy's troops. This was rebellion, for James, though repudiated in England, was still King of Ireland. In March, 1689, he arrived at Kinsale from France to subdue these rebels. But the task was beyond his strength. Dobery and Emmet parried his attacks, and a Williamite force, issuing from the latter town, almost annihilated a Jacobite army at Newtown-Butler.

Disaffection became general among the Protestants when the Irish Parliament repealed the Act of Settlement and attained eighteen hundred persons who had fled to England through fear; and when, in August, a Williamite force of twenty thousand landed at Carrickfergus, the Protestants everywhere welcomed it. This great force, however, effected nothing, and in June, 1690, William himself came and encountered James on the banks of the Boyne. The battle was fought on 1 July, and resulted in the defeat of James. Hastening to Dublin he told the Duchess of Tyrconnell that the Irish soldiers had shamefully run away, to which the lady is said to have replied: "But your Majesty won the race." The retreat was just. The Irish cavalry behaved with conspicuous gallantry, as did the greater part of the infantry. Some of the latter did run away, but not so fast as James himself, who fled taking the ablest of the Irish generals, Sarsfield, with him. That the Irish were no cowards was shown by their defence of Athlone and the still more glorious defence of Limerick. After being compelled to raise the siege of the latter city, King William left for England, committing the civil authority to lords justices and the military command to General Ginkel. In the following year Ginkel captured Athlone, owing to the carelessness of the Jacobite general, St-Ruth; and on 12 July, 1691, the last great battle of the war was fought at Aughrim. The Irish were not inferior to their opponents in numbers, discipline, or valour, and though outmatched in heavy guns they had the advantage of position. Nor was St-Ruth inferior to Ginkel in military capacity. His dispositions were excellent, and after several hours' desperate fighting Ginkel was driven back at every point. Just then St-Ruth was struck down by a cannon ball. Panic-stricken, the Irish fell back, allowing their opponents to advance and inflict on them a crushing defeat. The principal routes to Athlone and Sligo followed, and in a short time Ginkel and his whole army were before the walls of Limerick. When he had effectually surrounded it and made a breach in the walls, further resistance was seen to be hopeless, and Sarsfield and his friends made terms. By the end of the year the war was over, King James had triumphed, and Protestant ascendancy was secure.

The Eighteenth Century.—By the Treaty of Limerick the Catholic soldiers of King James were pardoned, protected against forfeiture of their estates, and were free to go abroad if they chose. All Catholics might substitute an oath of allegiance for the oath of supremacy, and were to have such privileges as were consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of Charles II. King William also promised to have the Irish Parliament grant further relaxation of the penal laws in force. This treaty, however, was soon torn to shreds, and in spite of William's appeals the Irish Parliament refused to ratify it, and embarked on fresh penal legislation. Under these new laws Catholics were excluded from Parliament, from the bench and bar, from the navy, from all civil offices, from the corporations, and even from the corporate towns. They could not have Catholic schools at home or attend foreign schools, or inherit landed property, or hold land under lease, or act as executives or administrators, or have arms or ammunition, or a horse worth £25. Neither could they bury their dead in Catholic ruins, or make pilgrimages to holy wells, or observe Catholic holidays. They could not intermarry with the Protestants or the clergyman assisting at such marriages being liable to death. The wife of a Catholic landlord turning Protestant got separate maintenance; the son turning Protestant got the whole estate; and the Catholic landlord having only Catholic children was obliged at death to divide his estate among his children in equal shares. All the regular clergy, as well as the bishops and vicars-general should quit the kingdom. The secular clergy might remain, but must be registered, nor could they have on their churches either steeple or bell. This was the Penal Code, elaborated through nearly half a century with patience, care, and ingenuity, perhaps the most infamous code ever elaborated by civilized man.

Such legislation does not generate conviction, and, in spite of all, the Catholics clung to their Faith. Deprived of schools at home, the young clerical student sought the halls of Continental colleges, and being ordained returned to Ireland, disguised perhaps as a sailor and carried in a smuggler's craft. And in secrecy and obscurity he preached, taught, lived, and died, leaving another generation equally persecuted to carry on the good fight. Poverty was his portion, and frequently the prison and the scaffold; and yet, while Protestantism made no progress, Catholicism was more than held in its own. In 1728 the Catholics were to the Protestants as five to one, and half a century later Young calculated that to make Ireland Protestant would take 4000 years. Indeed the Protestant clergy made no serious effort to convert the Catholics; nor was this the object of the Penal Laws. The Protestants possessing confiscated Catholic lands, its object was to impoverish, to debase, to degrade, to leave the despairs Catholics incapable of rebellion and ignorant of their wrongs. In this respect it succeeded. A few Catholics, with the connivance of some friendly Protestants, managed to hold their estates; the remainder gradually sank to the level of cottiers and day-labourers, living in cabins, clothed in
rags, always on the verge of famine. Shut out from every position of influence, rackrented by absentee landlords, insulted by imperialists and drovers, squireens, paying tithes to a Church they abhorred, hating the Government which oppressed them and the law which made them slaves, their condition was the worst of any peasantry in Europe. From a land blighted by such laws the enterprising and ambitious few escaped. The will of these and their despairs, ambition in happier lands. In the time of Elizabeth and James, and still more in Cromwell's time, thousands joined the army of Spain. But in the latter half of the seventeenth century the stream was diverted to France, then the greatest military power in Europe. The Catholics were denied by Act and by the whole of the administration of the counties until the end of the eighteenth century.

Nor were soldiers and statesmen the only Irish exiles whom penal laws had sent abroad. The decay of schools and colleges continued from the eleventh to the sixteenth century; nor did Ireland in that period produce a single great scholar, except Duns Scotus, who was partly educated abroad. Any hope of a revival of learning in the sixteenth century was blasted by the suppression of monasteries and the penal laws; early in the seventeenth century, however, Irish colleges were already established at Louvain, Salamanca, and Seville, at Lisbon, Paris, and Rome. In these colleges the brightest Irish intellects learned and taught, and Colgan and O'Clery, Lynch and Rothe, Wadding and Keating recalled the greatest glories of their country's past. At home Trinity College had been established (1593) to wean the Irish from "Popery and other ill qualities"; but the Catholics considered, and either went abroad or frequented the few Catholic schools left. The children of the poor, avoiding the Protestant schools, met in the open air, with only some friendly hedge to protect them from the blast; but they met in fear and trembling, for the hedge-school and its master were proscribed. The fire of learning was burning during the long night of the penal times.

In the Irish Parliament meanwhile a spirit of independence appeared. As the Parliament of the Pale had been so often used for factious purposes that in 1486 Poyning's Law was passed, providing that henceforth no Irish Parliament should meet without the consent of both the Irish and English Privy Councils. Further, the English Parliament claimed the right to legislate for Ireland; and in the laws prohibiting the importation of Irish cattle (1663), and Irish woollen manufactures (1698), and that dealing with the Irish forfeited estates (1700), it asserted its supposed right. The Irish Parliament, dominated by bigotry and selfish interest, had not the courage to protest, and when one member, Molyneux, did, the English Parliament condemned him, and ordered his book to be burned by the Oxford University. After Matthew Lucas, in 1719 expressly declaring that it had power to legislate for Ireland, taking away also the appellate jurisdiction of the Irish House of Lords. The fight made by Swift against Wood's halfpence showed that, though Molyneux was dead, his spirit lived; Lucas continued the fight, and Grattan in 1782 obtained legislative independence. England was then beaten by the American colonies; an Irish volunteer force had been raised to defend Ireland against a possible attack from the Continent. But legislative independence was won less by Grattan's eloquence than by the swords of the Volunteers. These events favoured the growth of toleration. The Catholics, in sympathizing with Grattan and in subscribing money to equip the Protestant Volunteers, earned the title of the "right friends." Nor were the penal laws less rigorously enforced, and from the middle of the century penal legislation ceased. In 1771 came the turn of the tide, when Catholics were allowed to hold reclained bog under lease. This grudging concession was followed in 1773 by an Act and his majesty's proclamation of the oaths of supremacy; in 1778 by an Act enabling Catholics to hold all lands under lease; and in 1782 by a further Act allowing them to erect Catholic schools, with the permission of the Protestant bishop of the diocese, to own a horse worth more than £2, and to assist at Mass without being compelled to accuse the officiating priest. Nor were Catholic bishops any longer compelled to quit the kingdom, and not Catholic children specially rewarded if they turned Protestant. Not for ten years was there any further concession, and then an Act was passed allowing Catholics to erect parishes and to be admitted to the ministry, admitting Catholics to the Bar, and legalizing marriages between Protestants and Catholics. Much more important was the Act of 1793 giving the Catholics the Parliamentary and municipal franchise, admitting them to the universities and to military and civil offices, and removing all restrictions in regard to the tenure of land. They were still excluded from the Parliament, from the inner Bar, and from a few of the higher civil and military offices.

Always in favour of religious liberty, Grattan would have swept away every vestige of the Penal Code. But, in 1782, he mistakenly thought that his work was done when legislative independence was conceded. He forgot that the executive was still left independent of Parliament, answerable only to the English ministry; and that, with rotten boroughs controlled by a few great families, with an extremely limited franchise in the counties, and with pensioners and placemen holding in the so many seats, the Irish Parliament was but a mockery of representation. Like Grattan, Flood and Charlemont favoured Parliamentary reform, but, unlike him, they were opposed to Catholic concessions. As for Foster and Fitzgibbon, who led the forces of corruption and bigotry, they opposed every attempt at reform, and consented to the Union of 1795 under the strong pressure from Pitt and Dundas. These English ministers, alarmed at the progress of French revolutionary principles in Ireland, fearing a foreign invasion, wished to have the Catholics contented. In 1795 further concessions seemed imminent. In that year an illiberal virtual act of Pitt and Westmorland, was replaced by the liberal-minded Lord Fitzwilliam, who came understanding it to be the wish of Pitt that the Catholic claims were to be conceded. He at once dismissed from office a rapacious office-holder named Beresford, so powerful that he was called the "King of Ireland"; he refused to consult Lord Chancellor Fitzgibbon or Foster, the Speaker; he took Grattan and Ponsonby into his confidence, and declared his intention to support Grattan's bill admitting Catholics to Parliament. The high hopes raised by these events were dashed to the earth when Fitzwilliam was suddenly and suddenly his bill was passed without any protest from Portland, the home secretary, or from the premier, Pitt. The latter, dialling the Irish Parliament because it had rejected his commercial propositions in 1785, and disagreed with him on the regency in 1789, already mediated a legislative union, and felt that the admission of Catholics to Parliament would thwart his plans. He was prob-
On one side were eloquence and debating power, patriotism, and public virtue, Grattan, Plunket, and Bushe, Foster, Fitzgerald, Ponsonby, and Moore, a truly formidable combination. On the other side were the baser elements in Parliament, the needly, the spendthrift, the mean and ambitious officers of Castlereagh, with the whole resources of the British Empire at his command. The pensioners and place-men who voted against him at once lost their places and pensions, the military officer was refused promotion, the magistrate was turned off the bench. And while anti-Unionists were unsparesly punished, the Unionists got lavish rewards. The infamous got well-paid sinecures; the briefless barrister was made a judge or a commissioner; the rich man, ambitious of social distinction, got a peerage, and places and pensions for his friends; and the owners of rotten boroughs got large sums for their interests.

The Catholics were promised emancipation in a united Parliament, and in consequence many bishops, some clergy, and a few of the laity supported the Union, not grudging to end an assembly so bigoted and corrupt as the Irish Parliament. By these means Castlereagh triumphed, and in 1801 the United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland opened its doors.

Since the Union.—The next quarter of a century was a period of baffled hopes. Anxious to stand well with the Government, Dr. Troy, the Archbishop of Dublin, had been a strong advocate of the Union, and had induced nine of his brother bishops to concede to the king a veto on episcopal appointments. In return, he wanted emancipation linked with the Union, and Castlereagh was not averse; but Pitt was the real man. Vague, though the Catholic Unionists had no doubt that he favoured immediate concordant. Disappointment came when nothing was done in the first session of the United Parliament, and it was increased when Pitt resigned office and was succeeded by Addington, a narrow-minded bigot. Cornwills, however, assured Dr. Troy that Pitt had resigned, unable to overcome the prejudices of the king, and that he would never again take office if emancipation were not conceded. Yet, in spite of this, he became premier in 1804, no longer of emancipation but an opponent, pledged never again to raise the question in Parliament during the lifetime of the king. To this pledge he was as faithful as he had been false to his former assurances; and when Fox presented the Catholic petition in 1805, Pitt opposed it. After 1806, when both Pitt and Fox died, the Catholic champion was Grattan, who had entered the British Parliament in 1805. In the vain hope of conciliating opponents he was willing, in 1808, to concede the veto. Dr. Troy and the higher Catholics acquiesced; but the other bishops were unwilling, and neither they nor the clergy, still less the people, wanted a state-paid clergy or state-appointed bishops. The agitation of the question, however, did not cease, and for many years it distracted Catholic plans and weakened Catholic effort. Further complications
arose when, in 1814, the Prefect of the Propaganda, Quaratotti, issued a rescript favouring the veto. He acted, however, beyond his powers in the absence of Pius VII, who was in France, and when the pope returned to Rome, after the fall of Napoleon, the rescript was disavowed.

The Catholics badly needed a leader. John Keogh, the able leader of 1793, was then old, and Lords Fingall and Gormanstown, Mr. Scully and Dr. Dromgoole, were not the men to grapple with great difficulties and powerful opponents. An able and more vigorous leader was required, one with less faith in petitions and protestations of loyalty. Some leading Catholics, among whom was Doctor O'Connell, a Catholic barrister whose first public appearance in 1800 was on an anti-Unionist platform. A great lawyer and orator, a great debater, of boundless courage and resources, he took a prominent part on Catholic committees, and from 1810 he held the first place in Catholic esteem. Yet the Catholic cause advanced slowly, and, when Grattan died in 1820, emancipation had not come. Nor would the House of Lords accept Plunket's Bill of 1821, even though it passed the House of Commons and conceded the veto. At last O'Connell determined to rouse the masses, and in 1823, with the help of Rev. John Sheil, a Jesuit, he formed the Catholic Association. Its progress at first was slow, but gradually it gathered strength. Dr. Murray, the new Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, joined it, and Dr. Doyle, the great Bishop of Kildare; other bishops followed; the clergy and people also came in; and thus rose a great national organization, supervising from its central office in Dublin subsidiary associations in every parish; maintained by a Catholic rent; watching over local and national affairs, discharging, as Mr. Canning described it, "all the functions of a regular government, and having obtained a complete monopoly of civil control over the Catholics of the people". The Association was suppressed in 1825 by Act of Parliament; but O'Connell merely changed the name; and the New Catholic Association with its New Catholic rent continued the work of agitation as of old. Nor was this all. By the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 the forty-shilling freeholders obtained the franchise. These freeholders, being so poor, were necessarily in the power of the landlords and were wont to be driven to the polls like so many sheep. But now, protected by a powerful association, and encouraged by the priests and by O'Connell, the freeholders, with their families, seized Waterford, and Meath, and elsewhere they voted for the nominees of the Catholic Association at elections, and in placing them at the head of the poll humbled the landlords. When they returned O'Connell himself for Clare in 1825, the crisis had come. The Tory ministers, Wellington and Peel, would have still resisted; but the people were not to be restrained: it must be concession or civil war, and rather than have the latter the ministers hauled down the flag of no surrender, and passed the Catholic Relief Bill of 1829. The forty-shilling freeholders were disfranchised, and there were some reservations on the question of their qualification. The Catholic Association included a few of the higher civil and military offices, prohibiting priests from wearing vestments outside their churches, bishops from assuming the titles of their sees, regulars from obtaining charitable bequests. In other respects Catholics were placed on a level with the other denominations. Many last were admitted within the pale of the constitution.

From that hour O'Connell was the uncrowned king of Ireland. Where he led the people followed. They cheered him when he praised Lord Anglesey and when he attacked him; when he supported the Whigs and when he opposed them; when he advocated the Repeal of the Union and when he abandoned the Repeal agitation; and when, after long years of waiting for concessions that never came, he again unfurled the flag of Repeal, they flocked to hear him, and laughed or wept with him, responsive to his every mood. Finally, to leave him free to devote his whole time to public affairs they subscribed yearly to the O'Connell tribute, giving him thus an income which never fell below £10,000 and often went far beyond the modest figure. And yet the legislative results of nearly twenty years of such devotion and sacrifice were limited.

The National Education system, established in 1831, required much amendment before it worked smoothly, and even now is far from being an ideal system. The Commutation of Tithes Act only transferred the odium of tithes collectively to the parson or to the landlord, but gave little relief to the people. The Poor Law, though it often relieved destitution, too often encouraged idleness and immorality. And the Corporation Act, while re-forming a few of the corporations, abolished many. Nor could anything be more complete than the failure of the Repeal agitation. The explanation is not far to seek. O'Connell had a wreathed party, men without capacity or patriotism. His acceptance of offices for his friends and his alliances with the Whigs was surely not a sound policy. And when he took up Repeal in earnest he was already old, with the shadow of death upon him. Lastly, as he himself admitted, he lost the support of the Young Irelanders, the most vigorous and capable section of his followers. These things embittered his last days and hastened his death in 1847.

Meantime the shadow of famine had fallen upon the land. The potato blight first appeared in Wexford, in 1843, whence it marched with stealthy tread all over the country, poisoning the potato fields as it passed. The stalks withered and died, the potatoes beneath the soil became putrid, and when they were dug and the sound ones separated from the unsound ones and put into pits, it was soon discovered that disease had accelerated the decay of the tubers. Before the fall of the year, the reckless and credulous landlords began to evict the starving freeholders by the landlords for political purposes, the reckless subdivision of holdings by the tenants, had so augmented the population that in 1845 the inhabitants of Ireland were well beyond 8,000,000, most of them living in abject poverty with the potato as their only food. And now, with half the crop of 1845 gone, and with the loss of the whole crop in the two succeeding years, millions were face to face with hunger. To cope with such a calamity required heroic measures, and O'Connell urged that distilleries should be closed, the export of provisions prohibited, public works abandoned, the poor to be given work and food. But the premier, Peel, minimized the extent of the famine, and Lord John Russell, who succeeded him in 1846, was equally sceptical. He would neither stop distilling nor the export of provisions, nor build railways; and when he set up public works they were not reproductive, and the money expended on them, largely levied on the rates, was squandered by corrupt officials. Ultimately indeed he set up government stores, and in many cases food was distributed free. Charity supplemented the efforts of Government, and with no niggard hand. There were Quaker, Evangelical, and Bangor Catholic Relief Societies, and aid came from Great Britain and from Continental Europe, from Australia and from the West Indies. But America was generous most of all. In every city from Boston to New Orleans meetings were held and subscriptions given. Philadelphia sent eight vessels loaded with provisions, 2,000 tons of flour, 2,000 quintals of Indian corn; railroads and shipping companies carried relief parcels free; and the Government turned some of the war vessels into transports to carry food to the starving millions beyond the Atlantic. Yet were the sufferings of the people great, and the number of deaths from famine and from famine-fever appalling. Thousands lived for weeks on cabbages and a little meal, on cabbage and seaweed, on turnips, on diseased horse and ass flesh; and one case is recorded
where a woman ate her dead child. Men died from cold as well as from hunger. They died on the roads and in the fields, at the relief works and on their way to them, at the workhouses and at the workhouse doors. They died in their cabins unattended, often surrounded by the dying and frequently by the dead. Flying from the country they died in the hospitals of Liverpool, Glasgow, or on board the sailing vessels to America. And thousands who crossed the ocean reached America only to die. In 1848 and in 1849 the famine was only partial, but in the latter year cholera appeared. In 1851 the famine was over, and such was the havoc wrought that a population, which at the previous rates of increase should have been 9,000,000, was reduced to 6,500,000.

The conduct of the landlords during this terrible time was selfish and cruel. With few exceptions they gave no employment and no subscriptions to the relief funds. Unable to get rents from tenants unable to pay, they used their right to evict, and in thousands of cases the horrors of eviction were added to the horrors of famine. Retribution soon followed. The evictors, without rents and crushed by poor-rates, became hopelessly insolvent. The British Parliament considered them a nuisance and a curse, and in 1849 passed the Encumbered Estates Act, under which a creditor might petition to have the estate sold and his debt paid. Insolvent landlords were thus sent adrift, and solvent men took their places, and to such an extent that in a few years land to the value of £20,000,000 changed hands. But the new landlords were no better than the old. They raised rents, confiscated the tenant’s improvements, worried him with vexatious estate rules, evicted him cruelly; and from 1850 to 1870 was the period of the great clearances. The necessary result was a constant and ever-increasing stream of emigration from Ireland, chiefly to America. Nor would British statesmen do anything to stem the tide. Lord John Russell would not interfere with the rights of property by passing a Land Act. Lord Derby was a landlord with a landlord’s strong prejudices. Lord Palmerston declared that tenant right was landlord wrong. Nothing could be expected from the Irish members. Sadler and Keogh broke up the Right party; Lucas was dead; D’Arcy in despair went to Australia; Moore was out of Parliament; and from 1855 to 1870 the Irish members were but placemen and traitors. In these circumstances the Irish peasant joined the Ribbon Society, which was secret and oath-bound, and especially charged to defend the tenants’ interests. Agrarian outrages naturally followed. The landlord evicted, the Ribbon shot him down, and the evictor fell unpitied by the people, who refused to condemn the assassin. After 1860 the Ribbonmen were gradually merged in the Fenian Society, which extended to America and England, and had national rather than agrarian objects in view. The Irish were good conspirators, and the attempted Fenian insurrection in 1867 came to nothing. But the mediated assault on Chester Castle, the Clerkenwell explosion, and the Fenian raids into Canada showed the extent and intrepidity of Irish disaffection. An increasing number of Englishmen began to think that the non possumus attitude of Lord Palmerston was no longer wise; and with the advent to power of Mr. Gladstone in 1868, at the head of a large Liberal majority, the case of Ireland was taken up.

The Catholic masses had a threefold grievance calling urgently for redress: the state Church, landlordism, and inequality. Mr. Gladstone called them the three branches of the Irish ascendency coffee tree. Commencing with the Church, he introduced a Bill disendowing and disestablishing it. Commissioners were appointed to wind it up, taking charge of its enormous property, computed at more than £15,000,000 ($75,000,000). Of this sum, £10,000,000, ultimately raised to £11,000,000, was given to the disestablished Church, part to the holders of existing offices, part to enable the Church to continue its work. A further sum of nearly £1,000,000 was distributed between Maynooth College, deprived of its annual grant, and the Presbyterian Church deprived of the Regium Donum, the latter getting twice as much as the former. The surplus was to be disposed of by Parliament for such public objects as it might determine. This was generous treatment for the state Church which had been so conspicuous a failure. Supported with an ample revenue, and by the whole power of the State, its business was to make Ireland Protestant and English. It succeeded only in intensifying their attachment to Catholicity and their hatred of Protestantism and England. In 1861, after the havoc wrought by the famine, the Catholics were seven times as numerous as the members of the state Church. There were many parishes without a single Protestant; and in a poor country a Church numbering but 600,000 persons had an income of nearly £70,000, mostly drawn from people of a different creed, who at the same time had their own Church to support. Yet there were members of Parliament who described Mr. Gladstone’s Bill as robbery and sacrilege. The House of Lords, afraid to reject it altogether, emasculated it in committee. And Ulster Protestants declared that if it became law they would kick the Queen’s crown into the Boyne. Ignoring these threats, Mr. Gladstone rejected the Lords’ amendments, though on some minor points he gave way, and in spite of all opposition the Bill became law. And thus one branch of the upas tree came crashing to the earth. The Land Act of 1870 was well-meant, but in reality gave the tenants no protection against rackrenting or eviction. Two years later the Ballot Act freed the Irish tenant from the terrors of open voting.

In 1873 the education question was reached. And first as to the primary schools. What the Catholic primary schools were in the early years of the nineteenth century we learn from Carleton. The teacher, the product of a local hedge-school and of a Munster classical school, or perhaps an ex-student of Maynooth, had first been employed as a tutor in some
farmer's family. Then he became a hedge-schoolmaster, and the manner in which he attained to this position was peculiar. Challenging the schoolmaster already in possession to a public dispute, they met at the church gates on Sunday in presence of the congregation, was referred to a layman, a clergyman, and the combatants was keenly relished, and, if the younger man won the applause of the audience by his depth of learning and readiness of reply, his opponent left the district and the victor was installed in his place. His school, built by the roadside by the people's voluntary efforts, was of earth and sods, with an earthen floor, a hole in the roof for a chimney, and stones for the pupils' seats. In many districts the teacher received little fees, but the people supplied him liberally with potatoes, meal, bacon, and turf, and entertained him at their houses. A century before Carleton's time the Charter schools were established, and endowed to educate the children of the destitute poor. They were to give industrial as well as literary training, and took religion and learning as their motto. But they became dens of infamy, with incompetent and immoral teachers, who taught the pupils nothing except to hate Catholics as such: the schools were pretexts for the Catholics, and were manifest failures, and yet till 1832 they received government grants. Such societies as the Society for Discontenuing Vice, the London Hibernian Association, and the Baptist Society were proselytizing institutions. The Kildare Street Society founded in 1811, though Protestant in its origin, was on different lines. The design was to have Catholics and Protestants educated together in secular subjects, leaving their religious training to the ministers of their religion outside of school hours. O'Connell favoured the scheme and joined the governing board, grants were obtained from Parliament, and for some years all went well. But again the bread of knowledge given to Catholics was steeped in the poison of proselytism. The bigots insisted on having the Bible read in the schools "without note or comment"; the Society was then vigorously assailed by John MacHale, at the time a young professor at Maynooth, and O'Connell retired from the board.

Recognizing the failure of such a system, Lord Stanley, the Irish chief secretary, passed through Parliament in 1831 a bill empowering the lord lieutenant to constitute a National Board of Education with an annual grant for building schools, and for paying salaries and wages to teachers and inspectors. The system was to be given on one day of the week by ministers of the different religions to children of their own faith. The schools were open to all denominations, and even the "suspicion of proselytism" was to be excluded. But the Catholics were treated unfairly. In spite of these numbers they were given but two of the seven members of the Board. Mr. Carisle, a Presbyterian, was made resident commissioner, and as chief executive officer appointed non-Catholics to the principal offices; and he and his fellow-commissioner, Dr. Whately, the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, which the history of Ireland and the Catholic religion were treated with injustice. In a few years the original rules of the Board were so changed that Catholic priests were entirely excluded from all Ulster schools under Presbyterian management. Outside of Ulster, a bigoted Protestant clergyman, named Stopford, was able in 1847 to abrogate the rule compelling Catholic children in Protestant schools to leave when the hour for religious instruction arrived. This left it optional with the children to remain, and brought much suffering on poor Catholics at the hands of tyrannical and bigoted landlords. Among the Catholic bishops there was toleration rather than approval of the National system. But Dr. MacHale, who had become Archbishop of Tuam in 1834, opposed the system from the first, believing that education not founded on religion was a curse. He preferred to have in his diocese the Christian Brothers' schools in which religious instruction was given the premier place. Dr. Murray of Dublin and Dr. Crollly of Armagh were not so hostile, and, when the matter was referred to an intellectual layman, was an escheater of the see, the National system might be given a further trial. The "Stopford Rule" strengthened MacHale's hand, as did a board rule in 1845 providing that all schools even partially erected by a board grant should be vested in the Board itself, and not as hitherto in the local managers who, in Catholic sees, were always the same as the priest. MacHale also objected to the disproportionately small representation of Catholics on the Board, to the character of the lesson-books, to the large number of non-Catholics in the higher positions. These attacks told. In 1850 the Synod of Thurlow condemned the National schools as then conducted. In 1852 Dr. Murray of Dublin died, and was succeeded by Dr. Cullen, who shared MacHale's views. The following year Whately's lesson-books were withdrawn from the Board's lists, and Whately in consequence resigned his seat. In 1860 the Board was enlarged from five to twelve, and powers were given to the Board to exclude Catholics. The "Stopford Rule" and the rule regarding the vesting of schools were abrogated, and, with the resident commissioner a Catholic, the system became more acceptable to Catholics. For the training of teachers however there was only one Trailing College under non-Catholic control, but the Catholics established the Training College at Drumsna, County Leitrim, in 1853 that at Baggot Street, Dublin, and since then they have established others at Belfast, Limerick, and Waterford. But even as the National system stood in 1873, Mr. Gladstone thought that the Catholics had no substantial grievance, and did nothing. Nor did it interfere with the state of things in intermediate education, though the inequality which existed was glaring. The diocesan free schools of Elizabeth, maintained by county contributions, and the free schools of James I and those of Erasmus Smith, maintained by confiscated Catholic lands, were under Protestant management and as such generally shunned by Catholics. Further, the Protestants were the richer classes, and, though their Church had been disestablished, it had been but partially disendowed. The Dissenters also had wealth and had well-equipped schools. But the Catholics, long prohibited from having any schools, were only able to get good ones even when the pressure of penal legislation had been removed. They had, however, set manfully to work, and, partly by private donations, principally by collections, had established colleges all over the land. Carlow College was founded in 1793, Navan College in 1802, St. Jheraghere's College, Tuam, in 1817, Clongowes by the Jesuits in 1814, and others in the years that followed. But they could get no state assistance till 1879, when the Intermediate Education Act was passed. The yearly interest on £1,000,000 was then appropriated for prizes and exhibitions to pupils, and for the building and fees of non-Catholic colleges. The result of the new law was that the Catholics, with very great success, were provided with schools of their own. They had used the additional means, not by means of higher education like the others, but by falling within the scope of the National Board's rules. It was in the field of higher education that Catholics suffered most. In 1795 Maynooth College had been founded for the education of the clergy. Its annual Parliamentary grant had been lost in 1869, but it nevertheless continued to flourish, and flourishes still as one of the first ecclesiastical colleges in the world. There were other ecclesiastical schools at Athlone, Thurlow, Waterford, and Drumcondra. But the laity had only Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges. The former had first opened its doors to Catholics in 1798, but would give them no share in its endowments, nor
did it abolish religious tests till 1873. The Queen’s Colleges, three in number, one at Galway, one at Cork, and one at Belfast, were constituent colleges of the Queen’s University, and were meant by Peel to do for higher education what Stanley’s godless colleges, and condemned by Rome as intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals; and at the Synod of Thurles, in 1850, it was resolved on the advice of Rome to set up a Catholic University. The model given was the University of Louvain. A committee was then appointed, subscriptions received both from Ireland and from abroad, a site was purchased in Stephen’s Green, Dublin, Dr. Newman was made first rector, professors and lecturers were appointed, and in 1854 work was begun.

But there were difficulties from the first. The nation still felt the effects of the famine, the secondary schools were but imperfectly organized and unable to furnish sufficient students, and Dr. MacHale and Dr. Cullen did not agree. Dr. MacHale complained that the administration was too centralized, that he could get no details of the expenditure, that there were too many Englishmen among the professors. He objected also to Dr. Newman. Though the great Oratorian loved Ireland, he was an Englishman with English ideas, and wanted Oxford and Cambridge men as his colleagues. MacHale, on the contrary, would have the whole atmosphere of the University Irish, and thus, trained by Irish teachers, Irish students would go forth to exhibit the highest capabilities of the Irish character. Dr. Cullen did not fully share these views, and generally agreed with Newman. Not always, however, for he objected to have Newman appointed an Irish bishop, and he disliked Newman’s excessive partiality for professors trained in the English universities. This want of harmony was not conducive to enthusiasm or efficiency, and the pecuniary contributions obtained left the various faculties woefully undermanned. Nor could any provision be made for students’ residence or for tutorial supervision. Most fatal of all, the Government refused to give a charter, and students could not be expected to frequent a university where they could get no degree. Unable to succeed where the elements of failure were so many, Newman resigned in 1857. In 1866 the Government of Earl Russell granted a supplemental charter making the Catholic University a constituent college of the Queen’s University, a step that was a blow on the head of the fourth Queen’s College, but the charter was found to be illegal. Nor did Lord Mayo’s attempt to settle the university question in 1888 succeed, and thus the Catholic University struggled painfully on.

Nor was Mr. Gladstone’s Bill of 1873 satisfying. He proposed to abolish the Queen’s University and the Queen’s College, Galway, and to have Dublin University separated from Trinity College, but with Trinity College, the Queen’s Colleges at Belfast and Cork, Magee College and the Catholic University as constituent colleges. From Trinity College £12,000 a year would be taken and given to the Dublin University, which would have in all an income of £50,000, for the payment of examiners and professors and the founding of fellowships, scholarships, and prizes to be competed for by students of all the constituent colleges. Peel’s was to be a senate, at first wholly nominated by the Crown, and subordinated by the Crown and Senate. The endowment of the Queen’s Colleges would remain, though the Catholic University would get nothing; nor would there be in any of the colleges any endowment for chairs of history, theology, or philosophy. This was perpetuating the inferior position of the Catholic University, as it was perpetuating the endowment of the godless colleges, and it would be almost impossible for the Catholics ever to have their proper share of representation in the Senate. Finally, men asked what sort of university that was which had no chairs of history or philosophy. The Bill in fact satisfied nobody, and Mr. Gladstone being defeated resigned office.

It will be convenient here to anticipate. In 1879 the Queen’s University was abolished and the Royal University took its place, empowered to give degrees to all comers who passed its examinations. The Queen’s Colleges were left. In 1882 the Catholic University passed under Jesuit control, and of the twenty-eight fellowships of £400 a year founded by the Royal Uni-
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versity fourteen were given to the Catholic University staff. With this slender indirect endowment it entered the lists with the Queen’s Colleges and beat them all. Subsequently there were two University commissions, one dealing with the Royal University, the other with Trinity College, but nothing was done. Finally, in 1908, Mr. Birrell passed his Irish Universities Act leaving Trinity College untouched. Abolishing the Royal University, the Act sets up two new universities, the Queen’s University with the Queen’s College at Belfast, and the National University at Dublin with the Queen’s Colleges at Cork and Galway and a new college at Dublin as constituent colleges. In these colleges there are new governing bodies, largely Catholic and National, but religious services of any kind are prohibited within the precincts, and there are no religious tests. This change has resulted in the Jesuits severing their connexion with the Catholic University, the buildings of which have been taken over by the new Dublin college.

To go back, when Mr. Gladstone was replaced by the Tories, in 1874, a new Irish party had been already formed demanding an Irish Parliament, with full power to deal with purely domestic matters. It was called the Home Rule party, Mr. Butt, a Protestant lawyer of great ability, being its chief. At the general election in 1874, sixty Home Rulers were returned. But Mr. Butt accomplished nothing. His own methods of conciliation and argument were not
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the most effective. His party, nominal Home Rulers, were mostly place-hunters, and except the Intermediary Education Act of 1878 there were no legislative results. Mr. Butt died in 1879, and for a brief period the Home Rule leader was Mr. Shaw; but after the general election of 1880 Mr. Shaw was deposed, and a youthful Home Rule leader was appointed, the person of Charles Stewart Parnell. There had been a serious failure of the potato crop in 1877 and 1878, but in 1879 there was only half the average yield. The landlords unable to get their rents began to evict, and it seemed as if the horrors of 1847 were to be reenacted in 1879. Mr. Gladstone was succeeded as Chancellor of the Exchequer by Lord Russell, who was followed by Lord Hartington. Mr. Gladstone was already on his deathbed. The New Poor Law, which was an attempt to deal with Irish poverty, was carried, and in 1879 the practice of imprisonment for debt was abolished. The late-night drinking was also abolished. The Home Rule movement was at its height. The Home Rule Bill was introduced by Mr. Parnell and his principal lieutenant. For the next few months terror reigned supreme. Mr. Forster filled the jails, broke up meetings, suppressed newspapers, and yet succeeded so ill in pacifying the country that he felt compelled to ask for more drastic measures. Mr. Gladstone was asked to come forward, but he was not willing. The Home Rule Bill was again, and for the last time, returned by the Lords. Mr. Gladstone was no longer young, and he decided to come forward. In 1884, Lord Cowper, the viceroy, and Mr. Forster were relieved of office, and Mr. Parnell and his colleagues were set free; and by an arrangement often called the Kilmainham Treaty an Arrears' Bill was to be introduced, while Parnell, on his side, was to curb the agitation and gradually re-establish the reign of law.

On the evening of 6 May these happy changes were fatally marred by the murder in the Phoenix Park, Dublin, of the under-secretary, Mr. Burke, and of the new chief secretary, Lord Frederick Cavendish. The assassins, who had according to the普通 law of coercion, killed by the Fenians; and though English intrigue succeeded in obtaining a papal rescript condemning a testimonial that was being raised for him, its only effect was to increase the subscriptions. Being friendly with the Tories, he joined with them to defeat Mr. Gladstone in 1850, and for a brief period Lord Salisbury was premier. He governed without coercion, and passed the Ashbourne Act, which advanced £5,000,000 to Irish tenants for the purchase of their holdings. In return, Mr. Parnell advised the Irish electors in Great Britain to vote for the Tories at the general election in October, 1886. But the Liberals, who had been deposed from the government of the country, were not sufficient to form a government without the Irish. On the understanding that Home Rule was to be conceded, Liberals and Irish coalesced, the Tories were turned out, and Gladstone became premier and brought in his Home Rule Bill of 1886, setting up an Irish Parliament with an executive dependent on it. Deserted by a large section of his followers under Bright, Chamberlain, and Hartington, he was defeated, and going to the country was seriously defeated at the polls. In August Lord Salisbury was again in office at the head of the Tories and Liberal Unionists, and in overwhelming strength.

The rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill of 1886 providing for the admission of leaseholders to the benefits of the Land Act of 1881, and for a revision of judicial rents to meet the recent heavy fall in prices, led to the starting of the Plan of Campaign by Messrs. Dillon and the Long Leases were granted by the Government to the tenant at a lower rent; and if it was refused he banked the money and fought the landlord, and was assisted by his fellow tenants throughout the land. The Plan was not approved of by Mr. Parnell, and it had the unfortunate effect of placing the perpetual Coercion Act of 1857 on the Statute Book. The Irish movement now seemed to pass the very measure they had so lately rejected, and it compelled many of the poorer landlords to make terms with the tenants. While on the one hand the
Plan was thus put in operation in Ireland, and on the other hand the Coercion Act, the Liberals and Irish worked well together in Parliament and on British platforms. The London "Times", always the bitter enemy of Parnell, praised, and in its anxiety to do harm published a series of articles on Parnellism and Crime. It relied, as it pretended, on authentic documents which connected Parnell and his colleagues with crime, and showed that Parnell himself conspired the Phoenix Park murders. A Special Commission appointed by Rule Billment discovered that the chief letters were forgeries and that the "Times" had been fooled by a disreputable Irishman named Richard Pigott. The forger confessed his crime and then committed suicide, and Parnell became the hero of the hour. When the Special Commission issued its report, early in 1890, the tide had turned with a vengeance against the Tories. Their majority was then seriously diminished, and when the general election came it was certain that nothing could prevent the triumph of Home Rule. In the midst of these bright hopes for Ireland there came the mournful wail of the banshee, and, even before the Special Commission report was issued, Captain O'Shea had filed a petition for divorce on the ground of his wife's adultery with Mr. Parnell. There was no defence, and could be none, and the decree was issued. Mr. Gladstone evidently expected that Mr. Parnell would retire from the leadership, and, finding that he did not, intimated that his continuance in that position would wreck Home Rule. The Irish party which had re-elected Mr. Parnell were not prepared to go so far, and, as they would not retire even for a day, they deposed him. A minority still supported him, and at the head of these appealed to the Irish people. Week after week he attended meetings and made speeches. But his health, already bad, could not stand the strain; the stubborn and reckless fight ended in his collapse, and at Brighton, on the 6th of October, 1891, the greatest Irish leader since O'Connell breathed his last.

In the years that followed faction was lord of all. At the general election in 1892 the Parnellite members were reduced to nine, while the anti-Parnellites were seventy-two, and at the election in 1895 there was no material change. To argument and entreaty the minority refused to listen, and though the anti-Parnellite leaders, Mr. MacCarthy and Mr. Dillon, were ready to make any sacrifice for unity and peace, their opponents rejected all overtures; and under the shelter of Parnell's name they continued to shout Parnell's battle-cries. At last patriotism triumphed over faction, and in 1898 Mr. John Redmond, the Parnellite leader, was elected chairman of the reunited Irish party. Much had been lost during these years of discord in unity and strength, in national dignity and self-reliance. To faction it was due that the Liberal victory of 1892 was more sweeping than, in consequence of the Rule Bill, 1893 was rejected by the Lords; and that, in 1894, Mr. Gladstone retired, baffled and beaten, from the struggle. At the elections of 1895 and 1900 the Tories were victorious, and during their long term of power the Coercion Act was frequently enforced. But there were concessions also. In 1890, Mr. Balfour's Land Act provided £33,000,000 for Irish land purchase, and in 1891 the Congested Districts Board was established. In 1896, there was an amending Land Act; and in 1898, the Local Government Act was introduced which authorized counties and rural districts from the non-representative Grand Juries to popularly elected bodies. A further important Act was that of Mr. Wyndham, in 1903, providing more than £100,000,000 for the buying out of the whole landlord class. Mr. Wyndham also favoured a policy of distribution of power and independence to local bodies of larger powers. But nothing was done till the Liberals came into office in 1906, and they had nothing more generous to offer than Mr. Birrell's National Councils Bill, a measure so halting and meagre, that an Irish National Convention rejected it with scorn. Mr. Birrell has but little fortune in his University Bill, which, though not establishing a purely Catholic University, provides one in which Catholic influences will predominate. In recent years also the programmes both in the national and secondary schools have been made more practical, facilities have been given for agricultural and technical education, and the present ecclesiastical college of Maynooth continues to maintain its reputation as the first ecclesiastical college in the world.

RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.—By the Catholic Relief Act of 1829 legal proscription ceased for the Catholic Church, as did legal ascendancy for the Protestant Church by Mr. Gladstone's Act of 1869. In practice, however, Protestant ascendancy largely remains still. Only within living memory was the first Catholic lord chancellor appointed in the person of Lord O'Hagan; Catholic bishops are still excluded, except in rare instances from the higher civil and military offices; and from the lord-lieutenancy they continue to be excluded by law.

ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANIZATION.—The Catholic Church, divided into four provinces, not, however, corresponding with the civil divisions, is ruled by four archbishops and twenty-three bishops. The number of dioceses is more than twenty-seven, for there have been amalgamations and absorptions. Cashel, for instance, has been joined with Emly, Waterford with Lismore, Kildare with Leighlin, Down with Connor, Ardagh with Clonmacnoise, Kilnamanagh with Galway, the Bishop of Galway being also Apostolic Administrator of Kilfenora. In many dioceses there are chapters, in others none. The number of parishes is 1087. A few are governed by administrators, the remainder by parish priests, while the total number of the secular clergy—parish priests, administrators, curates, chaplains, and professors in colleges—amounts to 2607. There are also many houses of the regular clergy: Augustinians, Capuchins, Carmelites, Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, Marists, Order of Charity, Oblates, Passionists, Redemptorists, and Vincentians. The total number of the regular clergy is of the order of 600, one-half of them engaged either in teaching or in giving missions, but not charged with the government of parishes. There is, however, one exception—that of the Passionists of Belfast, who have charge of the parish of Holy Cross in the city. There are the two Cistercian abbeys of Mount Mellieray and
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Roscrea, each ruled by a mitred abbot, and having forty-three professed priests.

Statistics.—The population of Ireland has been steadily diminishing. In 1861, it was 5,795,564; in 1871, 5,412,377; in 1881, 5,174,836; in 1891, 4,704,733; in 1901, 4,588,775. The decrease is due to emigration, and as the great majority of the emigrants are Catholics, the Catholic population has suffered most. In 1861, it numbered 4,505,265; in 1871, 4,150,867; in 1881, 3,908,891; in 1891, 3,547,307; in 1901, 3,310,-025. In the period from 1851 to 1901 the total number of emigrants, of Irish birth, was 5,451,456, of whom Irish ports was 3,846,393. No less than 89 per cent. went to the United States, the remainder going to Great Britain, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. The saddest feature of this exodus is that 82 per cent. of the emigrants were between 15 and 35 years of age. The healthy and enterprising have gone, leaving the weaker in mind and body at home, one result being that the number of lunatics increased from 16,605 in 1871 to 21,188 in 1891. In the latter year the total number of primary schools was 4,194, of which 8360 were under the National Board, 97 under the Christian Brothers and other communities, and 471 other primary schools. In 1908 the total number of National Board schools was 8538 under 3587 managers, of whom 2455 were clerical and 602 laymen. Of the clerical managers 1307 were Catholics, 713 Protestant Episcopalians, 379 Presbyterian, 52 Methodists, and 4 unclassed. In 1901 the number of pupils in all the primary schools was 636,777, of whom 471,910 were Catholic. There has been a steady improvement in the matter of illiteracy. In 1841 the percentage of those above five years who could neither read nor write was 53; in 1901 it had fallen to 14. Of the whole population 14 per cent. could speak Irish. In 1901 there were 35,373 pupils in the Intermediate schools, the number of Catholics being 78 per cent. of the total Catholic population. The Catholic girls in these schools were for the most part educated in the various convents. The boys were educated in the diocesan colleges, or in the colleges of the religious orders, and a proportion also in the Christian Brothers’ schools. “In Colleges of Universities and other Colleges”, in 1901, there were 3192 students, of whom 91 were females. The highest form of ecclesiastical education is obtained at Maynooth, other such colleges being All Hallows and Clonliffe in Dublin, Thurles, Waterford, and Carlow colleges.

Church Property, Churches, Schools, Cemeteries.—Church property is usually held in trust by the parish priest for the parish, the bishop for the diocese, the religious superior for his order, and often associated with private trusts. In many cases the title-deeds have been lost, but undisputed possession is considered sufficient, and the parish-priest or other superior for the time being is recognized as the legal owner of the church, church grounds, and cemetery, if there be such. New churches are built on land purchased, or acquired free of rent or under very long lease, and church and ground are exempt from taxation. New cemeteries belong to the District Council, and many of the older cemeteries have been taken over by the same authority. Schools built by the full Board are either vested or non-vested. If vested, they are held by trustees—usually the priest, who is manager, and two others—and in this case only two-thirds of the cost of building is granted by Government. In the case of non-vested schools, which are the property of the National Board, neither the full amount for building is granted by Government, and the school is also kept in repair, while in vested schools repairs have to be made by the manager. Both in vested and non-vested schools the National Board regulates the programme, selects the school books, and provides for the cost of examination and inspection. The appointment and dismissal of teachers rests with the manager, from whom in the Catholic schools there is an appeal to the bishop. All these schools are exempted from taxation. Clergymen of all denominations get loans from Government on easy terms to build residences. These houses, however, are not exempt from taxation, and belong to the clergyman and his successors, not to himself personally.

Public Institutions.—Prisons are under government management, and always have a Catholic chaplain, when there are Catholic inmates. So also have workhouses, asylums, and county hospitals, which are under the local authority. Reformatories and industrial institutions get loans from Government on easy terms to build residences. These houses, however, are not exempt from taxation, and belong to the clergyman, and so forth.

Legal Status of the Clergy.—The clergy have, with some few exceptions, the usual rights of citizens. They can receive and dispose of property by will as all others, and they can vote at elections. But they are excluded by law from the House of Commons, though not from the House of Lords; and they are excluded from the County and District Councils, though not from the various committees appointed by these bodies. They are exempt from military service and from serving on juries. Public worship is free; but priests may not celebrate the Mass outside the churches or private houses, nor appear publicly in their vestments, nor have religious processions in the streets; nor may the regular clergy go abroad in the distinctive dress of their order. These laws, however, are not enforced and not infrequently processions do take place through the streets, and the regular clergy
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E. A. D'ALTON.

IRISH LITERATURE.—It is uncertain at what period and in what manner the Irish discovered the use of letters. They were long conversant with Gaul, but it is more probable, as MacNeill has shown in his study of Irish oghams, that it was from the Romanized Britons that they first learned the art of writing. The Italian alphabet, however, was not the first to be employed in Ireland. Whoever the early Irish may have been who first discovered letters, whether from intercourse with Britain or with Gaul, they did not apparently bring either the Latin or the Greek alphabet back with them to Ireland, but they invented an entirely new one of their own, founded with considerable skill upon the Latin; this was used in Irish, as the Irish Celts for inscriptions upon pillars and gravestones. This ogham script, as it is called, consists of lines, straight or slanting, long or short, drawn either over, under, or through a given straight line, which straight line is in lapidary inscriptions usually formed by the angular edge of a rectangular upright stone. Thus, four cuts to the right of the line stand for S, to the left of the line they mean C, and if they pass through the line they mean E. None even of the oldest Irish manuscripts preserved to us is anything like as ancient as these lapidary inscriptions. The language of the ogham stones is in fact centuries older than that of the very oldestvellums, and agrees to a large extent with that which has been found of the Old Gaulish linguistic monuments. Early Irish literature and the sagas relating to the pre-Christian period of Irish history abound with references to ogham writing, which was almost certainly of pagan origin, and which continued to be employed until the Christianization of Ireland. It was due to the Church and the Roman letters which were introduced by the Church and must have been propagated with all the prestige of the new religion behind them; but isolated ogham inscriptions exist on grave stones erected as late as the year 600. When the script was introduced into the Celtic Church in Gaul, it was probably about the second century. Although it answered well, indeed better than the rounded Roman letters, for lapidary inscriptions, yet it was too cumbersome an invention for the facile creation of a literature, though a professional poet may well have carried about with him on his "tablet-staves," as the manuscripts call them, the catchwords of many poems, sagas, and genealogies. Over a couple of hundred inscribed ogham stones still exist, mostly in the south-west of Ireland, but they are to be found in Wales, and the Irish Celt planted his colonies in Scotland, Wales, Devonshire, and even farther East.

Earliest Manuscripts.—The earliest existing examples of the written Irish language as preserved in manuscripts do not go back farther than the eighth century; they are chiefly copies of trochas, written between the lines or on the margins of religious works in Latin, preserved on the Continent, whether they were carried by early Irish missionaries, or written by them in the numerous monasteries which they founded in Switzerland, Germany, France, and Italy. The oldest piece of consecutive Irish preserved in Ireland is found in the "Book of Armagh," written about the year 812. These early gloses, though of little except philological interest, yet show the wide learning of the commentators and the extraordinary development, even at that early period, of the language in question. Whether in form and style, says Kuno Meyer, stand on a high level in comparison with those of the Old High German gloses. "We find here," he writes, "a fully formed learned prose-style which allows even the finest shades of thought to be easily and perfectly expressed, from which we must conclude that there must have been a long previous culture [of the language] going back at the very least to the beginning of the sixth century" (Kultur der Gegenwart, part i, section xi, p. 80). These gloses are to be found at Wrzburg, St. Gall, Karlsruhe, Milan, Turin, St. Paul in Carinthia, and elsewhere. Tirement, however, the manuscripts are the "Book of Armagh," perhaps the most ancient manuscripts in which Irish is written. They date from about the year 900 to 1050. The oldest books of miscellaneous literature are the "Leabhar na h-Udheire," or "Book of the Dun Cow," transcribed about the year 1100, and the "Book of Leinster," which dates from about fifty years later. Both these books are great miscellaneous literary collections. After them come many valuable vellums. The date at which these manuscripts were penned is no criterion of the date at which their contents were first written, for many of these manuscripts were copied from other manuscripts. In the form of words and other indications, must have been committed to writing as early as the seventh century at least. We cannot carry these pieces farther back linguistically, but it is evident from their contents that many of them must have been handed down orally for centuries before they were committed to writing. It must also be noted that a seventeenth-century manuscript sometimes give a more correct version of a seventh-century piece than a vellum many centuries older.

Earliest Christian Scholars in Ireland.—It happens that Ireland's first great saint is also the first person of whom we can say without hesitation that some at least of the writings ascribed to him are really his. We actually possess a manuscript (Book of Armagh) 1100 years old, containing his "Confession," or apology. There is no reason, however, for supposing that it was with St. Patrick that a knowledge of the Greek alphabet was brought over to Ireland before his arrival there were Christians in Munster. At the beginning of the third century there were Irish missionaries at work, according to Zimmer, in the southern province of the island. Bede says distinctly that Palladius was sent from Rome to the Irish who already believed in Christ, and "eleven hundred" as the "two and a half centuries" (Eccles. Hist., bk. i, xiii). Pelagius, the subtle heresiarch who taught with such success at Rome, and
who acquired great influence there, was of Irish descent. "Habet," says St. Jerome, "progeniem Scotticis gentis de Britannorum vicinia" (P. L. XXIV, 682, 758). He came probably from those Irish who had settled in Wales and South Britain. His friend and teacher Celestius is said by some to have been an Irishman, but this statement is doubtful, and it is clear that (Irish Stiofán, now Shiell in English), the author of the "Carmen Paschale," who flourished in the first half of the fifth century, and who has been called the Virgil of the theological poetry, was almost certainly an Irishman. Indeed the Irish geographer Dicuil in the eighth century about the year 800 deploured the fact that some Irish families at least were within reach of a cosmopolitan literary education in the fourth and fifth centuries and that they were quick to grasp it.

Existing Manuscript Literature.—Although so many scholars have during the last fifty years given themselves up to Celtic studies, yet it remains true that the time has not yet come, nor can it come for many years, when it will be possible to take anything like an accurate survey of the whole field of Irish literature. Enormous numbers of important MSS. still remain unedited; many gaps have occurred in the present which have never been filled up, unless perhaps here and there by some short piece published in a learned magazine; of many periods we know little or nothing. There are poets known to us at present practically only by name, whose work lies waiting to be unearthed and edited, and so vast is the field and so enormous the quantity of matter to be dealt with that there is room for an entire army of workers, and until much more pioneer work has been done, and further researches made in Irish grammar, prosody, and lexicography, it will be impossible to reduce the great mass of material into order, and to date it with anything like correctness. These MSS. still exist in Irish, and the existence of the Manuscripts has never been accurately determined. The number in the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, alone is enormous, probably amounting to some fifteen hundred. O'Curry, O'Longan, and O'Beirne catalogued a little more than half the manuscripts in the Academy, and the catalogue of contents filled thirteen volumes containing 3448 pages; to these an alphabetic index of the pieces contained was made in three volumes, and an index of the principal names, etc., in thirteen volumes more. From an examination of these books one may roughly calculate that the pieces catalogued would number, however it might be divided, from long epic sagas to single quatrains or stanzas, and yet there remain a great deal more to be indexed, a work which after a delay of very many years is happily now at last in process of accomplishment. The library of Trinity College, Dublin, also contains a great number of valuable MSS. of all ages, many of them vellums, probably about 160. The British Museum, the Bodleian Library at Oxford, the Advocates Library in Edinburgh, and the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels are all repositories of large numbers of valuable MSS.

Contents of the Manuscripts.—From what we know of the contents of the existing manuscripts we may set down as follows a rough classification of the literature contained in them. We may well begin with the ancient epics dating substantially from pagan times, and probably first reduced to writing in the seventh century. Among these we find the famous "Acassin et Nicolette". After the substantially pagan epics may come the early Christian literature, especially the lives of the saints, which are both numerous and valuable. We find a list of names of 157 epic sagas. The "ollamh" (olla), or arch-poet, who was the highest dignitary among the poets, and whose training lasted for some twelve years, was obliged to learn two
hundred and fifty of these prime sagas and one hundred secondary ones. The manuscripts themselves divide the prime sagas into the following romantic categories, from the very names of which we may get a glance at the genius of the early Gael, and form some conception of the tragic nature of his epic.—Destruction of Houses, Courtships or Wooings, Battles, Stories of Caves, Navigation, Tragic Deaths, Feasts, Sieges, Adventures of Travel, Eloquence, Slaughters, Water-eruptions, Expeditions, Progresses, and Visions. "He is no poet," says the "Book of Leinster," "who does not sympathize with the feelings of these stories, and linger long over their incidents and colouring. And yet there is scarcely one of them in which some Christian allusion to heaven, or hell, or the Deity, or some Biblical subject, does not appear. The reason of this seems to be that, when Christianity had succeeded in gaining the upper hand over paganism, a kind of tacit compromise was arrived at, by means of which the bard, and the fili (i.e., poet), and the representatives of the old pagan learning were permitted by the sympathetic clerics to propagate their stories, tales, poems, and genealogies, at the price of tacking on to them a little Christian admin- istration, and of harmonising the pagan with the Christian, and of compelling them to fly at the mast-head the flag of the sasein power. But so badly has the dovetailing of the Christian into the pagan part been performed in most of the oldest romances that the pieces come away quite separate in the hands of even the least skilled reader, and the pagan substratum stands forth as a thing entirely distinct from the Christian accretion. Thus, for example, in the evidently pagan saga called the "Wooing of Etain", we find the description of the pagan paradise given its literary passport, so to speak, by a cunningly interwoven allusion to Adam's fall. Etain was the wife of one of the Tuatha De Danann, who were gods. She is reborn as a mortal—the pagan Irish seem, like the Gaulish druids, to have believed in metempsychosis—and weds the King of Ireland. Her former husband of the Tuatha De Danann race still loves her, follows her into her life as a mortal, and tries to win her back by singing her a captivating description of the glowing unseen land to which she would lure her. "O lady fair, would'st thou come with me," he cries, "to the wondrous land that is ours", and he describes how "the crimson of the foxglove is in every brake—a beauty of land the land I speak of, lo, of the island, the land of sweet streams traverse the country", etc.; and then the evidently pagan description of this land of the gods is made passable by an added verse in which we are advisedly told that, though the inhabitants of this glorious country saw everyone, yet nobody saw them, "because the cloud of Adam's wrongdoing has concealed us".

It is this easy analysis of early Irish literature into its ante-Christian and its post-Christian elements which lends to it an absorbing interest and a great value in the history of European thought. For, when all spurious ascensions have been discarded, it gives us a genuine picture of pagan life in Europe, such as we look for in vain elsewhere. "The Church adopted (in Ireland) towards Pagan sagas the same position that it adopted towards Pagan law. I see no sufficient ground for doubting that really genuine pictures of a pre-Christian culture are preserved to us in the individual sagas ("Windscheitl, Iri sche Texte, I, 258)." The sagas originated in Pagan and was propagated in Christian times, and that too without its seeking fresh nutriment, as a rule, from Christian elements. But we must ascribe it to the influence of Christianity that what is specifically Pagan in Irish saga is largely forced into the later and more mundane narrative, and that there exist many whose contents are plainly mythological. The Christian monks were certainly not the first who reduced the ancient sagas to fixed form, but later on they..."
espied them faithfully and promulgated them after Ireland had been converted to Christianity" (ibid., 62). *Irish Literature and Early Europe.*—When it is understood that the ancient Irish sagas record, even though it be in a more or less distorted fashion, in some cases reminiscences of a past mythology and in others not, by intimate conclusions derived from the works one needs only a moment's reflection to realize their value. "Nothing," writes Zimmer, "except a spurious criticism which takes for original and primitive the most palpable nonsense of which Middle-Irish writers from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth century are guilty with regard to Irish, "with a name, Gregarius, a parallel to the principal rôle in this cycle of Cuchulainn." (Introduction à l'étude de la littérature celtique, 217) and a study of the original tribute imposed on Leinster in the first century he writes: "The story has real facts for a basis though certain details may have been created by the imagination" and again, "Irish epic story, barbarous though it be, is, like Irish law, a monument of a civilization far superior to that of the most ancient Germans" (L'épopée celtique en Irlande, préface, p. xii). "Ireland, in fact," writes M. Darmesteter in his "English Studies," summing up his long research on the nation's deities, "the great Celtic scholars," "has the peculiar privilege of a history continuous from the earliest centuries of our era until the present day. She has preserved in the infinite wealth of her literature a complete and faithful picture of the ancient civilization of the Celts. Irish literature is therefore the key which opens the Celtic world" (Eng. tr., 1896, 182). But the Celtic world means a large portion of Europe, and the key to its past history can be found at present nowhere else in the Irish manuscripts. Without them we would have to view the past history of a great part of Europe through the medium of the Greeks and Romans, to whom all outer nations were barbarians, into whose social life they had no motive for inquiring. Apart from Irish literature we would have no means of estimating what were the feelings, modes of life, manners, and habits of those great Celtic races who once possessed so large a part of the ancient world, Gaul, Belgium, North Italy, parts of Germany, Spain, Switzerland, and the British Isles, who burnt Rome, plundered Greece, and colonised Asia Minor. But in the ancient epics of Ireland we find another standard by which to measure, and thereby test the heroic epic, clearest reflection of the life and manners of the race in one of its strongholds, and we find many characteristic customs of the Continental Celts, which are just barely mentioned or alluded to by Greek and Roman writers, reappearing in all the circumstances and expansion of saga-telling.

Of such is the custom of the "Hero's Bit" mentioned by Posidonius, upon which one of the most famous of Irish sagas, "Bricriu's Feast," is founded. Again, the chariot, which had become obsolete even in Gaul a couple of hundred years before Caesar's invasion, is described repeatedly in the sagas of Ireland, and the battle cry of the epic of Finn always represented as fighting from their chariots. We find, as Diodorus Siculus mentions, that the bards had power to make battles cease by interposing with song between the combatants. Caesar says (Gallie War, bk. VI, xiv) the Gaulish druids spent twenty years in studying and learned a great number of verses, but Irish literature tells us what the arch-poet, probably the counterpart of the Gaulish druid, actually did learn. "The manners and customs in which the men of the time lived and moved are depicted", writes G. O'Kelly, "what is really a distorted early for doubt as to the former actuality of the scenes depicted. In matter of costume and weapons, eating and drinking, building and arrangement of the banquet hall, manners observed at the feast, and much more, we find here the most valuable information" (Ir. Archeol., I, 232). "It may be said that the Irish saga is the only richly-flowing source of unbroken Celtism." "It is the ancient Irish language," says d'Arbois de Jubainville, "that forms the connecting point between the neo-Celtic languages and the Gaulish of the inscribed stones, coins, and proper names preserved in Greek and Roman literature." It is evident, then, that those of the great Continental nations of to-day whose ancestors were mostly Celts, but whose language, literature, and traditions have completely disappeared, must, if they wish to study their own past, turn themselves first to Ireland, and there they will find the tale of Poseidon, the rise up before them in a ruddy covering of flesh and blood, which, for the first time, will enable them to see what manner of men were their own forbears.

Three Principal Saga Cycles.—There are three great cycles in Irish story-telling, two of them very full, but the third, in many ways the most interesting, is now but scantily represented. This last cycle is the purely mythological one, dealing with the Tuatha De Dannan, the gods of good, and the Fomorians, gods of darkness and evil, and giving us, under the apparent early history of the various races that formed the vast later Celtic pantheon. According to these accounts the Nemedians first seized on the island and were oppressed by the Fomorians, who are described as African sea-robbers; these races nearly exterminated each other at the fight round Conning's Tower on Tory Island. Some of the Nemedians escaped to Greece and came back a couple of hundred years later calling themselves Firbolg. Others of the Nemedians who escaped came back later, calling themselves the Tuatha De Dannan. These last fought the battle of North Moytura and beat the Firbolg, and, the battle of Magh Trench, and, the battle of Magh Trench, and, the battle of the Firbolg. They held the island until the Gaels, also called Milesians or Scoti, came in and vanquished them. From these Milesians the present Irish are mostly descended. Good sagas about both of these battles are preserved, each existing in only a single copy. Nearly all the rest of this most interesting cycle has been lost or is to be found merely in condensed summaries. These mythological pieces dealt with peoples, dynasties, and probably the struggle between good and evil principles. There is over it all a sense of vagueness and uncertainty. Thus in the Irish legend of the battle of Magh Trench (or Ulster cycle, as it is variously called), on the other hand, deals with the history of the Milesians themselves within a brief but well-defined period, and we seem here to find ourselves not far removed from historical ground. The romances belonging to this cycle are sharply drawn, numerous, and ancient, many of them are fine both in their conception and execution. The time is about the birth of Christ, and the figures of Cuchulainn (Coochullin), King Conor Mac Nessa, Fergus, Naiose (Neesa), Meadbh (Mève), Déidire, Conall Cearnach, and their fellows, have far more distinctness in them than the dim, mist-defined, distorted forms of the Tuatha De Dannan such as Nuada of the Silver Hand, Bres, Balor of the Evil Eye, Dana, and the other beings whom we find in the mythological cycle. The best known and greatest of
all these sagas is the "Táin Bo Cuailnge", or "Cattle-Raid of Cooley", a district in the County of Louth. It gives a full account of the struggle between Connacht and Ulster, and the hero of the piece, as indeed of the whole Red Branch cycle, is the youthful Cuchulainn, the Hector of Ireland, the most chivalrous of enemies. This long saga contains many episodes drawn together and formed into a single whole, and is a kind of Irish Diaghel, and the state of society which it describes from the point of culture-development is considerably older and more primitive than that of the Greek epic. The number of stories that belong to this cycle is considerable. Standish Hayes O'Grady has reckoned ninety-six (appendix to Eleonora Grant's The Leinster Cycle of Irish Literature). These sagas seem to be now wholly lost, and many others very much abbreviated, though they were all doubtless at one time told at considerable length.

After the Red Branch or heroic cycle we find a third very comprehensive and even more popular body of romance woven round Finn Mac Cumhail (Cool), his son Oscar, his grandson Oisin or Osian, Conn of the Hundred Battles King of Ireland, his son Art the Lonely, and his grandson Cormac of the Lifsey, in the second and third centuries. This cycle of romance is usually called the Fenian cycle, because it is the story of Ireland and of the Fenian militia. These, according to the Irish historians, were a body of Irish janissaries maintained by the Irish kings for the purpose of guarding their coasts and fighting their battles, but they ended by fighting the king himself and were destroyed in the famous cadh (or battle) of Tailtean (Gowra). As the heroic cycle is often called the Ulster cycle, so this is also known as the Leinster cycle of sagas, because it may have had its origin, as MeicNeill has suggested, amongst the Galoines, a non-Mediterranean tribe and subject race, who dwelt round the Hill of Allen in Leinster. That whole body of romance is of later growth or rather expresses a much later state of civilization than the Cuchulainn stories. There is no mention of fighting in chariots, of the Hero's Bit, or of many other characteristics which mark the antiquity of the Ulster cycle. Very few pieces belonging to the Ulster story have come down, and the great mass of texts is of Middle and Late Irish growth. The extension of the story to all the Gaelic-speaking parts of the kingdom is placed by MacNeill between the years 400 and 700; up to this time it was (as the product of a vassal race) propagated only over the parts of the country developed in different quarters of the country, that about Diarmuid of the Love Spot in South Munster, and that about Goll the son of Morna in Connacht. Certainly it is that this cycle was by far the most popular and widely spread of the three, being familiarly known in every part of Ireland and of Gaelic-speaking Scotland even to the present day. It developed also in a direction of its own, for, though none of the heroic tales are wholly in verse, yet the number of Ossianic epoeyes, ballads, and poems is enormous, amounting probably to some 50,000 lines, mostly in the more modern language.

Early Christian Literature.—Perhaps no country that ever adopted Christianity was so thoroughly and rapidly permeated and even saturated with its language and conceptions as was Ireland. It adopted and made its own in secular life scores and hundreds of German words astirly the Christian ecclesiastical purposes. Even to the present day we find in Irish words like pós, a kiss, borrowed from the Latin for "[the kiss] of peace", pacīs, Old Irish pōc; the word for rain, bðsteach, is from baptizare, and meant originally "the water of baptism"; both these root stems appear in the modern English word "head", i.e. the baptized part. A common word for warrior, or hero, laoch, now laoch, is simply from laicus, a layman. The Latin language was, of course, the one used for religious purposes, both in private and very formal parts of society, such as the Church and the temples of Christianity. In it were written the earliest hymns; Patrick used it in his "Confession", as did Adamnan in his "Life of Columcille". But already by the middle of the eighth century the native language had largely displaced it all over Ireland as a medium for religious thought, for homily, for litany, for books of devotion, and the lives of saints. We find the Irish language used in a large religious literature, much of which is native, while some of it represents lost Latin originals which are now known to us only from the Irish translations. One interesting development of "rith eager", the written word, is the literature beginning with the vision of St. Fursa, which is given at some length by Bede, and of which Sir Francis Palgrave states that "tracing the course of thought upwards we have no difficulty in deducing the poetic genealogy of Dante's Inferno to the Milesian Fursus". These "visions" were very popular in Ireland, and so numerous that they gave rise to the, the twelfth-century "Vision of Mac Conglina". More important than these, however, are the lives of the saints, because many of them, dating back to a very remote period, throw a great deal of light upon conditions and customs in an early Irish. In the first half of the seventeenth century Brother Michael O'Clergy, a Franciscan, travelled round Ireland and made copies of between thirty and forty lives of Irish saints, which are still preserved in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. Nine, at least, exist elsewhere in ancient volumes. A part of one of these, the voyage of St. Brendan, spread through all Europe, but the Latin version is much more complete than any existing Irish one, the original having probably been lost.

Irish Historical Literature.—Owing to the nature of the case, and because it is not easy to join the isolation of Ireland, it is extremely difficult, or rather impossible, to procure independent foreign testimony to the truth of the Irish annals. But, although such testimony is denied us, yet there happily exists another kind of evidence to which we may appeal with comparative confidence. This is nothing less than the natural phenomena as reported in the annals, for if it can be shown by calculating backward, as modern science has enabled us to do, that such natural phenomena as the appearance of comets or the occurrence of eclipses are recorded to the day and hour by the early Irish, then we can with some certainty that these phenomena were recorded at the time of their appearance by writers who personally observed them, and whose writings must have been actually consulted and seen by these later annalists whose books we now possess. If we take, let us say, the "Annals of Ulster", which treat of Ireland and Irish history from about the year 444, but of which the written copy dates only from the fifteenth century, we find that they contain from the year 496 to 854 as many as eighteen records of eclipses and comets, and all these agree exactly to the day and hour with the calculations of modern astronomers. How impossible it is to keep such records unless written memoranda are made of them at the time by eyewitnesses is shown by the fact that Bede, born in 675, in recording the great solar eclipse which took place only eleven years before his own birth, is yet two years wrong, and so the "Annals of Ulster" give, not only the correct day, but the correct hour, thus showing that their compiler, Cathal Maguire, had access either to an original, or a copy of an original, account by an eyewitness. Whenever any side-issues from an external quarter have been touched upon, the chief sources, even the Cymric, Saxon, or Continental sources, they have always tended to show their accuracy. We may take
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it then, without any credulity on our part, that Irish history as recorded in the annals may be pretty well relied upon from the fourth century onward.

The first scholar whom we know to have written concerning the Irish was a certain Abbot of Clonmacnoise, who died in 898. He begins in Latin with the founding of Rome, later on he makes occasional mention of Irish affairs, and lays it down that Irish history is not to be trusted before the reign of Cínbaed, that is, prior to about the year 300 n. c., "Omnis memoria de Hibernia in antiquo tempore est". This statement [the Irish were always called Scotti till into the late Middle Ages] usque Cínbaed incerta erat." In the fourth century n. c. the references to Ireland become fuller and more numerous, they are partly in Latin, partly in Irish, but towards the end of the work Latin gives way to the native speech. The greatest book of annals, with a few trifling exceptions also the latest, is that known under the title of the "Four Masters" (q. v.). It is evident from the entries that the compilers of the "Annals of Ulster" and the rest copied from original annals. In the "Annals of Ulster", for instance, we read under the year 428 "Chronicum magnum scriptum est", at 427 and 428 the compiler writes "sic in libro Cuanach inveni", at 428, "ut Cuanach scriptur", at 507, "seundum librum Mochod", at 428, "sicut in libro Dubhdailithe narratur", etc. No nation in Europe can boast of so continuous and voluminous a history preserved in a vernacular literature as the Irish. The only annals and distinguished from annals were written under great difficulties by Geoffrey Keating, a learned priest, in the first half of the seventeenth century; it also is taken, almost exclusively, from the old vellum manuscripts then surviving, but which mostly perished, as Keating himself did, in the cataclysm of the Cromwellian wars.

Early Irish Poetry.—There is no other vernacular poetry in Europe which has gone through so long, so unbroken, and so interesting a period of development as that of the Irish. The oldest poems are ascribed to the early Milesians and are perhaps the most ancient pieces of vernacular literature existing. None of the early poems rhymed. There is little that we can see to distinguish them from prose except a strong tendency, as in the Teutonic languages, towards alliteration, and a leaning towards dissyllabic words so that the bards were eligible without heavy glosses. It is a tremendous claim to make for the Celt that he taught Europe to rhyme, yet it has been often made for him, and not by himself, but by such men as Zeuss, the father of Celtic learning, Constantine Nigra, and others. Certain it is that as early as the seventh century and the Irish had brought the art of rhyming verses to a high pitch of perfection, that is, centuries before the rest of the vernacular literatures of Europe knew anything at all about it. Nor are their rhymes only such as we are accustomed to in English, French, or German poetry, for they dealt with not only in all rhymes, like these nations, but also in assonances, like the Spaniards, and they often thought more of a middle rhyme than of an end rhyme. The following Latin verses, written no doubt after his native models by Aengus Mac Tipratae sometime prior to the year 704, will give the reader an idea of this middle or interlinear rhyming which the Irish have practised from the earliest times down to the present day:—

Martinus mirus more
Ore laudavit Deum,
Puro corde cantavit
Atque amavit Eum.

A very curious and interesting peculiarity of a certain sort of Irish verse is a desire to end a second line with a word of a syllable more than that which ends the first, the stress of the voice being thrown back a syllable in the last word of the second line. Thus, if the first line end with an accented monosyllable the second line will end with a disyllable word accented on its first syllable, or if the first line end with a disyllable accented on its first syllable the second line will end with a trisyllable accented on its antepenultimate. This is called aird-rinn in Irish, as:—

Fail'n the land of learned men
The bardic band is fallen,
None now learn a song to sing
For our song is fading.

This metre, which from its popularity may be termed the hexameter of the Irish, is named Deibhidhe (D'yeveve), and well shows in the last two lines the internal rhymes to which we refer. If it be maintained, as Thurneysen maintains, that the Irish derived their rhyming verses from the Latins, it seems necessary to account for the peculiar forms that so much of this verse assumed in Irish, for the merest glance will show that the earliest Irish verse is full of touras de force, like this "aird-rinn", which cannot have been derived from Latin. The best of the "aird-rinn" is not that which the Irish brought their rhyming system to a pitch of perfection undreamt of by any nation in Europe, even at the present day, and it is no exaggeration to say that perhaps by no people was poetry so cultivated and, better still, so remunerated as in Ireland.

There were two kinds of poets known to the early Gael. The principal of these was called the filé (fella); there were seven grades of filé, the most exalted being called an ollamh (ollaw). These last were so highly esteemed that the annalists often give their obituaries, as though they were so many princes. They took from twelve to twenty years to arrive at this dignity. Some fragments of the old metrical textbooks still exist, showing the courses required from the various grades of poets, in pre-Norse times. One of these, in elucidation of the metre, gives the first lines of three hundred and fifty different poems, all no doubt well-known at the time of writing, but of which only about three have come down entire to our own time. If there were seven species of filé there were sixteen grades of bards, each with a different name, and each had his own peculiar metres (of which the Irish had over 300) allotted to him. During the wars with the Norse, on the other hand, the bards suffered fearfully, and it must have been at this time, that is in the ninth and tenth centuries, that the finely-drawn distinction between the poets and bards seems to have come to an end. So highly esteemed was the poetic art in Ireland that Keating in his history tells us that at one time no less than a third of the patrician families of Ireland followed that profession. These constituted a heavy drain on the resources of the country, and at three different periods in Irish history the people tried to shake off their incubus. However, Columcille, who was a poet himself, befriended the bards of Clontarf, and, in the sixth century, their numbers were reduced and they were shorn of many of their prerogatives; but, on the other hand, public lands were set apart for their colleges, and these continued until the later English conquest, when those who escaped the spear of Elizabeth fell beneath the sword of Cromwell.

Modern Irish Poetry.—Much of the ancient poetry of the schools was largely in the nature of a memoria technica, the frame in which valuable information was enshrined, but the bards attached to the great houses chanted a different strain. So numerous are the still surviving poems from the period of the Battle of Clontarf down to the sixteenth century that Meyer has remarked that the history of Ireland could be written out of them alone. When the great houses fell beneath the sword of Elizabeth, of Cromwell, and
The poets we praise are up-raising the notes
Of their lays, and they know how their tones will delight.
For the golden-haired lady so graceful so poseeful
So Gaelic so glorious enthralled in our sight.
Unfolding a tale how the soul of a fay
Must be clothed in the frame of a lady so bright,
Untold are her graces, a rose in her face is,
And no man so staid is but faints at her sight.

Owen Roe O'Sullivan, the witty and facetious name-sake of the poet, was unpretentious, and which, though reduced to less than a score in the Elizabethan period, were still the proper property of the learned and highly educated, so intricate were the verse forms, now died away completely. There was, perhaps, not a single writer living by the middle of the eighteenth century who could correct verses in the classical metres of the schools.

On the other hand, however, there arose a new kind of poetry, in which the consonant rhyming of the old school was replaced by vowel chiming or vowel rhymes, and in which only the syllables on which the stress of the voice fell were counted; a splendid lyrical poetry sprang up amongst the people themselves upon these lines. The chief poets of these latter times were in very reduced circumstances, mostly schoolmasters or farmers, and very different indeed in status from the refined, highly educated, and still more the learned, poets with a constant at the right hand of powerful chieftains advising them in peace and war. A usual theme of the new poets, who seemed to revel in their newly found liberty of expression, was the grievances of Ireland sung under a host of allegorical names, the chances of the Stuarts returning, and the bitterness of the present as compared with the glories of the past, or the vision of Ireland appearing as a beautiful maiden. The poets of the South used even to hold annual bardic sessions, though such attempts must always have been attended with great danger, for the possession of a manuscript was often sufficient cause for persecuting or imprisoning the possessor; many fine books were on this account hidden away or walled up lest they should bring the owner into trouble with the authorities. Even as late as 1798, the grammarian Neilson of County Down, who was a Protestant clergyman of the Established Church and pew-money payer, was convicted by the Governor of a dozen dragoons and accused of treason because he preached in Irish.

It is very difficult to convey in the English language any idea of the beautifully artistic and refined measures in which the poets of the last two or three centuries have resided, both in Ireland and in the Highlands of Scotland, where also they produced a splendid lyrical outburst, about the same time as in Ireland, and on the same lines. Suffice it to say that most of their modern poetry was written and is being written to this very day upon a wonderful scheme of sound, on a careful arrangement of rhyme that first one and then another vowel will strike the ear at skillfully recurring intervals. Some poems are written entirely on the œ sound, others on the o, others on the ū (oo), ê (ee), or ã (au) sounds, but most upon a delightfully intermingling of two or more of them. Here is a typical verse of Tadhg Gáelach Ó Súillivan, who died in 1800 and who consecrated his muse, which had at first led him astray, to the service of religion, his poems producing a profound effect for good all over the South of Ireland. The entire poem is made upon the sounds of è (e) and o, but with a careful arrangement in the first half of the verse is ò/è/ò/ò/è/ò, the arrangement in the second half is o/è/ò/ò/è/è. To understand the effect that this vowel rhyming should produce, we must remember that the vowels are dwelt upon in Irish, and not passed over quickly as they are in English:—
Aryan origin and have their counterparts in most Aryan literature. Of these, too, it is only recently that collections have been made. There is one remark which must not be omitted about this folk-poetry and its MSS. poetry as well—it resembles scarcely anything in the nature of a ballad. Lyrics couched in the most exquisitely artful rhyme, and didactic and bacchæanéan and religious poetry of all sorts, Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland produced in plenty, but they have almost nothing in the nature of the splendid Lowland ballads. They could not tell a story in verse. With the exception of the Ossianic poems and a few poems of the classical school there was never any attempt made to recount a striking tale through the medium of verse.

Modern Irish Printed Literature.—For long it was believed that the Celtic languages were connected with the East—with the Phenicians, according to a favourite theory—or at least that they had nothing in common with the Aryan, or Indo-European, group of tongues. All the scholars of the eighteenth century and of the beginning of the nineteenth century took up this attitude. Even the great German scholar Bopp excluded Celtic from his Indo-European grammar. Lhuyd, the Welsh antiquary, had already shown early in the eighteenth century the close co-relation between all the Celtic tongues, but it remained for the Bavarian Zeuss to prove to the world beyond seas or nay, in his "Grammar of Celtic" published in 1853, that the Celtic languages were Indo-European. Since that day Celtic scholarship, based upon Zeuss's monumental work, has made enormous strides. The work of the great native Irish scholars O'Curry and O'Donovan, who first penetrated the difficult language of the Brevon Laws, and the more recent works of the learned and unique acquaintance with Irish manuscripts first gave to the world a general knowledge of Irish literature, was succeeded by the more distinctly scientific labours of Whitley Stokes, Father Edmund Hogan, S.J., Robert Atkinson, and of Standish Hayes O'Daly (whose acquaintance with the modern and ancient literature makes him the legitimate successor of O'Donovan and O'Curry), of W. M. Hennessy and Father Bartholomew MacCarthy, all in Ireland, while Zeuss found a worthy successor in Ebel, who published a corrected and augmented version of his "Grammatik" in 1874. In recent years Windisch, Thurneysen, Zimmer, and Kuno Meyer have done immense work in the same field. In France, Gaidos founded the "Revue Celtique" in 1870, afterwards edited by d'Arbois de Jubainville, and of which twenty-eight volumes have appeared; in them many Irish texts have been published and much light thrown upon Celtic subjects in general. The "Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie" made its appearance in 1896, and was followed by the "Archiv für celtische Lexicographie".

Up to this point, and by most of these learned men, the Celtic language regarded as a subject for pure scholarship only, as a thing dead, having no immediate or necessary connexion with the country or the people that had given it birth. Their scholastic labours, however, may to some extent have unconsciously prepared the way for the popular movement which succeeded. Certain it is that a great popular movement in favour of the language and literature sprang up at the very close of the nineteenth century in Ireland itself, under the auspices of a society called the Gaelic League and the extension of the previous society called the Gaelic Union, which was an offshoot from an older and still existing body, the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language. The Gaelic League was founded in the year 1893; the objects were: (1) The preservation of Irish as the national language and the extension of its use as a spoken tongue. (2) The study and publication of existing Irish literature and the cultivation of a modern literature in Irish.

Such was the intellectual stagnation in Ireland at the period of this foundation that it would be safe to assert that there were not, at that time, more than a few hundred people living, if so many, who could read or write in Irish. After many years of silent labour and much painful uphill toil, the League has at last become a widely spread popular movement throughout the Irish world. Hundreds of books have been written and published under its auspices, and many thousands of people have been taught to read them. It publishes a weekly and a monthly paper and it has done a great deal towards collecting the rapidly perishing folk-lore of the country. The number of working affiliated branches belonging to the League, carrying on educational work from week to week, in the year 1908, was in Munster 129, in Leinster 115, in Ulster 113, and in Connacht 74. There were 22 branches in Scotland, 11 in England, and a few more isolated ones scattered over Europe and America. The League is governed by a president, two vice-presidents, and an annually elected executive of forty-five members, of whom thirty-two are resident in or near Dublin, the rest represent various parts of the country and Scotland and England. These meet once a month in Dublin, and govern the League. They controlled and paid out of their own funds in 1908 seven organizers for Conn's Half of Ireland (Connacht and Ulster), and there were forty-two district teachers working for the League in this part of Ireland. In Mogh's Half (Leinster and Munster) there were six organizers and eighty district teachers. There are also six colleges connected with and practically founded by the Gaelic League, at Ballingarry in Cork, at Farrar in Mayo, at Cloghaneely in Donegal, at Ring in Waterford, and one each in Dublin and Belfast. The country colleges have two terms, each of which lasts about six weeks. The Dublin and Belfast colleges are open during the winter. There were over two hundred students at each of the Cork and Mayo colleges in 1908.

Scores of writers in Irish have arisen under the impetus of the new movement, scarcely one of whom, it is safe to say, would ever have put pen to paper in English. Perhaps the best-known and most idiomatic writer in Irish at the close of the last decade was Canon O'Leary, P.P., of Castlelyons in County Cork. He is a novelist, grammarian, and writer on miscellaneous subjects. Michael Breathnach (or Walsh), J. J. Doyle, T. Hayes, Father Dinneen, M. Ó Malley, P. O'Connor, Conal Maol (P. J. O'Shea), P. O'Shea,
made further progress. The introduction of Christianity left its mark deeply upon the people and on the language. The Irish annals may be substantially relied on from about the fourth century onwards. The Irish had already highly developed the use of the book as a repository of tradition. The Lecanary, a phase of its activity which recalls to us the Greek renaissance of the sixteenth century. Fathers O'Leary, O'Reilly, Edmund Hogan, S.J., Crehan, Dr. Bergin, Dr. Henry, P. McGinley, J. H. Lloyd, D. Foley, S. O'Catáin, and J. Craig have all worked on greater subjects as well as on other ecclesiastic and literary subjects; while the Rev. Dr. Henebery, Father Hayden, J. S.D., Dr. Quiggin, and Father Mullin have written upon Irish pronunciation and dialects. Voluminous writers on history and other subjects are Michael Breathnach (d. in October, 1908), Eoghan O'Neachtain, and Sean O'Kelly. Father Dinneen gives a lexicographer, editor of texts, and miscellaneous writer. Father John C. MacErlean, S.J., R. Foley, and Tadgh O'Donoghue are all editors of texts; the latter is also a poet and a miscellaneous writer. Canon O'Leary, Father T. O'Keeley, T. Hayes, W. Ryan, P. O'Mahony, Dr. O'Flynn, and F. Partridge have all written books; Fr. O'Kelly has written the libretto of an Irish opera which was produced in 1909.

The Gaelic League has also published editions principes of the poetry of Owen Roe O'Sullivan, Seaghan Claíraích MacDonnell, Pierce Ferriter, Geoffrey Keating, Geoffrey O'Donoghue of the Glen, Pierre T. O'Gorman, Murphy of Rathmearsel, Colum Wallace, and others. The works of all these poets existed previously only scattered in manuscripts or in the mouths of the people until the League saved them. The Irish Texts Society, founded in London in 1896, has published ten handsome volumes of hitherto unprinted Irish texts, including Keating's "History" in three volumes. T. O'Conocannon, M. Foley, Rev. P. O'Sullivan (a Protestant clergyman), P. Stanton, the late Denis Fleming, and others have been enriching Irish by translations from English and other languages. Nearly all the Catholic and Nationalist papers now publish more or less Irish in every issue, so there is little danger of the language ceasing to be written. Of 11,332 students who followed the various courses under the intermediate, or secondary, school system in 1908-9, 6085 took up Irish as one of their subjects. The language is also taught in five or less satisfactory schools out of about 8538. Of these schools, however, many belong to the more Protestant counties of the North of Ireland, and these have as yet had little to do with the new movement. The School of Irish Learning under Dr. Bergin, of which Dr. Kuno Meyer was the practical founder, gives university teaching in comparative philology, philology, comparative grammar, and the reading of the old vellum MSS. Its courses in 1908-9 were attended by over 30 students, its journal "Éiriu" and its "Anecdota Hibernica" are known to all Celtic scholars.

We may now briefly sum up what we have said about the native Gaelic literature. The Irish probably learnt the use of letters in the second century, but did not use the Roman alphabet till the country was converted to Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries. The earliest existing manuscripts do not go back further than the eighth century, but the inscribed Ogham stones are centuries older than these. The early epics and sagas contain a substantially accurate picture of pagan times and of pagan manners and customs. The feeling of the Church was from the start favourable towards the native language and native scholarship. The number of existing Irish manuscripts is great, but it is difficult to say with accuracy what they contain, nor can they be certainly dated and sifted until Celtic studies have
Ireland produced a more vigorous literature in English, which began to be occasionally written by natives as well as Palesemen. Stanhurste (1547–1618), although he wrote his “De rebus in Hibernia gestis” in Latin, was perhaps the first Irish-born man (he was a native of Dublin) to attempt to express things in English verse. He translated the first four books of Virgil’s *Æneid* into “English heroic Verse” in 1583, but only aroused the scornful derision of his English contemporaries by his effort. The seventeenth century, however, was one of an era of great men and great learning, if not of great literature. It witnessed from start to finish a war of race and religion, miserable and merciless, a long drawn out agony. Such eras are necessarily fatal to literature. During this century Keating and MacFhibris wrote in Irish, O’Mulchonry in Irish and Latin and translated from the Spanish. O’Sulliven Bearb wrote his great history of Ireland in Latin. Usber, the renowned scholar and ecclesiastic, the glory of the Pale, wrote in Latin and English. Stanhurste, his uncle, answered him in Latin; Ward, Colgan, and O’Clery wrote in Irish and Latin. Ware wrote in Latin. So did Lynch, and Luke Wadding, pride of the Franciscan Order. Of all the great writers and scholars of the seventeenth century Keating, MacFhibris, and O’Flaherty were the only ones who remained throughout upon their native soil. During many years the lives of most of these men would not have been worth an hour’s purchase had they been caught upon their native soil. It is indeed only with the advent of Molyneux (b. in 1656), that we find the first Irishman who used the English language with effect on behalf of Ireland herself. He forms a kind of connecting link between the nationalities of the Catholic and Celtic Irish, by this time largely banished, broken, or exterminated, and those Protestant nationalists who waxed ever stronger during the succeeding century in Ireland’s artistic and learned writer of renown, a friend of Locke, and by training and inclination a philosopher. Molyneux was moved to write his “Case of Ireland” in 1690 by his indignation at the violent action of the English Parliament in ruining Ireland by forcibly throttling its woolen trade to help the traders of England. His book was by order of the British House of Commons burnt by the common hangman. But it was a mighty echo soon after in the *memoires de Swift*, and its legitimate consumption, three-quarters of a century later, in the burning eloquence of Grattan and the humilation of England. One brilliant Irish writer of this century, Jonathan Swift (1667–1745) three, in 1646; d. 1720), used French for his literary medium. His “*Memoires du Chevalier de Gramont*” is a delightful classic, which gives a brilliant description of the Court of Charles II.

A number of poets of Anglo-Irish birth, but chiefly of Hibernia, seeming whose names figure rather prominently in the story of English literature, are found through this and the next century. Of these, one of the most remarkable as a man, though hardly as in the English language must look to England and to it alone, for there only was to be had a public who would understand them. It is really with Jonathan Swift (1667–1745) that English literature in Ireland for the first time allowed itself to be coloured, in part at least, by the country of its birth. For although the bulk of Swift’s direct, lucid, powerful, and nervous writings belong to England, yet a considerable portion of them are the direct outcome of his Irish life and his Irish surroundings. It is true that Molyneux had preceded him as the Protestant nationalist which, by making the English in Ireland as independent as possible of the English in
England, tended also in some measure towards the up-lifting of the enslaved and disfranchised native Irish. But Molyneux did not wield the pen of Swift. He was a thinker, not a stylist, a philosopher rather than a writer. Swift was both. He who in England had been, beyond all comparison the most powerful political pamphleteer of his day, the protagonist and mainstay of his party, became in Ireland the determinant supporter of the civil rights of his fellow-countrymen and their outspoken champion against English aggression. His services to his native country rendered his name endeared to hundreds of thousands of the native Irish Catholics, men whom he himself looked on, and quitetruly, as being powerless in Ireland either for good or evil, merely "hewers of wood and drawers of water". Indeed the dean was, like all the other Protestant dignitaries of his day, the declared enemy, if not of the Irish race, at least of the Irish language, which was the only one used by the great majority of the native inhabitants. At one time he thought that he had a scheme by which the Irish language "might easily be abolished and become a dead one in half an age, with little expense and less trouble". "It would be", he said again, "a noble achievement to abolish the Irish language in the kingdom", but whatever his scheme was, he did not further enlighten the public upon it and it died with him. One of his own most spirited poems, "O'Rorke's Feast", is a translation from the Irish, perhaps the first of the kind ever made in Ireland. He heard it sung at a banquet in the County Leitrim, and was so taken by the air that he asked for a translation and was told that Mackey, the author, could give it to him either in Latin or in English. Several other poems of the dean's relate to his life in Ireland and his surroundings there.

It is because a certain percentage of Swift's writings both in prose and verse are concerned with the people and conditions of Ireland, that he may be regarded as the father of Anglo-Irish literature, a term which can properly be applied only to literature coloured by or inspired by Ireland and Irish themes, written in the English language but by Irish-born people. If this definition of Anglo-Irish literature be correct it would exclude almost all Swift's predecessors and many of his successors for indifference to Ireland on the part of Irish writers of English did not by any means end with Swift. With the eighteenth century it becomes increasingly difficult to place Irish-born writers, for an ever-growing number belong, like Swift, to both countries. It is hard to see how by any stretch of imagination Laurence Sterne, the author of "Tristram Shandy", though born and partly educated in Ireland, could be called an Anglo-Irish writer. Ireland, as the Psalmists says, was not in all his thoughts. The same is true of Sir Philip Francis, the reputed author of the "Letters of Junius". Even our beloved Goldsmith (1730-1774) and altogether delightful Irishman though he was, cannot properly be termed an Anglo-Irish poet. His "Vicar of Wakefield" struck a new note in English literature and even profoundly affected the rising genius of Goethe, but neither it nor his plays nor his poetry concerned themselves even indirectly with his native country. What is true of Goldsmith is true to some extent even of Richard Brinsley Sheridan (1751-1816), who was of the Milcah in England, and whose nature like that of Goldsmith was Irish in the extreme. Bishop Berkeley (1684-1753), on the other hand, after whom the State University of California is named, is really an Irish writer. His wonderful "Querries" are almost as pertinent to the case of Ireland to-day as they were eight score years ago. Edmund Burke (1729-1797), the profoundest and, perhaps the noblest political thinker that the British Isles ever produced, while he was never for a moment forgetful of the country of his birth, yet belongs for the most part, as far as his writings go, to England and English politics.

It is apparent from what we have written that Ire land gave to England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some of its most distinguished authors, that these authors, though born in Ireland and brought up amidst Irish surroundings, were mostly of English descent, and turned naturally for a public to the Eng land of their fathers, whose language they spoke and wrote. It is evident that, as time went on, an ever-increasing number of Irish Gaels (still unemancipated and denied education in their own language) joined the ranks of those English writers who looked to an English and not to an Irish public. It is only within the nineteenth century, however, that we get a vigorous and promising Anglo-Irish literature, inspired wholly by Irish themes and written mainly for the Irish people themselves. The foremost of these new Anglo-Irish writers were, in prose, Miss Edgeworth and, in poetry, Thomas Moore.

Maria Edgeworth (1767-1849), the creator of the Anglo-Irish novel, was the scion of a good family, some of whose members belonged to the Catholic and some to the Protestant religion. She herself belonged to the latter, but it was a relative of hers (see Edgeworth, Henry Essex) who attended the unfortunate Louis XVI to the scaffold. She was gifted with a mind as singularly open and unprejudiced as it was acute and observant. To this she united an admirable style, clear and pungent, and a dramatic power of presentation which rarely failed her. She never looked upon herself as a writer with a mission, but undoubtedly she was. In her "Castle Rackrent", theSwift's downfall through its own reckless sangundering of a great Irish family, as told through the mouth of an acquaintance of the chief servitor of his house, is a tale of very great power. In her novel the "Abenteer" she attacks, and with equal force though in a different vein, another side of the same social evil whose effects she had portrayed so powerfully in "Castle Rackrent". Following Macklin (really Man aulgin), in his play of "The True-Born Irishman" produced in 1763, she holds up to merciless ridicule the Irish land-owners who deserted their own estates to try to cut a figure in London, and there compete with men who were at once much wealthier than
themselves and also, so to speak, born and bred to the life of the English metropolis. Her "Moral Tales" are frequently reprinted even to this day. Miss Edgeworth cannot in any political sense be called a nationalist writer. The cry of "Ireland a Nation" never appealed to her, nor does she break the native Irish against the English garrison, nor the doing of the men of '98, nor the feelings of the natives against the settlers. With her began the Irish novel, but not the Irish political novel. Her contemporaries, Lady Morgan (1783–1859), wrote Irish novels also, but no one ever reads them now, while Miss Edgeworth's popularity is perennial. A different temper was Thomas Moore (1779–1852), the first great Anglo-Irish poet. It is true that he had had some few predecessors, among whom were Ned Lysaght, the poet of Grattan and the Volunteers, and William Drennan, the poet of the United Irishmen, but he owed nothing to any of them. A Catholic and in his youthful days a sympathiser with the men of the '98 Rebellion, and with Irish national aspirations, his muse spread the name and fame of his native island throughout thousands upon thousands of those gilded drawing-rooms, where, before that, Irish aspirations or even the very name of Erin would have been met only by a scoff or perhaps by some still more emphatic disapproval. While rescuing the admirable ancient music of Ireland from oblivion he wedded it to the most melodious songs that the English language had yet produced, and he never shrank from insisting upon the national character both of his music and his verses, nor hesitated to depict the sad and oppressed state of his mother country. Who can say what considerable if indirect influence Moore's verses must have exercised on the hearts of men, when it came, as it soon after did, to dealing with the gravest Irish problems in the House of Commons, including the emancipation of the Catholics. Just as Sir Walter Scott's novels affected a profound change in the outlook of England upon Scotland, and of the Lowlanders upon the Highlanders, so Moore's "Melodies" must have made hundreds of thousands of Englishmen and loyalists for the first time familiar with the wrongs, the aspirations, and the inner soul of Ireland. Not that Moore was in any sense a poet of the people; he was a poet rather of the cultured classes and of the drawing-room, and thus the very consciousness of his Irishness was inapparent. It is safe to say that the Irish peasantry themselves never grasped his melodies as a popular possession or sang them commonly at their firesides. But with the cultured classes his voice was enormous. Probably no poet ever lived whose lines penetrated so many drawing-rooms alien in sympathy to himself and his ideals.

It has been of late years the custom on many sides to decry Moore. It is, however, hard to subscribe to almost any of the complaints. It is true that divorced to a certain extent from the life of the native Gael, and being ignorant of the national language, he takes the tunes and welds them into songs, and takes love songs and makes slogans of them. This is a real fault of commission; with regard to the other criticisms it is not always fair to judge a poet for faults of omission, or in other words for not being what nature did not make him. Above all it is hard to accuse of timeserving or of pusillanimity a poet who could imperil his popularity in England by such a vigorous melody as that in which he compares the oppression of Ireland to the Jewry and prophesies the destruction of her tyrant. A great deal of Moore's success as a poet is due to the national music of Ireland to which his songs are wed, and lyrics such as "Avenging and Bright," "The Minstrel Boy," "Let Erin remember," "When he who adores thee," and "She is far from the land" have become almost embedded in the life of Ireland and part and parcel of the national mind.

Moore died in 1852, but long before his death there had sprung into being a distinctively Irish literature in the English language, inspired by Irish feelings and ideals, and looking not to an English but to an Irish public. The poets Callahans and Walsh were its precursors. The foundation by Davis, Dillon, and Duffy of the weekly paper "The Nation" in 1842 produced a profound effect all over Ireland, but the Young Ireland writers who then arose never attempted to reach the people through any other medium than English, although at this time Irish was still the familiar speech of about four millions. Of the poets of the Young Ireland movement two stand out pre-eminently, Thomas Davis (d. 1845) and Clarence Mangan (d. 1849). Davis sang, not so much because he was born with the divine afflatus, as because he deliberately set himself to act upon the soul of the people through the medium of poetry. In this he succeeded, for his vigorous political verse, ballads, and other national and patriotic songs, thrown off in haste and not always polished, though generally powerful, exercised a profound effect upon Ireland. Mangan on the other hand, though a Young Irelander by conviction, shrank from the glare and glare of political movements, and led a lonely life, consumed by the fire of his own thoughts. Though the effect of his poems upon the people was far less than that of Davis, he, when at his best, as in his "Dark Rosaleen", attained to heights which would have been impossible to the other. By far the greatest prose writer of the Young Ireland movement was that ardent rebel against English rule, John Mitchel (1816–1872), of whom it is safe to say that no man born in Ireland, Swift alone excepted, ever made such powerful use of the English tongue as a medium for thought, instruction, and invective. His powers of sardonic scorn and indignation are very Swiftian, and his "Last Conquest of Ireland (perhaps)" is one of the most scathing political works ever written, while his "Jail Journal" gives a good idea of the man himself. At this time also appeared a group of novelists whose works have never ceased to be popular for nearly two generations. Of these the most remarkable was Carleton (1794–1859), who understood the peasantry and depicted their feelings in a way that no one else has ever done. In books like "Fardourougha the Miser", the "Black Prophet", and "Traits and Stories of the Irish Peasantry", he portrays not so much the life as the passions of the people with vividness and power.
Samuel Lover (1797–1868), on the other hand, and John Banim (1798–1844), were the novelists of the bourgeois class, and Charles Lever (1797–1883) and perhaps W. H. Maxwell, of the rollicking, sporting, jovial gentry, whose day of domino was even then prosaically, though they knew it not. The gentle and retiring Gerald Griffin, a poet also, gave Ireland at least one novel of supreme excellence in the "Colleen Bawn", and Sheridan Le Fanu (1814–1873) left behind him some very weird stories, the excellent ballad "Shamus O'Brien", and a capital novel of eighteenth century life in Ireland, "The House by the Churchyard". On the whole it may be said of the Young Ireland movement that it, more than any other movement either before or after it, worked by and through letters; but strong political passions do not make for a true and abiding literature; and the vigorous ballads and political verses of Davis, Gavan Duffy (q. v.), and D'Arcy McGee and their group seem to us to-day to contain but little originality. After the great famine, and the dispersion of the Young Irish group, Ireland lay exhausted and wearied listless until the Fenian movement stirred her into activity once more, in the sixties. But this movement passed off without any great influence upon literature. Charles Kickham whose peasant ballads are admirable and whose novel of "Knocknagow" is still widely read, was almost the only literary Fenian of any note. Then came the Land War and the Parnell movement, but it too produced no literary outlet of any consequence. The ballads and poems of Timothy D. Sullivan are probably the most popular and enduring of these writings. Through all these periods of storm and stress, but almost wholly untouched by them so far as their art went, lived Sir Samuel Ferguson (1810–1886), the first and greatest poet to draw extensive inspiration from Ireland's Gaelic past, William Allingham (1824–1889), a graceful singer of the fairies, and Aubrey De Vere (1814–1902), the friend of Tennyson, and at once the most productive and the most essentially Catholic poet ever born in Ireland. Of these names Ferguson's is the greatest. A scholar, an antiquary, and a successful man of the world he gave Ireland her best epic poems in his "Conary" and his "Congal", while his translations from the Irish language have seldom been excelled. Dowden characterizes him as "the only epic poet of the Victorian age", and Stopford Brooke as "the first and perhaps the best of all who have striven to bring into recognition, light, and beauty the Ancient Sages and tales of Ireland". Taking as a whole the popular English poetry of Ireland, as produced from the close of the eighteenth till the last decade of the nineteenth century, we find it replete with notes and themes that would be practically unrepresented in English literature were it not for Ireland. Through a vast proportion of this poetry flame the lightnings of bards and dreamers. To this is frequently joined a devoted Catholicism; for though the worst of the Ascendancy was over, and the blood-hounds were no longer taught, in the phrase of Thomas Davis, "alike to run upon the scent of wolf and friar", still the memory of those days remained, and continued to colour men's passions and their poetry. Almost all of it is shot through with insistent national aspirations. Then we have the poetry of exile, which fills so dreadful a space in Ireland's literary history, and mystic, the emigrant, the cry of the coffin ship, the poetry of misery—the misery not of unite but of a whole country—for as Stopford Brooke has well put it, "Ireland has added to English literature this poetry of the Sword, the Famine and the pestilence" (preface to the "Treasury of Irish Poetry"). The early English verses of the Irish peasant himself, as distinguished from the poets of education, were made upon the models of his native songs, and consisted principally of word-rhyming. Unhappily no collection has been made of these pieces which are of great interest, for their manner rather than for their matter.

The last decade of the nineteenth century ushered in a fresh era for English-Irish poetry. A new band of poets made their appearance who sacrificed less to passion and more to craftsmanship. The Gaelic movement, unlike the upheavals that went before it, has created a body of poets who have turned their thoughts to poetry than the reverse, and many of these poets have written under its influence. Others of them, however, as Stopford Brooke writes in the preface to his and Rolleston's anthology, "have been so deeply influenced by Wordsworth, Keats, and in part by Shelley, and even when they write of the airs of England breathe and the waters of England ripple in their poetry". Of all these new writers there is an almost universal consensus of opinion that the greatest is William Butler Yeats. He has in his art applied the most refined technique to a subject-matter drawn alternately from things symbolic and poetic or from nature in its simplest moods, or again from the old Irish sagas and folklore, which he visualizes from his own standpoint. Mysticism is also the prevailing note of George Russell ("A. E."), painter, poet, and editor. On the other hand religion and simple faith are the distinguishing characteristics of Katherine Tynan Hinkson. Ardent love of country and depth of feeling mark the works of Anna MacManus ("Eithne Carbery"). Almost all the poets of the last fifteen years draw their inspiration more or less from Ireland and things Gaelic.

The greatest Irish historian of the last half century has been beyond all question W. E. Hartpole Lecky (1838–1903). His earliest writings were coloured by a strong nationalism; this, however, gradually departed from him. Of the seventeen volumes of his "History of England" in the eighteenth century, five are given up to the history of Ireland during the same period, and these are written with an admirable impartiality which makes them a valuable and necessary antidote to the biased pictures of Froude. After Lecky's works Alexander Richey's (1830–1883) "Lectures on Irish History present us with what are probably the soundest and most philosophic views that have appeared on this subject. Another book which has produced a deep effect upon the country and upon the current of historic thought has been Alice Stopford Green's "Making of Ireland and its Undoing" which appeared in 1908. A. M. Sullivan's "Story of Ireland" and P. W. Joyce's "Social History of Ireland" are two popular and useful works.

We must now turn to Anglo-Irish drama. The Irish have always been a dramatic race, and also a race of born actors. Beginning with Lodowick Barry, an Irishman whose play of "Ram Alley" was actually written during Shakespeare's life, Ireland has gone to England a large share of her dramatists and actors. It is necessary only to mention the names of Southern, Macklin, Farquhar, Steele, Goldsmith, Sheridan, O'Keefe, Kenney—and so on through Sheridan Knowles, Dion Boucicault
and the two operatic composers, Michael Balfe and William Vincent Wallace, down to Bernard Shaw, to show how deeply this branch of English literature has influenced Irish music. The oldest form of the Anglo-Irish drama is in full swing, and the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, under the direction of Lady Gregory and Mr. Yeats, where some forty-nine or fifty new plays by Irish writers have recently been produced, has aroused a great deal of interest and is undoubtedly the most remarkable development of Irish literature in the present day.

In romance Ireland seems at present to fall far short of the palmy days of Carleton and Lever, Le Fanu and Lover, Banim and Gerald Griffin. Of romance proper, standish o'grady, to whose stimulating books dealing with Gaelic Ireland a host of younger men owe inspiration, is the leading representative. One of the best Irish novel-writers of the day is Canon Sheehan of Doneraile, who has struck a new note in literature by his brilliant and sympathetic descriptions of clerical life inside the Catholic Church. Other well-known and widely-read authors are Jane Barlow, lady r. m. gilbert, Lady Bevan, Emily l. lawson, the poet of the "Wild Geese", Katherine tynan hinkson, and Shan Bullock. Nor can we close this article without some allusion to the translators of and adapters from the Irish, of whom two stand out pre-eminently, lady Gregory in prose and dr. sigerson in verse. One hundred and fifty years ago, the Irish in their "Bards of the Gael and Gall", has given us in English verse a long vista of Irish poetry reaching back for some fourteen hundred years and lost in the dim twilight of bygone ages. Of memoirs and autobiographical works the most remarkable are swift's "Journal to Stella" and dolan's "Memoirs of Joseph Holt", a memoir of the irish revolution of 1798, carleton's "Autobiography" (1896), miles byrne's "Memoirs" (he was another '68 man), and the remarkable series of letters, mostly unpublished, written by john o' Donovan on his official investigations into Irish topography—perhaps one of the most extensive collections of official letters in the world.

"O'Reilly, irish writers, ed. for the bernese-celtic society (Dublin, 1892); o'curry, lectures on the tradition of irish history (re-issue, dublin, 1879); idem, manners and customs of the ancient irish, with an introduction by w. k. spillane (3 vols., dublin, 1873); douglas brogden, life of the irish poet john petter (london, 1888); sheehan, a literary history of ireland (london, 1899); tournier, essais d'une histoire des peuples celtiques (leipsig, 1865); dottin, la litterature irlandaise (1829); douglas, the irish nation, an essay in culturalugenwart (berlin and leipzig, 1900); joyce, social history of ancient ireland (2 vols., dublin, 1905); eleanor hopkins, the irish language (london, 1898); idem, 18; o'grady, catalogue of irish manuscripts in the british museum. old and modern series, part o'connor and 1894, 51; henry ferguson, the history of the gael in the british islands (london, 1879); ferguson, celtic inscriptions of ireland (london, 1887); macalister, studies in irish etymology (3 vols., london, 1890-1897); and elsewhere.

"Early irish and celtic writers, with a catalogue of the literary manuscripts in the british museum, part o'connor and 1894, 51; henry ferguson, the history of the gael in the british islands (london, 1879); ferguson, celtic inscriptions of ireland (london, 1887); macalister, studies in irish etymology (3 vols., london, 1890-1897); and elsewhere.
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IRENAEUS

Saint, Bishop of Lyons, Father of the Church.—Information as to his life is scarce, and in some measure inexact. He was born in Proconscal Asia, or at least in some province bordering thereon, in the first half of the second century; the exact date is controverted, between the years 115 and 125, according to some, or, according to others, between 130 and 142. It is certain that, while still very young, Irenaeus had seen and heard the holy Bishop Polycarp (d. 155) at Smyrna. During the persecution of Marcus Aurelius, Irenaeus was a priest of the Church of Lyons, a church which, however, was subject to the care of the bishops of the Church of Asia Minor, whom heUps. essays on New Testament Hebrews 12:1-2.Translation, interpretation, and literary analysis of this passage are provided in this section. The discussion includes textual challenges, historical context, and theological implications. The commentary highlights the critical role of Hebrews 12:1-2 in understanding the Apostle Paul's message to his Christian communities.

The passage is cited as follows:

Hebrews 12:1-2

Christ, then, who spoke through the holy apostles and prophets, announced oracles of eternal things, so that by them all of you would be reminded and instructed. For the first time the things that are written are not only a matter of speculation but also of sure knowledge. For the things that are written in the holy apostles and prophets are not just pronouncements about things that have long since passed but also are a sure prophecy of what is to come. This is the purpose of the Church, to be a school of instruction and to teach you knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. This is the purpose of the Church, to be a school of instruction and to teach you knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

Critical Textual Challenges:

1. Hebrews 12:1-2 seems to contain a mixture of themes, including the role of the holy apostles and prophets as witnesses of eternal truths, the certainty of revealed knowledge, and the function of instruction and prophecy in the Church. These themes may require careful attention to the historical and theological context.

2. The phrase "things that are written" may refer to the Old Testament or the New Testament, or both. Understanding the specific referent is crucial for interpreting the passage.

3. The phrase "things that are written are not only a matter of speculation but also of sure knowledge" suggests a distinction between speculative and certificatory knowledge. Exploring the implications of this distinction is important.

Theological Implications:

1. The passage underscores the importance of Holy Scripture in the life of the Church. The Church is to be an instrument of instruction and knowledge, particularly through the study of the Holy Scriptures.

2. The certainty of revealed knowledge is emphasized, suggesting a faith that is both reasonable and transformative. This theme is central to Irenaeus' theology and has implications for contemporary Christian faith.

3. The distinction between speculation and knowledge raises questions about the nature of knowledge and its role in the Church's life. This distinction may inform contemporary discussions about the role of reason and revelation in Christian theology.

In summary, Hebrews 12:1-2 provides insight into the role of Scripture in the early Church, emphasizing the certainty of revealed knowledge and the function of instruction in the life of the Church. The passage highlights the importance of Holy Scripture as a source of instruction and knowledge, with implications for contemporary Christian faith and theological discourse.
Irene, Sister (Catherine FitzGibbon), b. London, England, 12 May, 1825; d. in New York, 14 Aug., 1886. At the age of nineteen, Irene, with her parents, and in 1850 joined the community of the Sisters of Charity at Mount St. Vincent, New York, taking in religion the name of Irene. During her novitiate she taught in St. Peter's parish school, and finally became sister servant there. At that time no parent was allowed to visit the orphanage or the care of abandoned infants. When picked up in the streets, they were sent to the municipal charity institutions to be looked after by paupers. Many were left at the doors of the sisters' schools and houses, and in the evident hope that they might receive from them some special consideration. The constant increase in the number of these waifs, suggested the establishment of a foundling asylum, such as had long existed in Europe. Archbishop McCloskey sanctioned the project and in 1869 Sister Irene was assigned to carry it into effect. After visiting the public homes for infants in several cities she organized a woman's society to collect the necessary funds for the proposed asylum with Mrs. Paul Thebaud as its head. By their aid a house (17 East Twelfth Street) was hired, and here on 11 October, 1869, the foundling asylum was opened with a cence its door. On the evening of the same day it held its first infant, and founded. Within a year a larger house (3 Washington Square, North) had to be taken.

In 1870 the city was authorized by the Legislature to give the asylum the block bounded by Third and Lexington Avenues, Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth Streets, for the site of a new building, and $100,000 for the building fund, provided a similar amount was raised by private donations. Of the required sum, $71,500 was realized by a fair held in 1871, and $27,500 came from three private donations. The new building was opened in October, 1873. The city pays 45 cents a day each for all children cared for under two years of age, and 32 cents for all over that age. It costs ($1000 a day to run the institution, in which from six to seven hundred children are sheltered with more than 1500 others on the outdoor list. In addition to what is paid by the city, $40,000 is donated annually by Catholic charity for the work. Since it was opened, 50,000 children have been taken care of by this foundling asylum. From eighteen to twenty thousand of the children have been placed in good homes throughout the country, the average of those thus given for adoption being from 90 to 95% and a half to three years the title of "The Foundling Asylum," under which it was incorporated in 1869, was changed by legal enactment in 1891 to "The New York Foundling Hospital." In addition to caring for the children, homeless and indigent mothers are also provided for, to the yearly average of five hundred. St. Ann's Maternity Hospital was opened for them in 1880 and in 1881 a children's hospital at Spuyten Duyvil on the Hudson. Sister Irene's whole life was given to the care of foundlings, and just before she died she added the Seton Hospital for incurable consumptives, the cost of which ($350,000) she collected herself.

SADLER in Ave Maria (Notre Dame, Indiana, 10 Oct., 1896); BRUNOW in Catholic Home Annual (New York, 1897); The Feminist's Journal (New York), contemporary files; The Semi- (New York, November, 1906).

Thomas F. Meahan.

Irenopolis, a titular see of Issuria, suffragan of Seleucia. Five of its bishops are known: John (325), Menodorus (451), Paul (458), George (692), Euchemon (878). The city is mentioned by Hierocles in the sixth century and George of Cyprus in the seventh. It figures in the "Notitia Episcopatum" of Anastasius, Patriarch of Antioch in the sixth century, and in the "Nova Tastica" of the tenth century, as attached to

Irene, Empress. See Byzanine Empire.
the Patriarchate of Constantinople. At this period the Byzantine emperors had taken the province of Isauria from the Patriarchate of Antioch. Ramsay ("Asia Minor", London, 1890, p. 355), following Sterling, identifies Isaropolis of Isauria with Isaropolis, of which he does not indicate the exact site. Coins found bearing the name Irenopolis belong rather to a city of the same name located in Cilicia, the ancient Neronias, some of whose bishops are also known.

Le Quien, Orbis Christianus, II, 897-900, 1029 sq.

S. Vailhé.

**IRIARTE**

**IRIARTE**

Ignacio de, painter, b. at Azcoitia, Guipu- coa, in 1620; d. at Seville, 1655. Iriarte was the son of Esteban de Iriarte and Magdalena Zabal and, as the account of his baptism at home, he was, in 1642 went to Seville, and entered the studio of the elder Herrera. Here he learned to understand colouring, but he was never able to draw the human figure with spirit or accuracy, and therefore determined to devote his attention exclusively to landscape, and was the first Spanish artist who discovered the radically different path, and obtained in it the greatest possible celebrity. In 1646 we hear of him as residing at Aracena, near to the mountains, and there it was that he married Doña Francisca de Chaves, but his first wife lived a very short time, and in 1646 he married in Seville with Doña Francisca de Chaves, and an original member of the Academy of Seville, his first secretary in 1660, and again secretary from 1667 to 1669. For very many years, he was the intimate friend and associate of Murillo, who praised his landscapes very highly, and on many occasions the two artists worked together, Murillo executing the figure, and Iriarte the landscape. In consequence, however, of a dispute with reference to a series of pictures on the life of David, this division of labour came to an end, and the two painters, both of them men of great determination, decided to work separately and not in conjunction. Murillo painted the whole of the picture representing an episode in the life of David, and Iriarte contented himself with his exquisite landscapes, as a rule wild and rugged scenes, somewhat allied to those of Salvador Rosa, in which at that time he was the greatest exponent. There is a landscape preserved at Madrid in an unfinished condition, with a figure preserved more in by Murillo and the background left incomplete by Iriarte, and this is said to have been left incomplete at the time of the quarrel. The painter has been called the Spanish Claude Lorrain, and Murillo declared that his best landscapes were painted "by Divine inspiration", but the agreement of the two artists is not accurate, even if there is a forced character and an imaginative romance about Iriarte's landscapes with an extraordinary lack of atmosphere. They are, however, pleasing and attractive, although rare. His works are to be found principally in Madrid, but can also be studied in the Louvre and the Louvre.

Quillet, Dictionnaire des Peintres Espagnols (Paris, 1816); De Castro y Velasco, El Museo Pictórico y Escollo Optico (Madrid, 1840); Hurd, Art and Art of the Spanish (London, 1848); Hurd, Vie Complète des Peintres Espagnols (I, 1830); Hartley, A Record of Spanish Painting (London, 1894).

**GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.**

**IRISH**

**IRISH**

The, in Countries other than Ireland.—I. IN THE UNITED STATES.—Who were the first Irish to land on the American continent and the time of their arrival are perhaps matters of conjecture rather than of historical proof; but that the Irish were there almost at the beginning of the colonization is a fact well supported by historical records. The various nations of Europe whose explorers and followed Columbus were alive to the possibilities of land conquest in the new continent. For this purpose colonists were needed, and expeditions were fitted out under government protection, which brought over the earliest settlers. England was especially active in promoting these expeditions, and during the seventeenth century various colonies, beginning with that of Jamestown in 1607, were planted with immigrants, most of them of the English nation, with Irish names, with occasionally in the documents relating to these early settlements; it is certain that there were Irish Catholics in the Virginia Colony prior to 1633.

In the narrative of the voyage of the Jesuit Father Andrew White and his associates in the "Dove" and "Hog" from England to Maryland, it is stated that Baltimore's expedition, we are told that on the way over they put in at Montserrat (one of the smallest of the Caribbean Islands) where they found a colony of Irishmen "who had been banished from Virginia on account of professing the Catholic faith" (see Old Catholic Maryland, p. 14). The accepted history of that island attests the fact that it was originally settled by the Irish, although at present the white population has largely disappeared. A modern traveller (Stark, 1893) says: "It is not surprising, therefore, that the descendants of the slaves who belonged to the Irish settlers all have Irish names and speak a jargon of Irish, English, and Spanish, of which the brogue predominates." While Father White and most of his companions who first planted the cross in Maryland were of English origin, it is equally true that Ireland, as well as other Catholic lands in Europe, contributed her quota of missionaries who nourished the faith in the early Maryland settlement, and a most notable example is the Jesuit missionaries of these times we find Fathers Carroll, Murphy, Hayes, Quin, O'Reilly, Casey, and others whose names indicate their Celtic origin.

But the beginning of immigration from Ireland to America, in such numbers and under circumstances so notable as to become matter of definite historical record, may be said to date from the subjugation of Ireland completed by Cromwell in 1651. Under that merciless conqueror the English policy of transplanting the Irish was ruthlessly carried out. The native Irish were deprived of their lands, routed from their homes, and ordered to remove their families and such effects as were permitted to the Province of Connaught in the west, where a certain territory, mostly wild and desolate, had been prescribed, within which they were to remain under military surveillance and establish a new residence. Those who refused suffered various punishments and sometimes death. In many cases the disbanded soldiers and pensioners appointed by Cromwell ordered the deportation of the recalcitrant Irish to the American plantations, and entered in English merchants from Bristol and London carried on a lucrative business in shipping and transferring these unfortunate victims to their destination. In order to suit their traffic, leave was granted to these traders to fill their ships with such destitute or homeless inhabitants (made such by their conquerors) as might be delivered to them by the military governors for transportation afloat, so that, as the records show, during the year 1655, 500 or 600 persons (men, women, and children) were carried away and distributed, some to Barbados and others to the different English colonies in America. Two thousand more Irish boys and girls were shipped the following year to Barbados and to the American plantations, and it has been estimated that in the vast emigration of the Irish who had been thus distributed among the different English colonies in America (see American Catholic Quarterly Review, IX, 37). Of the total number thus shipped out of Ireland across the main, the estimates vary between 60,000 and 100,000 (Lingard, "History of England," vol. iv. ed. cit., 1849, p. 365).

Prior to this deportation there had been some voluntary emigration from Ireland to America; with the development of the Colonies this emigration steadily increased and later assumed such enormous
proportion that, before attempting to trace its prog-
ness, it may be useful to inquire what were the causes
which compelled over five million people, pouring out
in a continuous stream through nearly two centuries,
to abandon their native land with all its associations, re-
ligious, domestic, and national, and seek homes for
themselves and their families beyond the Western
Ocean.

For over a hundred years preceding the Cromwellian
era Ireland had been distracted by the frequent in-
vasions of the English under desperate and unscrupu-
losers, whose professed purpose was to re-
establish English supremacy in Ireland and to force
the new religion of Henry VIII upon her clergy and
laity. Vexatious and destructive, and a world of
what she had cherished for over a thousand years was pro-
scribed, and her churches, monasteries, and other
shrines of religion plundered. The lands attached to
them were confiscated by the Crown and parcelled out
among the greedy adventurers, whose success in
depriving the true owners of their former holdings, the balance
being reserved in part to the Crown, and in part dis-
tributed among the adventurers who had advanced
money for carrying out the scheme, and the soldiers as
a reward for services rendered. The informers, or
"discouragers," as they were called, who attacked these
lands before the Colonization Act of 1662, were likely
by grants of portions of the plundered lands. Spea-
kling of these various changes in the ownership of
the land, Arthur Young, an impartial Protestant observer,
writing in 1776 (Tour of Ireland, Vol. II, p. 59),
says: "Nineteen-twentieths of the kingdom (com-
prising 11,420,692 Irish acres or nearly 21,000,000
acres, English measure) changed hands from Catholic
to Protestant. . . . So entire an overthrow of landed
possessions is, within the period, to be found in scarce
any country in the world. In such great revolutions of
property the ruined proprietors had usually been
"wrapt up" or "banished." While the framers of
these laws and such methods of conquest bore heav-
iest on Roman Catholics, yet the Presbyterian Irish,
chiefly in the north, and the Quakers were likewise
made to suffer for their attachment to their country
and to the religion which their consciences dictated, so
that no element of the native population escaped the
savage vengeance of their English conquerors.
The periods of respite were few, and the calm was only the
peacefulness of death and desolation.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century the
population of Ireland, as a result of this barbarous
 treatment, had been reduced to about one and a half
million souls. Less than one million souls. Let the econo-
mizers, some as early as the reign of Elizabeth (1573),
for the colonization of Ireland chiefly with English and
Scottish settlers. For instance, in 1709, in pursu-
ance of the policy of stamping out the Irish and re-
placing them by a more tractable race, 820 families of
German or Latins, consisting of 723 persons, landed in
Dublin at a cost to the Government of £24,000 (Young,
I, 371). Military expeditions were organized and sent
over to take possession of the lands of the disaffected
Irish. Great tracts of land, sometimes embracing
whole counties, were declared confiscated to the Crown
and were allotted to the "gentlemen undertakers"
who financed these enterprises. Under James I,
5,900,000 acres, and under Charles I about 2,500,000
acres were thus confiscated. The native Irish chiefs
and their clansmen naturally resisted these attempts to
possess them of their lands. If they remained
passive, their counties or portions of them would
force them into rebellion. In either case they were ad-
judged to be rebels who might be lawfully hunted and
shot down at sight. The methods adopted to crush
them were cruel in the extreme, their cattle were taken
from them, their houses levelled, and their harvests
burned. Men, women, and even children were indis-
criminately shot down or hanged by a brutal soldiery,
Act of Union of 1800. Their legislative independence thus extinguished, their trade and commerce destroyed, with every avenue for hard-earned wealth closed to them, the Irish people were thrown back on the soil for their means of support and became victims of a system of landlordism with its rents, fines, and rack-rents, its tithe, and various other iniquitous conditions, under which human beings could not live except by almost superhuman industry and the most degrading conditions which confronted the Irish yet remaining on their native soil at the close of the eighteenth century. That those who could should go elsewhere to find relief was most natural. As a result a tide of emigration set in, to be continued during two centuries, carrying away millions of the best, and were destined to become so important an element in the establishment and maintenance of the American Republic. It was no ordinary overflow of a surplus population, seeking new fields of industry, nor the enterprise of adventurous spirits induced, as had been other colonists, by promises of rich rewards, but rather the mournful flight of a people seeking to escape the ruin which had overtaken so many of their fellow-countrymen and which as surely was to be their lot if they remained at home. During the period of 1680 to 1720 thousands of woolen weavers, mostly Protestants from Ulster, deprived of their meager livelihood, and Catholics anxious to avoid persecution, had left Ireland for the American Colonies where they were changed into enemies who paid off old scores in the War of American Independence" (Gregg, "Irish History", 92). Other Catholic Irish from the middle and south of Ireland had likewise voluntarily emigrated to the different colonies, through which they dispersed, to find or make homes for themselves and their families wherever circumstances favoured.

In the early years of the eighteenth century we find abundant records of Irish emigration. Thus, in 1718, five ships arrived in Boston with 300 emigrants from Ulster. So considerable was the influx that, in 1720, the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed an ordinance directing that "certain families recently arrived from Ireland be warned to move off", and, in 1723, another ordinance was passed requiring all vessels to be required for the two years 1736-1738 ten ships arrived in Boston harbour bringing 1000 such immigrants, and hardly a year passed without a fresh infusion of Irish blood into the existing population. Irish names frequently appear in the early records of many of the New England towns, showing how widely the immigration had taken place. In 1718, Irish names had appeared in some of the English towns. In some of the particular localities in Ireland were numerous enough to establish their own independent settlements, to which they gave the names of their Irish home places, such as the towns of Belfast, Limerick, and Londonderry in Maine, Dublin, Derryfield, and Kilkenny in New Hampshire, and Sullivan and Carroll Counties in the latter state, and this practice was followed in many instances by the Irish arriving in other colonies, notably Pennsylvania and New York, where the names of counties and towns of Ireland attest the place of origin of the first settlers. It was from the Irish settlers in New Hampshire that Stark’s Rangers were recruited who fought the battle of Bennington and took part in the campaign leading to the surrender of Burgoyne. The official military records of the province of New York show that from early times Irishmen were there in large numbers. Those from Long Island, the first pointed in 1683), who gave New York its first charter of liberties, was a native of the County Kildare and a Catholic. The muster-rolls of the various military companies which were maintained under British rule down to the time of the Revolution and participated in the French and Indian Wars, show a large proportion of unmistakable Irish names, and there were some thousands of Irish soldiers in the various regiments of the line and of the militia of New York serving in the Continental Army.

On account of its reputation for religious tolerance and wise administration, William Penn’s colony attracted Irish settlers in unusual numbers. Penn’s trusted agent and administrator of the affairs of the colony during the years 1701-1720 was distinguished for his high character and the ability with which he discharged his trust, was a native of Lurgan, Ireland; among the “first purchasers” who embarked with Penn on the “Welcome”, arriving at Philadelphia in 1682, we find the names of several Irishmen, who had come neither to escape from their native town of Wexford and Cashel respectively for America. (See list in Scharf and Westcott, “History of Philadelphia”, I. 99.) Other early Irish immigrants arriving at Philadelphia were Patrick, Michael, and Philip Kearney, natives of Cork, among whose descendents may be named General Stephen W. Kearney, first governor of California, Commodore Lawrence Kearney, and the dashing General Phil Kearney, the distinguished soldier of the Civil War, and, in 1719, George Taylor, later one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In 1727, 1155 Irish landed at Philadelphia and in 1728, 6560 were. How many there was of the total of 6310 immigrants arriving during 1729 by way of the Delaware River, 5655 were Irish. In one week alone, as reported by the “American Weekly Mercury” of 14 August, 1729, there arrived “about two thousand Irish and an abundance more daily expected”. In 1727 thirty-three vessels are registered as arriving at Philadelphia, bringing passengers from different ports in Ireland, and although definite statistics are not available, there is sufficient evidence to show that this tide of emigration did not slacken for many years. So great was it that in 1735 a bill was introduced in Parliament to prohibit emigration from Ireland entirely. The great number of Irish in Pennsylvania at the beginning of the War of Independence, their high character, and important standing in the community indicate how large and valuable had been the immigration there.

Besides the Irish who had come into the Virginia Colony before referred to, there was other emigration to it, as well as to the Carolinas, where as early as 1734 a colony of 500 Irish settlers planted themselves on the Santee River; among these are to be found such names as Rutledge, Jackson, and Calhoun, which a generation later were to be familiar and which in the fate of the United States. Other settlements in the Southern States were made by Irish immigrants who had come thither from the northern Colonies. From various town and other colonial records (see Hanna, “Scotch-Irish”, II, 9 and passim), it has been ascertained that Irish emigrants had settled in Pennsylvania in 1682, in North Carolina in 1683, in South Carolina and New Jersey in 1700. The historian of South Carolina (Ramsey) writes, “but of all other countries none has furnished the Province with so many inhabitants as Ireland” (Vol. I, 20). The disastrous famine of 1740, like that still more terrible one a hundred years later, greatly increased the emigration to America; besides those who left from Galway, Dublin, and other ports, it is recorded that for “several years afterwards 12,000 emigrants annually left Ulster for the American Plantations”, and that “from 1771 to 1773 the whole emigration from Ulster is estimated at 30,000 of whom 10,000 were governors” (Laughton, “History of England in the Eighteenth Century”, II, 261; Froide, “English in Ireland”, II, 125.)

There are no official records of immigration to the United States prior to 1820. But with reference to the period from 1776 to 1820 the Bureau of Statistics has adopted an estimate, based upon the most reliable
data which could be obtained, showing 260,000 as the total of immigrants of all nationalities arriving in the United States during that time. In his notebook for 1818, Bishop Connolly says: "At present there are here [New York] about sixteen thousand Catholics—mostly Irish; at least 10,000 Irish Catholics had arrived in New York only within these last three years. They spread", he adds, "over all the large states of this country and make their religion known everywhere." And beginning about this time, namely, the close of the second war with England, 1812-1815, the stream of Irish emigration, which before had been largely Presbyterian, was changed, so that Catholic Irish have ever since constituted the bulk of such immigration into the United States. At the port, and the number recorded as arriving from Ireland in the year 1820, the first year of the official registration of immigrants, is 3614, and judging from these figures and from the proportion of immigrants arriving prior to the War of Independence, we may safely say that, out of the above official estimate of 250,000 as the total number of immigrants during the period from 1776 to 1820, at least 100,000 were Irish.

Since the year 1820 the number of immigrants arriving in the United States from Ireland is shown by the official records as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821 to 1830</td>
<td>50,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831 to 1840</td>
<td>207,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841 to 1850</td>
<td>780,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 to 1860</td>
<td>914,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861 to 1870</td>
<td>435,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871 to 1880</td>
<td>436,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881 to 1890</td>
<td>655,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 to 1900</td>
<td>403,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,884,570</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and for the years 1901 to 1908 inclusive as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>30,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>29,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>35,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>36,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>37,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>34,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>34,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>21,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,692</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Reports of Com. General of Immigration for 1906-7 & "Immigration," p. 4338), the above figures indicating that emigration from Ireland during the past eight years has been maintained at nearly the same average as during the last preceding decade. As a result the population of Ireland has diminished according to the censuses from 1861 to 1901 at the following rate per cent:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see Statesman's Year-Book, 1907). The greatest immigration in any one year was in 1851 when 221,233 persons are recorded as arriving; next to this was the year 1850 with arrivals numbering 164,004. The arrivals during the decade 1841 to 1850 were nearly four times greater than those of the preceding ten years, and this number in turn was exceeded by the figure for the next succeeding decade 1851-1860, when the highest level in the history of Irish immigration to the United States was reached. The statistics given above show a total immigration from Ireland between 1820 and 1907 of 4,144,262 persons, to which add 100,000, the number as above estimated for the years 1776 to 1820, making a total of 4,244,262, exclusive of the Irish who were in the United States prior to the Revolution. But there are reasons for believing that the figures thus given underestimate the actual volume of Irish immigration. During the decade 1841-1850 Irish labourers went every year in large numbers to England in search of employment, and many of them remained, especially in Liverpool, the population of which became in time to a large extent Irish. In 1846 alone, 278,005 Irish of both sexes were reported to have left Ireland for Liverpool, whence most of them embarked for America (see "British Commissioners' Report", cited in O'Rourke's "History of the Great Irish Famine", p. 487-8).

Many such emigrants sailed directly to the United States and arrived in largest numbers at the port of New York. During the years 1847-70, the State of New York through its Emigration Commission maintained a system of registration of aliens arriving at that port, and the records thus kept of the total of Irish immigrants largely exceeding the number reported by the National Bureau of Statistics. These variations may be explained by remembering that under the New York system immigrants were classified according to the country of their nativity, while in the Federal reports for the most part classification is made according to the "country of last permanent residence" of the immigrant, so that those who had left Ireland and had sojourned for a while in England were not classified as Irish immigrants. Again during the same period there was a large immigration to Canada, some of it officially promoted and assisted by public money (O'Rourke, p. 438), the greater part of it was destined for America, but was diverted to Canada by English shipowners, who found it easier to deliver their human freight there than at the port of New York, where the condition and circumstances of the immigrant were more carefully scrutinized.

The United States Bureau of Statistics estimates the total immigration into Canada between 1821 and 1890 at 3,000,000, of which it is safe to assume that more than half came from Ireland. No official record has been kept of immigrants arriving in the United States from Canada, except in certain cases neither numerous nor important enough to be mentioned here, and it is impossible to state the precise number of persons of Irish birth who, sooner or later after their arrival in Canada, crossed the borders and thus increased the Irish element in the United States. That the number was very large there is abundant evidence. In the U.S. Census of 1860, presented in 1861 in the Canadian House of Parliament, the opinion was expressed that over one-half of the immigrants arriving in Canada ultimately removed to the United States. (See Immigration into the U. S., in U. S. Bureau of Statistics, 1909, p. 4339.) And it has been argued that if the 3,000,000 immigrants who had had to remain there, the total population of the Dominion must have increased far beyond 5,371,315, the figures officially reported in 1901. These considerations, we think, justify a revision and correction of the estimate of Irish immigration into the United States (for the period 1820 to 1903), which up to the present time has been officially quoted at "about four millions"; we would say that, taking the entire period from the beginning of the War of Independence (1776) to and including 1908, such immigration easily numbers five and a half million souls.

Recurring to the statistics of recorded immigration, we find the number of persons of Irish nativity included in the resident population of continental United States at the close of each decennial period since 1850 to be as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>961,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,611,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,655,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,654,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1,615,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,615,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[see Abstract of 12th (1900) Census, p. 9].
And the same census (1900) shows that in that year there were 4,968,182 persons resident in the United States of whose parents at least one was born in Ireland, including the 1,615,450 residents above specified, who were themselves of Irish birth. Of these 67 per cent were located in the states of the North Atlantic division and 22 per cent in the North Central division. About three-fourths of the above foreign-born population shown by the census of 1900 were comprised within the following eight states in the respective numbers set opposite:

- New York .... 425,553
- Massachusetts 249,018
- Pennsylvania 205,900
- Illinois .... 114,563

While the twelve cities having the largest population of Irish nativity were as follows:

- New York .... 275,102
- Philadelphia .... 98,427
- Chicago, Ill. .... 73,912
- St. Louis, Mo. .... 19,421
- Providence, R.I. .... 18,886
- San Francisco, Cal. .... 15,963
- Newark, N.J. .... 12,792

Beyond the immediate ancestry of persons comprising the population, no classification according to race origin has been made in any census, and there is consequently no official record showing what part of the population (to the extent of the first degree) is of Irish origin. But various unofficial estimates have been made. In 1851 Hon. W. E. Robinson, M.C., in a carefully prepared discourse (reported in the “New York Tribune,” 30 July, 1851) refuting the claim then urged by various public writers and speakers that the population of the United States was chiefly Anglo-Saxon in character, presented statistics of emigration showing that not more than one-eighth of the population could be considered of Anglo-Saxon origin and that out of a population then (1850) numbering 23,191,976, there were:

- Irish born .................................................. 3,000,000
- Irish by blood ........................................... 4,500,000

making a total Irish element of ...................................... 7,500,000

Rev. Stephen Byrne, O.S.D., author of “Irish Emigration to the United States,” puts the Celtic element at one-half of the present (1873) population, the Anglo-Saxon at one-fourth. The official census of 1870 gives the total population of the United States as 38,696,984. And the New York “Irish World” (25 July, 1874), speaking of the census, claims that two-thirds of the people are Celtic in birth or descent and only about one-ninth are Anglo-Saxon, and in a tabulated statement of the component elements of the population, that journal estimates the “joint product in 1870 of Irish Colonial element and subsequent Irish immigration (including that from Canada) at 14,325,000” (cited from O’Kane Murray’s “History of the Catholic Church in the United States,” p. 611).

In 1882 Philip H. Bagden, an English writer, in his work “The American Irish,” p. 33, states: “the American Irish themselves lay claim to a population of between ten and fifteen millions. There can be no doubt that the amount of Celtic blood in the American people is very much greater than they themselves would like to allow.” Since 1870, 1,740,460 immigrants from Ireland have arrived, according to the above-quoted official statistics, apart from those arriving through Canada, and if the estimated Irish element of that year has doubled itself and more during the fifty years which have now elapsed, the number of persons of Irish birth or origin in continental United States would appear now to be not less than thirty millions. We have referred to the Irish immigration for 1851 as the largest in history. The steady and extraordinary increase from 44,521 in 1845 to 257,372 in 1851 (figures of Thom’s Almanac for 1853, cited in O’Rourke, “History etc.,” p. 496) compels us to mention the political causes from which it arose and the distressing conditions under which the immigrants of that period established themselves in the United States.

As is well known the potato blight appeared in Ireland in 1845, as it had appeared before, namely in 1740, 1821, and in several lesser years. By 1846 it had extended over the whole country, so that nowhere in the land were there any potatoes fit either for food for human beings or for seed. But side by side with the blackened potato fields there were abundant crops of grain which were in no way affected by the potato blight. These, however, were disposed of frequently by distrent, as the sole means of providing the rent for the landlord, while the unfortunate tenants by whose labour they had been produced were left without food. Famine which brought fever and other miseries in its train set in, so that tens of thousands of the people sank into their graves, many of them dying within the shelter of the workhouses. There were evictions without limit, many of them under heart-rending circumstances. Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, tells of 700 human beings evicted in one day in 1847 from one estate (Parnell Movement, p. 114), and other appalling instances might be cited. In the Irish workhouses were 104,455 persons, of whom 9000 were fever patients (O’Rourke, “History of the Great Irish Famine,” p. 478). Nearly three-quarters of a million were employed on public works which had been devised as a means of relieving the distress, and 3,020,712 persons were receiving daily rations of food from the Government (ibid.).

Of the horrors of that time it is almost impossible to speak with moderation. While myriads starved to death in Ireland, says O’Neill Daunt (Ireland and her Agitators, p. 231),’ ships bursting with grain and laden with cattle were leaving every port for England. There would have been no need for the people to emigrate if their food did not emigrate. But the exhausting results of the Union had brought matters to a point that compelled Ireland to sell her food to supply the enormous money drain. The food is first taken away and then its price is taken away also. “The Union has stripped them (the Irish people) of their means and the only alternatives left to the perishing multitude were the work-house, emigration, or the grave.” The condition to which the Irish people were thus reduced was extremely pitiable and excited the sympathy of the whole world. The peoples of Europe are bought and sold high and low, while ship after ship ghted generously from the American shores passed fleets of English vessels carrying away from a dying people the fruits of their own labor” (see Lester, “Glory and Shame of England,” I, 161). 114 ships carrying provisions, the relief of a starving nation, landed their cargoes in Ireland in 1847 (O’Rourke, “History etc.,” p. 512), and the United States, responding to the universal sentiment of the nation, sent its two ships of war, the “Jamestown” and “Macedonian,” on these errands of mercy. From these causes the population of Ireland was diminished during the famine period by two at half million souls: they disappeared by death and emigration. It was to America that by far the greatest number of the emigrants went.

The transportation of emigrants in those early days was attended with such cruel conditions that review them nowadays which it is almost incredible that they should have been tolerated by any civilized nation. The ships employed in this service were only too often broken-down freight ships, in which merchants were unwilling to entrust valuable
merchandizes. The humane provisions of modern times with respect to light, ventilation, and cleanliness were wholly unknown. More often than not the ships were undermanned, so that in case of a storm the passengers were required to lend a hand in doing the work of sailors. The provisions supplied were always uncooked, scanty in amount, and frequently unfit for use. With such the voyage these from six to eight weeks. Against head-winds and storms the old hulks were frequently from twelve to fourteen weeks on the way. With the emigrants already predisposed by famine and hardship, it is not to be wondered at that fever broke out on board ship and that many died and their remains were tossed overboard during the voyage. This was especially true in the British vessels, in which the death-rate exceeded that of the vessels of all other nationalities (see Kapp, “Immigration”, p. 34).

As a result these emigrant ships on reaching the United States were in many instances little else than floating hospitals. When they arrived in port the shipmaster made haste to discharge his human cargo, and the sick and dying, as well as those who had survived unharmed, were put ashore on the wharves and public landing-places and were left to their fate. Some of the sick, when they reached New York, were fortunate enough to be sent to hospitals, but others were carried to the sheds and structures which had been provided by the brokers and agents of the shipowners, under their agreement with the municipal authorities to provide for such sick emigrants as they might land. But the treatment of the emigrants in these institutions was little less brutal than they had experienced on board ship. The food there was often unfit for any human being, still less for the sick. Sanitary conditions were ignored, and medical attendance was rarely adequate to the existing needs. Not only the sick and the dying, but often the corpses of the dead, were huddled together. One instance is specified where the bodies of two who had died four or five days before were left unburied on the cots whereon they had died, in the same room with their sick companions (see Maguire, “The Irish in America”, p. 180). So fatal were these conditions that it has been estimated by medical statisticians that not less than 20% of the emigrants died between the date and the arrival of the various emigrant hospitals in American ports in the year 1847 (Kapp, “Immigration”, p. 23).

Those of the emigrants who survived the hardships of the voyage and retained strength enough to go about encountered troubles of a different kind. Boarding-house charges were fraudulently multiplied, money-brokers practised their calling at extortionate rates, while the selling of fraudulent railroad tickets was one of the commonest practices by which the poor immigrant was misled. As a result the able-bodied immigrant was compelled to remain in and around New York without means to help himself or his family, and thus oftentimes became a charge upon the charity of the public. So gross did these abuses become that a number of the most prominent citizens of New York applied to the Legislature for relief. Included in these were Archbishop Hughes, Andrew Carrighan, John E. Devlin, Charles O’Connor, James T. Brady, John McKeon, Gregory Dillon, and other men of Irish blood who were identified with the Irish Emigrant Society, which had been organized for the purpose of aiding the Irish immigrants arriving at the port of New York.

These efforts of the Legislature were defeated by Act of the Legislature of the State of New York of the board generally known as the “Commissioners of Emigration”, composed of men of the highest standing in the community, who served without compensation and to whom was entrusted the general care and supervision of the immigrants as they arrived. Gullan C. Verplanck, distinguished alike as scholar and public-spirited citizen of New York, served during twenty-three years as president of this board, and although not of Irish blood, his long and faithful service in behalf of the Irish immigrants ought not to pass without honourable mention in these pages. Under the watchful supervision thus established the evils complained of were gradually overcome, notwithstanding persistent opposition from shipowners and others.

In 1855 the first state emigration depot was opened in Castle Garden at the lower end of Manhattan Island, and since then millions of immigrants have streamed through this gateway, under the inspection and protection of the officials, on their way to settle in various places throughout the United States, where they were to make their homes. In 1874 the Congress of the United States assumed control of the question of immigration, and the admission and supervision of the arriving immigrant are now in charge of a Commissioner General of Immigration appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. In 1884 a Home and Mission House were established in close proximity to Castle Garden for the protection of Irish immigrant girls. This institution was founded by Cardinal John McCloskey, with the co-operation of other prelates, and was placed in charge of Rev. John J. Riordan, a zealous Irish missionary.

Speaking of the distribution of the immigrants upon their arrival in the United States, Bishop J. L. Spalding estimates (Mission of the Irish People, p. 113) that only eight in one hundred of the Irish emigrating to the United States have been employed in agricultural pursuits, a percentage smaller than that of the emigrants from any other country, the remaining ninety-two going to make up the tenement-house population in the larger cities. He asserts further (ep. cit., p. 166) that the agricultural settlers became much more by accident than from choice, following the lines of the railroad or canals on which they laboured, saving their wages and buying lands. This tendency of the Catholic Irish to congregate in the large cities was seen to be attended by consequences so injurious both morally and materially to the immigrant that efforts were made from time to time to withdraw them from the large cities at which they arrived and to settle them on the land. Bishop Fenwick of Boston planted a colony in Maine, and Bishop Reynolds of Charleston, S. C., diverted some of the emigration from Liverpool to New Orleans, and Archbishop Abel of Dubuque and Joseph Cretin of St. Paul, induced and helped many of the Irish to settle in the States of Iowa and Minnesota, and in 1850 Bishop Andrew Byrne of Little Rock welcomed a colony of Irish Catholics brought over by Father Hoar of Wexford. Of these latter a small number remained in Arkansas, the rest going to Iowa where they established a colony known as "New Ireland".

After the Civil War the question of Catholic colonization engaged the attention of various of the prelates, including Archbishop John Ireland (then Bishop) of St. Paul, who established the St. Paul Catholic Colonization bureau; through his efforts various colonies were established in Minnesota. Later, in May, 1879, the Irish Catholic Colonization Association of the United States was established at Chicago, under the auspices of various archbishops, with the co-operation of eminent Irish Catholic laymen, and during the present decade it created a work of colonization in their own neighbourhood, and successful colonies were established in Minnesota and Kansas. In all these organized efforts at colonization the promoters have aimed to provide for the religious needs of the colonists, by
securing the services of priests and the building of churches and schools, at the same time that homes and other material assistance were provided for them. These movements for the colonization of Irish immigrants differed from the ordinary schemes of emigration in that the promoters did not invite or encourage the Irish to leave their native land, but for those who had resolved to make their abode in the New World the emigration provide homes free from the distressing and degraded conditions which so many of those who remained in the large cities had to face.

The entire white population of the Colonies at the outbreak of hostilities in 1775 has been estimated by various authorities, including the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, at 1,200,000, of which about one-third was settled in New England and the remaining two-thirds in New York, Pennsylvania, and the Southern Colonies. Dr. Carroll estimated the Catholics in all the Colonies at that time at 25,000. It is well known that a considerable number of the colonists were adverse to the War of Independence, and those refrained from giving any support to the struggling Colonies. Lecky estimates (England in the Eighteenth Century, IV, 153) that one-half of the Americans were either openly or secretly hostile to the Revolution. Other writers are content to fix the proportion of those who were disaffected to the half of the patriots on the Revolutionary side of the entire population. But the records show very few, if any, Irish, whether Catholics or Protestants, among those lukewarm patriots. On the contrary, Irish immigrants and the sons of Irishmen in the various colonies were among the most active and unwavering supporters of the cause of liberty. Ramsay says, in his "History of the American Revolution, II, 311: "The Irish in America, with a few exceptions, were attached to independence". Whether in the councils of state, or while enduring the hardships of military service, or by the material and financial support which they gave to the "American Irish", or by the active, generous, and unostentatiously, their blood and treasure that without their aid the issue of the contest may well appear doubtful.

In June, 1779, when Parliament was investigating the reverses sustained by the British armies in their American campaigns, Joseph Galloway, who had held various offices in the American Contingent of the Continental Army, until the evacuation of that city in 1778, was asked: "That part of the rebel army that enlisted in the service of Congress, were they chiefly composed of natives of America, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch and Irish?" His answer was: "The names and places of their nativity being taken, I am free to assert, in question with precision. They were scarcely one-fourth natives of America; about one-half Irish; the other fourth English and Scotch." And this was confirmed by the English Major General Robertson, who, testifying before the same committee, said: I remember General Lee telling me that half of the rebel army were from Ireland" ("House of Commons Reports", 5th Session, 14th Parliament, III, 303, 431; see also "The Evidence as given before a committee of the House of Commons on the detail and conduct of the American War, London, 1785", cited in Bagneral, "The American Irish", p. 12). It is evident that the rebels gave point to the taunt flung at the ministers by Lord Mountjoy during the debate in Parliament over the repeal of the Penal Laws: "You have lost America through the Irish." "It is a fact beyond question", says Flouden, "that most of the early successes in America were owing to the vigorous exertions and prowess of the Irish emigrants in that cause" (Historical Review of the State of Ireland, II, 178). The historians Marmon and Gordon write to the same effect.

Speaking of the Irish immigrants, a recent American writer, Douglas Campbell, says: They contributed elements to American thought and life without which the United States of to-day would be impossible. By them American Independence was first advocated and for their efforts succeeding those of New England Puritans that Independence would not have been secured" (The Puritan in Holland, England and America, II, 471). And Lecky speaking of the Ulster emigrants writes: "They went with hearts burning with indignation and in the War of Independence they were the first to the front, and the number of the insurgents. They supplied some of the best soldiers of Washington. The famous Pennsylvania Line was mostly Irish" (op.cit., II, 282). So, too, we may add, the Maryland Line was largely made up of Irish exiles or of the sons of Irishmen. The colonial records of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and others show that from Lexington to Yorktown Irishmen took part in every campaign, and W. E. Robinson declares, "there was no battle or campaign in which Irish blood did not flow freely for American Independence". Nor did the Irish shrink from making large pecuniary sacrifices for the cause. In 1780 when the Continental Army, severely tried by nearly five years of exhausting struggle, was in desperate straits for necessary clothing and supplies, to say nothing of the pay of the troops, a fund of two million dollars was raised by subscription from ninety of the most prominent Irishmen in the United Colonies. Twenty-nine of these subscribers were Irish either by birth or parentage, all members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and their united subscriptions amounted to four hundred and forty thousand dollars.

Among the signers of the Declaration of Independence thirteen (some authorities claim more) were of Irish origin. These were Matthew Thornton and William Whipple who signed for New Hampshire, James Smith, James Wilson, and George Taylor of Pennsylvania, Thomas Lynch, Jr., and Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, George Read and Thomas_Morgan of Delaware, and Charles Carroll of Maryland, Thomas Nelson, Jr., of Virginia, William Hooper of North Carolina, and Philip Livingston of New York, it is promulgated over the signatures of the President of the Continental Congress and of Charles Thompson, its Irish secretary. Col. John Nixon, a member of the Committee of Safety, and son of an Irishman born in the County of Wexford, first read that document to a great concourse of people assembled in the State House yard, Philadelphia, and it was first printed from the press of another Irishman, John Dunlap from Tyrone, who had already (1771) printed the Paine. These facts are contained in a newspaper published in the United States. The convention whose deliberation produced the written Constitution upon which the Government rests, included among its members a large proportion of Irishmen. Prominent among them were William Livingston, first Governor of New Jersey, William Paterson, later to be Governor of the same state, Daniel Carroll of Maryland, Thomas FitzSimons of Philadelphia, George Read of Delaware, Richard Dobbs Spaight, afterwards Governor of North Carolina and Hugh Williamson of the same state, Pierce Butler and John Rutledge of South Carolina, the latter to become afterwards Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the most influential men in the service of the struggling patriots was Charles Thompson, born in the County of Derry, Ireland, who had arrived at Newcastle, Delaware, in 1740. He was the confidential friend of every leader in the struggle, and the chief in the conduct of affairs and administrative capacity were so universally conceded that he was chosen secretary of the First Continental Congress, serving the succeeding congresses in the same capacity for a period of fourteen years.

Among the officers of Irish nationality in the Continental Army who won distinction by brilliant services, we may name the following. General Henry Knox, son
of a Belfast emigrant, who was master of ordnance, served in every battle with Washington, and was appointed first Secretary of War on the organization of the Government in 1789. General John Stark, the hero of Bennington, another native of Ireland. General John Stark, who was an emigrant from Limerick and who commanded the troops sometimes known as the "Line of Ireland". His successful campaigns in Georgia and the Carolinas and at the battle of Monmouth are historic. For his services, including the recapture of Stony Point from the British, Congress voted him £500, and in 1790 he received a gold medal. General Richard Montgomery, a native of Donegal, in command of the expedition to Canada, who fell before Quebec in 1775, one of the earliest victims in the cause of American liberty. A monument to him in St. Paul's churchyard in the city of New York marks the nation's appreciation of his services. General Stephen Moylan, a native of Cork, of which city his brother was the Catholic bishop. He was first Quartermaster General of the Continental Army and afterwards commanded the Pennsylvania troops known as Moylan's Dragoons. Richard Battle, a native of Kilkenny, fought in many engagements and was present at the surrender of Yorktown. Daniel Morgan, a native of Balinascreen, County Derry, Ireland, the hero of Cowpens, North Carolina, where with 800 men, mostly Irish and sons of Irishmen, he defeated twice the number of British troops and took many of them prisoners. Edward Hanly, a native of County Kerry, who had served as surgeon of the Irish Brigade (of France) in Canada. On the retirement of the French, he cast his lot with the Americans and served throughout the Revolutionary War with distinction. Andrew Lewis, an emigrant from Donegal, who came to Virginia in 1772, and served with his four brothers until the close of the war. His statue in Capitol Square in the city of Richmond shows that his adopted state, Virginia, recognized him as one of her most distinguished sons. George Clinton was the son of Charles Clinton, a native of Longford, Ireland, who landed at Cape Cod in 1729. Besides his military service, he became the first Governor of New York, in which capacity he served twenty-one years and was then (1801) chosen Vice-President of the United States. His brother James was in charge of one of the New York regiments and succeeded to the command made vacant by the death of General Montgomery. General Clinton became governor of that state in 1817. John Sullivan, one of the most distinguished commanders in the Revolutionary War, was son of John Sulli- van, an Irish immigrant from Limerick who settled in Belfast, Maine, in 1723. His capture of Fort William and Mary at Portsmouth in December, 1774, was the first blow struck for independence. Besides many other important civil offices which he filled after the close of the war, he was President of the Commonwealth of New Hampshire. His brother James Sullivan was chosen Governor of Massachusetts. In addition we might name General Walter Stewart and William Rush, both of Philadelphia, two of the famous Pennsylvania Line. William Thompson, William Maxwell, James Hagan, John Rutledge, brother of Edward Rutledge, one of the signers, Colonel Charles Louch, son of John Louch, an Irish immigrant who with his brother John founded the settlement that has taken on Louch in the Virginia backwoods, and others whose names would unduly extend this list. In recounting the part taken by the Irish in the achievement of our independence, it would be ungracious if we neglected to record the presence and services of those other Irish who, equally exiles as their brethren in America, had taken on Louch in the Virginia backwoods and had thereby become allies in that memorable struggle, fighting American battles both by sea and land under the banner of the fleur-de-lis. We refer especially to the Dillon and Walsh regiments of Catholic and Irish troops which in October, 1781, under de Rochambeau and de Grasse helped to surround the army of Cornwallis at Yorktown and compelled its surrender to the "combined forces of America and France".

The first naval engagement in the War of Independence was fought and won 11 May, 1775, shortly after the battle of Lexington, by Jeremiah O'Brien of Machias, Maine. This son of an Irish immigrant with his four brothers and a few other fellow-townsmen went out in O'Brien's lumber schooner "The Lumber" and against great odds attacked and captured the British armed schooner "Margaretta", the captain of which had previously ordered the pine tree set up in the town as a liberty pole to be taken down. Easily the foremost figure in the naval service of the American patriots was the Catholic Irishman John Barry (q. v.), a native of Wexford, to whom a commission was issued by the Continental Congress 14 October, 1775, when he was placed in command of the "Lexington" and later commanded the "Alliance". With the former he captured the British war vessel the "Atalanta" and, according to the historian "this vessel, which was the precursor of the Continental flag, bore the battle on the ocean" (see Preble, "Origin of the Flag", p. 243). How highly Barry's character and ability were esteemed may be judged from the circumstance that the British General Howe offered £2000 and the command of the best frigate in the English navy if he would abandon the service of the patriots; to which Barry made the memorable answer that he had devoted himself to the cause of his country and not the value and command of the whole English fleet could seduce him from it (see Frost, "History of the American Navy", p. 88). On 4 July, 1784, after the Government had regularly organized its navy, his first commission was issued to John Barry who thus became senior captain, the highest rank then known in the naval service. These appointments, together with his devoted service continued throughout the war, clearly justify the designation of "Father of the American Navy" accorded to Barry. His remains are interred in St. Mary's Catholic churchyard in Philadelphia, and a life-size statue erected (1906) by the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick within the precincts of Independence Hall attests the esteem in which Barry was held. The fact should not be overlooked that Barry's life as a Catholic was as consistent and edifying as his public career was patriotic and valuable to the country of his adoption.

In the second war with England (1812) the services rendered by Irishmen and the sons of Irishmen were among the most important in that memorable contest. Johnson Blakely, who fought and captured the British frigate "Reindeer", was Irish by birth. Stephen De catur, who captured the "Macedonian", was of Irish parentage. So were Charles Stewart, Captain James Lawrence, and Thomas McDonough whose victory on Lake Champlain was a famous achievement. At the battle of Lake Erie the British fleet was almost annihilated, and the most brilliant naval victory of the war was won by the American forces under the command of Oliver Hazard Perry, the son of an Irish mother (Sarah Alexander). On land the last decisive battle of the war, that at New Orleans, was won by troops largely of Irish origin under the leadership of Andrew Jackson, another of the Irish patriots.

The devotion of the Irish in America to the country of their adoption and their readiness to sacrifice themselves in her defence were again conspicuously demonstrated when the safety of the republic was imperilled by the unfortunate Civil War. During that long struggle (1861-1865) Irish patriots and Irish valour were everywhere in evidence, and impartial historians have freely acknowledged the great and important military service rendered by the Irish element in de-
There are no statistics showing the full percentage of the Irish element in the Fighting service of that war; but it is certain that a very large proportion there can be no doubt. A table published by C. G. Lee of Washington, an authority on the statistics of the Civil War, shows the enlistment in the Union Army of 144,200 men of Irish birth. D. P. Conyngham, the historian of the Irish Brigade, estimates the number of Irishmen so enlisted at 173,000 (see "The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns," p. 8). But these figures very inadequately represent the part taken by Irishmen and their descendants in the defence of the Union. In the analysis of the nationality of 337,800 soldiers from the State of New York, compiled by B. C. Goode, late acting Superintendent of Military Education (see "New York in the War of the Rebellion," p. 49, by Frederick Phisterer, late Captain of the U.S. Army), the race or nationality by birth of 230,267 of them was obtained by official records and, estimating from these, it was found that of such total number of soldiers supplied from that state there were—:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natives of the United States</th>
<th>203,622</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of foreign birth</td>
<td>134,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The latter being divided as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natives of Ireland</th>
<th>51,206</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natives of Germany</td>
<td>36,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives of British America</td>
<td>19,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives of England</td>
<td>14,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives of foreign countries</td>
<td>12,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

134,178

Of those registered as natives of the United States, it is safe to assert that a large part was made up of sons of Irish parents and, judging from the history of Canadian immigration, that the number credited to British America included many others, sons of Irish emigrants to Canada who, later, had taken up their residence in the United States. Before the war, the Irish element already present in the population registered as native-born, as before indicated, can hardly be questioned but that at least one-fourth of the soldiers so recorded were descendants of Irish immigrants.

If to these we add only a fraction of those registered as natives of British America, sons of Irish emigrants who had landed in Canada before taking up residence in the United States, the Irish race would appear to have furnished about one-third of the entire quota of soldiers supplied by the State of New York in defence of the Union. But the troops from other states, notably Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, included in the ranks of the contingent of soldiers of Irish birth or descent, whose number may fairly be estimated as between one-third and one-fourth of the total number of troops supplied by those several states. Not a few regiments were composed almost exclusively of men of Irish birth or Irish descent, such as the 9th and 28th Massachusetts Volunteers under command of Colonel Cabell and Colonel Richard Byrnes respectively, and later under Col. Thomas Cass (who fell at Malvern Hill), and Col. Patrick Guiney; the 88th New York Volunteers under Colonel Patric Kelly, and the 69th of the same state which assembled under the order of their colonel, Michael Corcoran, bidding his men "to rally to the support of the Constitution and laws of the United States"—a sentiment which was the inspiration of the subsequent outpouring of Irish soldiers in defence of the Union: the 116th Pennsylvania Volunteers, recruited in Philadelphia, early fought in the western part of Meagher's Irish brigade, which went to the front in command of Colonel Dennis Hoeman; the 37th N. Y. (Irish Rifles); and Meagher's Zouaves under the command of Thomas F. Meagher.

At the very outset of the war an Irish brigade made up of about 2000 Catholic Irishmen was organized in Chicago by Colonel James A. Mulligan, who after four years of hard service fell mortally wounded in one of the engagements at Winchester, Va. Another Irish legion, composed almost exclusively of Irish Catholic soldiers, was mustered into service as the 90th Illinois Volunteers, recruited largely through the exertions of an Irish priest, Father Dunn, and was one of the first regiments to respond to the president's call for troops. The first fortification thrown up for the defence of Washington was Fort Corcoran, on Arlington Heights, built by the men of the New York 69th Regiment. When the ranks of these regiments had been thinned by death or by disability from wounds or disease, they were filled with fresh volunteers, many of them being immigrants only recently arrived. In the later engagements of the war, the Irish of New York, was thus recruited thrice during the war. Besides these entire regiments of Irish soldiers, there were many regiments from the different states, each containing one or more companies composed exclusively of Irishmen. Later the Irish Brigade of New York was organized under the command of General Thomas F. Meagher with the 69th as its nucleus, the 63rd and 88th regiments of New York being added, numbering in all over 2500 men. Another Irish legion, better known as the Corcoran Legion, comprising four full regiments, namely, the 69th, 155th, 164th, and 220th, was organized in 1863 by General Michael Corcoran upon his return to New York after a year's confinement in a Confederate war prison. Irish priests, among them Rev. (now Archibishop) John Ireland, Bernard O'Reilly, Lawrence S. McMahon, afterwards Bishop of Hartford, William Corby, Thomas J. Mooney, James Dillon, John Seully, Daniel Mullen, Philip Sheridan, Paul Gillen, Edward McKee, and others, accompanied the Irish regiments as chaplains, sharing the hardships of war with them. To recount the deeds of the Irish soldiers in that war would be to write a history of most of the important battles of the war. At Antietam, Williamsburg, Fair Oaks, Chickahominy, Malvern Hill, Chancellorsville, Spottsylvania, Bull Run, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, and Fredericksburg, the Irish soldier was found in the fore-front of battle braving every danger and unhesitatingly giving up life itself in defence of the flag of his adopted country.

The official war records contain frequent acknowledgment of the valuable service rendered by the Irish regiments in these various battles, and distinguished officers in both contending armies have testified to the heroic conduct of the Irish soldier. There are no statistics to show the total number of men of Irish birth who served in the Union army. In four years of struggle gave their lives in defence of their country, but it was unquestionably very great. At Fredericksburg alone, in the memorable attack on Marye's Heights, the Irish Brigade was so depleted that after the battle the number of men remaining alive was so small that not one regiment was left for a general to command, and General Meagher, their commander, thereupon resigned his commission; (see "The Irish Brigade", pp. 349, 350, 366). According to the statistics, over 4000 men of the brigade and regiment lost their lives on the field of battle, or of wounds received, or disease contracted in service. The 69th New York lost 998 men during the war. At Antietam, out of 18 officers and 210 men engaged, it lost in killed and wounded 16 officers and 112 men. The Irish Legion lost 3100 in killed and wounded, including officers and men. Out of 1703 men enlisted, the Irish 22nd lost 500 in killed and wounded by the time of the close of service, the killed, wounded, and missing in action reached the large number of 1133, of whom 408 were killed or wounded in the campaign of the Wilderness (The Irish Brigade, p. 586). And the last Union general killed in the war was the Irish General Thomas H. Smith, who fell at Petersburg in April, 1865.
Space does not permit an enumeration of all the names of men of Irish blood who held responsible command in the Union armies in that war. Some of the generals were Logan, Lair, and Dougherty of Illinois, Gorman of Minnesota, Magens and Sullivan of Indiana, Reilly and Mulligan of Ohio, Stevenson of Missouri, and with him James Shields, already a hero of the War of 1812, who was a three states, Shirley of Michigan, Smith of Delaware, Meagher, Corcoran, Patrick H. O'Rourke, P. H. Jones, and Thomas F. Sweeney of New York, George G. Meade, Geary, and Birney of Pennsylvania, McPherson, McDowell, and McCook, the dashing Phil Kearney, and George B. McClellan. It was another Irishman's son, "little" Phil Sheridan, the greatest cavalry leader of the war, whose brilliant work just preceding the surrender at Appomattox undoubtedly contributed greatly to that result. When hostilities ceased, Sheridan as lieutenant-general occupied next to the highest rank in the military service of the country, while at the same time the highest command in the navy was held by Admiral Porter, the descendant of an Irishman, the next highest command being held by Admiral Rowan, a native-born Irishman.

While men of the Irish race were engaged on the battlefield of the Civil War, a large number of the Southern States had the entire coast of the state of Georgia, the Southern States, accompanied and encouraged by their clergy, the religious orders of women within the Church were no less diligent in nursing the sick and wounded in the camps and hospitals. Among these volunteer nurses it is no exaggeration to say that the Irish element predominated. Thus in July, 1862, at the request of the Secretary of War, a band of seven Sisters of Mercy left New York and took charge of the Soldiers' Hospital at Beaufort, N. C., which was later on transferred to Newbern. This was in charge of Mother Augustine McKenna, a native of County Monaghan, Ireland. Several of these, exhausted by the toils of the last enemy, were obliged to resign their lives only to be replaced by others from their community in New York. The hospital at Jefferson City, Mo., was put in charge of another company of nuns from the same order who came from their home in Chicago, and when this institution had to be abandoned, they took charge of the hospital department of the steamboat "Empress," which was about to start for the battle-field of Shiloh. These Chicago sisters were in charge of Mother Alphonse Butler, and Confederate and Union soldiers alternately came under their care (see "Annals of the Sisters of Mercy of the United States"). The United States military hospitals were placed in charge of the same sisters. The Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul sent from Ennmitburg and other houses many of their members, whose ministrations in the hospitals at Norfolk and elsewhere elicited the grateful admiration of Protestant and Catholic alike.

The Hospital of the Good Samaritan at Cincinnati was the gift of some enlightened and appreciative Protestant gentlemen to Sister Anthony, born at Limerick, whose services in the field hospitals had won for her the title of "Ministering Angel of the Army of God." The head nurses of the Government in America," p. 482). The earliest use of the Mercy Hospital at Pittsburg, established by Irish sisters of Mercy, was for the relief of the sick and disabled soldiers returning from the Mexican War, 1848. At Helena and Little Rock, Ark., hospitals were maintained by the same community, who served the sick and wounded to the last. Four years later the United Confederate forces, as the fortunes of war shifted the control of the territory in which the hospital stood. There were Irish women in the community of the Sisters of St. Joseph who served at Harriusburg, caring for the disabled soldiers and taking charge of the State hospital that received the wounded in the Virginia battle-fields. The same community afterwards (1864) opened and maintained an asylum at Philadelphia for the orphaned daughters of the Union soldiers of the Civil War (Hist. Sketch of Church in Philadelphia, p. 193), and all over the country the orphans, made such by the war, found shelter under the hospitable roofs of one or other of the religious communities, whose members were largely of the Irish race.

The record of the services rendered by the Irish in that war would be incomplete without reference to the part taken by John Hughes, the great Irish Archbishop of New York. This distinguished prelate, the friend of President Abraham Lincoln and of his secretary, Mr. Seward, and, on his request a confidential mission to Europe in 1861, where at the French Court and in other influential circles he advocated the justice of the conduct of the Government at Washington in resisting the secession of the states and the consequent disruption of the Union. At that time the British Government and English public men with few notable exceptions had manifested their hostility to the Government, as they continued to do afterwards, and efforts were being made (as was believed) to engage France in an alliance with England with a view to their joint acknowledgment of the Confederate States as an independent nation. This would have entitled the Confederacy to all the rights of a belligerent, and would have permitted England to become its ally openly and to furnish troops and supplies in support of the rebellion. But the efforts in question failed, and the Government gratefully acknowledged the patriotic services performed by Archbishop Hughes in that behalf.

But the genius of the Irish race, which had thus helped to found the Republic and to preserve it when it needed defenders, was not lacking in times of peace in the development of the country and in the practice of the arts and sciences. One of the greatest entering into the development of the arts and sciences was the supremacy of the State of New York, namely, the construction of the Erie Canal, was planned and carried out during the year 1817-18 by De Witt Clinton, then governor of that state, who was a descendant of Charles Clinton, himself an immigrant born at Longford, Ireland, as already noted. But this great enterprise had already, as early as 1784, been publicly advocated by another Irish immigrant, Christopher Colles, then living in the city of New York, who had been an engineer and instructor in the Continental Army. With almost prophetic foresight, the reports on the speculators went to New York City by means of aqueducts, models of which he publicly exhibited, thus anticipating by more than half a century the existing Croton aqueduct system. Another Irishman's son, James Sullivan, Governor of Massachusetts, projected the Middlesex (Mass.) Canal. It is a well-known fact that the actual work of construction of the railroads and canals during the greater part of the last century was accomplished mainly by Irish hands and Irish energy. In the higher plane of railroad operation Irish talent and ability have been constantly in evidence, and in the most successful of the affairs of a railroad system, no name stands higher than that of the late Samuel Sloan, an emigrant from the north of Ireland. An Irish surveyor, Jasper O'Farrell, laid out the city of San Francisco. Among the California pioneers (1828) there were Irish Martins, Sullivans, and Murphys, including Don Timoteo Murphy, who lived two years in the United States and gave the land on which the first orphan asylum in San Francisco was built. In later days the Floods, Fairs, and O'Briens are associated with the successful development of the great mining industries of that state, while Eugene Kelly, another Catholic Irishman of San Francisco and New York, stands out as a type of the successful merchant and banker.
Among the journalists and publishers of Irish birth or parentage, we may name John Dunlap, publisher (1771) of the "Pennsylvania Packet"; Matthew Carey, who (1785) founded the "Silent Witness"; and John McCreary, who, in 1790 issued the first Catholic Bible published in the United States; Matthew Lyon, the "Hampden of Congress", who (1793) published the "Farmers' Library", one of the earliest newspapers published in Vermont; George Pardon of the "Truth Teller" (1828); Rev. R. J. O'Flaherty, who (1848) founded the "Catholic Miscellany", and his sons, the publishers and editors of the "Boston Pilot", namely, Patrick Donahue, Thomas D'Arcy McGee, Rev. John Roddan, John Boyle O'Reilly; Thomas O'Conor, publisher of the "Shamrock", whose son Charles became the most distinguished jurist of his time; Bishop Joe Ryan and John Bell of the "Catholic Miscellany"; Rev. James Keogh, first editor of the "Philadelphia Catholic Standard"; Bishop Michael O'Connor, who founded the "Pittsburg Catholic", and Rev. Tobias Mullen, afterwards Bishop of Erie, who continued its publication; Bernard Dorin, an exile with Emmet and MacVeagh, and John Doyle, early publishers of Catholic books in New York; Dr. P. E. Moriarty, O.S.A., distinguished both as a writer and controversialist; Daniel W. Mahoney and Charles A. Hardy, who published "The Catholic Standard" of Philadelphia and later "The American Catholic Quarterly Review" under the editorship of a notable Jesuit scholar, Dr. James A. Corcoran; James A. McNama, editor of the "Freeman's Journal"; Patrick J. Meenan, of the "Irish American"; Edward Dunigan and James B. Kirker and their successor; Felix E. O'Hourke, Denis and James Sadlier, all of New York; Eugene Cumminskey and John Murphy of Baltimore; Lawrence Keboe of New York; besides many other Irishmen and sons of Irishmen whose names are identified with Irish and Catholic journalism and with the publication of Irish and Catholic literature in the United States. Prominent in the ranks of secular journalism were Horace Greeley, of the "New York Tribune", E. L. Godkin, of the "New York Evening Post", William Cassidy, of the "Albany Argus", Henry O'Reilly, of the "Rochester Advertiser", and Hugh J. Hastings.

Nearly one-half of all the presidents of the United States have been of Celtic extraction. The list includes James Monroe, James Polk, Andrew Jackson, James Buchanan, Ulysses S. Grant, Chester A. Arthur, Benjamin Harrison, Andrew Johnson, and William McKinley. And at no time since the establishment of the Government has the Irish race been without representation in Congress, among the judicial and in the highest civil and military services. Many of the men named for their distinguished military services afterwards held posts of honour in the civil service of the Government. To the names already mentioned of patriots of the Revolution, who afterwards became governors or chief justices of their respective states, we may add William Claiborne, of Irish birth, first Governor of Louisiana, when that state was admitted to the Union (1812), Andrew Jackson, Governor of Florida, General James Shields, first Governor of Oregon Territory, Thomas F. Meagher, first Governor of Montana Territory, and Edward Kavanagh, Governor of Maine in 1843. At the bar and on the bench the list of names of men of Irish blood who acquired distinction would fill a volume. When the attempt was made in 1813 in a New York court to compel the Jesuit Father Anthony Kohlman to disclose matters communicated to him in confession, it was the Irish Presbyterian lawyer, William Sampson, one of the United States District Judge Kohlman's refusal to reveal the information thus acquired, and vindicated the principle (since incorporated in statute law) protecting ministers of the Gospel against being compelled to disclose matters so communicated. Another Irish exile, Thomas Addis
Emmet, attained distinction as one of the leaders of the bar in New York. In later days James T. Brady, David Graham, Charles O'Conor, John McKean, Charles F. Daly, who to his judicial accomplishments added the most brilliant scholarship and served for many years as President of the American Society, Robert J. Dillon, Richard O'Gorman of New York, Francis Kernan of Utica, afterwards U. S. Senator from New York, Bernard Casserly, U. S. Senator from California, Daniel Dougherty of Philadelphia, Patrick A. Collins of Boston, are a few only of the names of men of Irish birth who by their talents and high character have reflected honour on the race from which they sprang.

In medicine another distinguished Irish exile of '88, William James MacNevin, achieved national reputation in his profession. Prior to his time, Edward Hand, John Hart, Richard Ferguson, and Ephraim McDowell, all natives of Ireland, had attained distinction as practitioners in this country. Irish physicians and surgeons were found attached to all the Irish regiments serving in the Civil War. A few are now surviving, honoured wherever known. Together they contributed a body of devoted and self-sacrificing men, true to the noblest ideals of their profession. In 1902 it was an Irish American, Surgeon Major James Carroll, who with another United States Army surgeon deliberately submitted himself to the perilous experiments then being made by the Government to ascertain whether the yellow fever was a communicable disease. As a result he contracted the disease and gave up his life as a sacrifice in the cause of science for the good of humanity. To the American-born son of Irish immigrants, Dr. Joseph O'Dwyer, humanity the world over is indebted for the development of the processes of intubation of the larynx in cases of diphtheria, and the invention of the instruments used in that operation. Always known for his charities, Dr. O'Dwyer declined to patent his inventions, thereby sacrificing large pecuniary gains. The merit of these inventions was recognized by the medical profession both in this country and in Europe, and their use has resulted in saving the lives of thousands of children. The Carney Hospital, devoted to the relief of suffering humanity, was the gift to the citizens of Boston from Andrew Carney, a successful Irishman resident in that city. A similar foundation was established at St. Louis, Mo., named after the donor, John Mullanphy, a successful Irishman who likewise established the Mullanphy Orphanage, a religious and charitable endowment at St. Louis.

Cornelius Heeney, an Irishman resident in Brooklyn, gave a large estate to the "Brooklyn Benevolent Society" in trust for the poor, and especially poor orphan children, and procured the incorporation of the society, which continues to administer his charity. Still another Irish immigrant, Judge Myles F. O'Connor, established and endowed a home for orphans at San Jose, Cal., besides distributing a large fortune during his lifetime towards the support of works of charity and the promotion of the Catholic Church in the State. A native of the public squares of New Orleans, inscribed to "Margaret," marks the appreciation of the people of that community for Margaret Haughey, an Irish woman whose charitable labours during life won for her the title of "the orphans' friend", and who bequeathed a considerable fortune for the support of the orphan asylum which she had greatly helped to establish. Of the lesser gifts of Irishmen and women to the cause of religion and humanity it would be impossible to give even a summary. It is enough to state that to people have given more freely or more steadily for these purposes than the Irish, and that a great number of the charities, hospitals, orphan asylums, and homes for sick and destitute humanity which are the boast of the present generation have had their origin in the piety, goodwill, and generous contributions of the early Irish immigrants and their descendants.

A notable feature in the history of the Irish arriving in this country has been their tendency to associate themselves in societies composed exclusively of members of their own national origin. About twenty-six "Gentlemen, merchants and others, natives of Ireland or of Irish extraction" assembled at Boston on St. Patrick's Day to organize the Charitable Irish Society. The professed object of their association was to relieve their fellow-countrymen who might be in need and to preserve the spirit of Irish nationality. With like purpose the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick was established at Philadelphia in 1771, the New York society of the same name in 1784, the Hibernian Society for the Relief of Emigrants from Ireland in Philadelphia in 1790, and the Hibernian Society of Charleston, S. C., in 1799. Later on, and as the Irish element in the population increased, similar societies were established in other cities with the same benevolent purposes. In all of them the bond of union was the Irish nationality of the members either by birth or adoption, and the maintenance of such national spirit was one of the objects of the society. But this devotion to the history and traditions of their native land was constantly and inseparably coupled with an unwavering attachment to their adopted country, and the Irish in America have demonstrated beyond any question that they or their fathers had sprung was no hindrance to the faithful discharge of their duty as American citizens. Indeed, it needed no declaration of loyalty to prove that the men who were thus associated were devoted to the interests of their adopted country, for the roll of members of the several societies was but a list of men who, having done valiant service for that country in its hour of need, became later the trusted officers of the Government which they had helped to establish, and held high rank in the social and business circles of the respective communities in which they lived.

With the great increase in the volume of immigration in later years (we refer to the period since 1820), the Irish immigrants, both those newly arriving, then mostly Catholics, as well as these already residing in the country, found themselves confronted with a deep-seated sentiment of antagonism based on both professional and religious prejudice. In the majority of the elements of the population. While this spirit of hostility was averted against all residents of foreign birth, Irish Catholics, by reason of their religion, their large numbers, and the resulting influence which as citizens they exercised in the political contests of the time, were singled out as a class to be especially attacked by this un-American section of the nation. This anti-Irish and anti-Catholic sentiment was of unmistakable English origin. It had its beginning here in the legislation of the Colonies, which, copying the English penal laws directed against the Catholic Irish in Ireland, attempted to ostracize the Irish "Papist." It was embodied in the state church establishments of several of the colonies. Although the principle of freedom of religion was definitely incorporated in the Federal Constitution, yet so persistent and obstinate was this prejudice that it found expression in the original constitutions of various of the states which made the profession of the Protestant religion a condition of holding office in the Government. It was further manifested in the repeated efforts to change the naturalization laws so as to withhold the right and privileges of citizenship from all immigrants except upon onerous conditions, including a fourteen years' residence in the country.

We are not attempting to detail the history or development of this spirit of prejudice against the Irish
Catholic immigrant. Suffice it to say that it was only too real and widespread, and that, under the guise of union and the concerted efforts of the unscrupled agitators, it took shape and form in the various native American and Know-Nothing movements which were organized during the period of 1830 to 1855. As a result of the activities of these associations, Irish Catholics in many parts of the country, almost alone among all classes of the population, were persecuted and were made the victims of mob violence, their dwellings demolished, their families made homeless, their churches and convents fired, and their clergy ill-treated. Prior to any threatening manifestation of this anti-Irish sentiment, there had existed various societies made up of Irishmen or Irishwomen, such as the Sons of Erin, Montgomery-Greens, Irish Volunteers, various Provident Societies, and others, whose social and benevolent purposes in no wise diminished the patriotic attachment of their members to the country of their adoption. Although the number of such societies and their membership were comparatively small, yet they served as rallying-points for the maintenance of the spirit of Irish nationality, and as centres of the charitable activity of their members. When the fateful spirit of native Americanism darkened the land and Irish Catholics realized the need of another and more aggressive, these societies were multiplied, and many of the Irish thus became proficient in military drill and the use of arms. There were likewise various county associations, composed of immigrants or their descendants from the several counties in Ireland and named after their respective counties.

The great increase in the number of these societies, and the fact that in important political contests their members were arrayed almost as a unit in opposition to the political parties who were identified with these anti-Catholic movements, were made pretext for accusing the Irish of a certain callousness which united them to be good citizens. Some, even of their own coreligionists (though not of their race), deplored the fact that the Irish seemed to have isolated themselves from their fellow-citizens and had thereby subjected themselves, however undeservedly, to the reproach of having put Irish nationalism above all other considerations. In the latter case, the power which the anti-Catholic movements possessed against the Catholic immigrants (at that time mostly poor and incapable of resistance), the insults and injuries put upon them because of their race and faith, and the attacks upon their persons and property, which almost without exception were sanctioned and allowed by law, are an effective answer to these criticisms.

In later days many Gaelic societies have been organized, as well as various Home Rule associations and branches of the Irish Land League. Through these organisations the Irish in America have sought to co-operate with their brethren at home in the movements undertaken for the improvement of the political, social, and industrial conditions of the Irish people in their native land; and the success attending those movements is due in large part to the sympathy of the American Irish and their generous contributions of money. The constant affection manifested in a practical way by the Irish in America for their less fortunate brethren in Ireland, may be judged from the large amounts of money remitted to the latter out of the earnings of the Irish in this country. As early as 1834 R. R. Madden ascertained (see Madden, "Memoirs", 105) that $50,000 was the sum annually sent home from the United States, which was increased from year to year until during the period from 1848 to 1864 the American Irish sent home no less a sum than $13,000,000, that is, $65,000,000 (see Parnell Movement, p. 166). The report of the British Emigration Commissioners for 1873 (cited in O'Rourke, op. cit., p. 503) states that in 1870 £727,408 (equal to $35,000,000) was sent from Ireland to North America, while the amount remitted from 1848 to 1870 £16,634,000 or $83,000,000 was so remitted through banks and commercial houses, apart from the money sent through private channels. The historian whom we have quoted estimates the total transmitted through all channels to relatives and friends in Ireland to the Irish in America in the early 1870's at £1,000,000 annually, or in all the amount of over £20,000,000 ($100,000,000) for the twenty-three years preceding the date when he wrote (1874). That the amount remitted from that time to the present has been equally large, there can hardly be any doubt.

The most prominent, as it is the most distinctively Irish perhaps, among the organisations which have referred is the Ancient Order of Hibernians, which was organized in America in the year 1836 for the avowed purposes of promoting friendship, unity, and Christian charity among its members and the advancement of the principles of Irish nationality. Many of the branches maintain systems of insurance, paying death benefits not exceeding $3000. In 1908 it had a total membership of 200,000 persons associated in 2365 divisions, distributed in forty-seven states and territories of the Union. The property owned by the order was valued (1908) at $1,722,665. During the last two or three years the membership has been increased, and over 1500 new local societies have been organized. Its contributions in support of Irish education include an endowment of $50,000 to the Catholic University at Washington, D.C. and $10,000 to Trinity College, Washington, besides over 500 scholarships in various colleges and academies throughout the country, and it has given over $25,000 in aid of the work of the Gaelic League for the revival of the Irish language and literature. Other societies, such as The Emerald Beneficial Association, The Irish Catholic Benevolent Union, founded in 1896 for benevolent purposes and composed almost entirely of members of Irish nationality, have a large membership in various states and territories. Besides these large national societies, branches of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and other smaller societies have been organized, mostly since 1840, and in the larger cities of the Eastern States, each society comprising emigrants or their descendants from particular counties in Ireland. Their purposes are purely social and benevolent and their members nearly all Catholics.

Of the relations of the Roman Catholic Irish towards the Church in America it is almost needless to speak. Not only do the Catholics of other nationalities, but their fellow-citizens of other faiths, acknowledge the great services rendered by the Irish in America in the up-building of the Church. So identified have they been with the maintenance and progress of the Church that their race and religion united have made them a marked element in the community. The mission of the Irish race, as evidenced by the part which they have taken in the support of religion in the United States, has been the theme of many writers, and it would be as endless as unnecessary a task to detail here what the Irish have done in that respect. Their number alone, coming from a land where they had suffered so greatly for conscience' sake, implied a corresponding religious activity and influence in the United States, where they were released from the restraints and threats which they had been trained to face in their native land. In increasing numbers, they provided in turn the laity out of which new congregations were formed as a result of the supply of a large extent their spiritual needs. From the time of the first Bishop, John Carroll, of the See of Baltimore, to the pres-
faith in the United States what the Irish people have done. Their unalterable attachment to their priests; their deep Catholic instincts, which no combination of circumstances has ever been able to bring into conflict with their love of country; the unworlthy and spiritual temper of the national character; their indifference to ridicule and contempt, and their unfailing generosity, all fitted them for the work which was to be done, and enabled them, in spite of the strong prejudices against their race which Americans have inherited from England, to accomplish what would not have been accomplished by Italian, French or German Catholics.
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PETER CONDON.

II. In Australia. —Nowhere in modern times has the Church made such substantial progress as in the United States of America, and there is no need to take into account the Commonwealth of Australasia. In both Irish immigration has been a large contributing factor of this development, and between both, notwithstanding the immense intervening distance, there is to be found in the early records a curious correlation of pioneer missionary effort. To the political and economic results of British rule in Ireland both these countries owe no little part of their present-day vigour and expansion. It was the declaration of American independence that stopped the transportation of British convicts across the Atlantic, and forced the establishment at Botany Bay, in January, 1788, of the first penal settlement on the Australian continent. The religious persecutions in Ireland and the political disturbances there sent many unfortunate representatives of the race. Thousands of these prisoners, transported from Ireland for political or religious offences, were exiled without any intimation of the duration of the sentences passed on them by drumhead courts-martial. Hence, under date of 12 November, 1796, there is record of Governor Hunter writing back from the colony to the authorities of the Home Office in England that the "Irish Defenders" were threatening to resist all orders because of the indeterminate terms of their sentences, and that they may themselves be "sent to servitude." In May, 1802, Governor King also wrote praying the home government not to send any more Irishmen there and "as few as possible of those con-
victed of sedition and republican practices, otherwise in a very short time the whole colony would be imbued with the same seditive spirit.

But the sentence had no effect whatever, and the number of exiles constantly increased until in a short time it amounted to more than a thousand. Confessors of the Faith, as most of them were in their native land, they had to face in bondage even more savage persecution under rules framed to compel them to join in idolatrous religious ceremonies, and religious instruction, they saw the Government attempting to rob their children of their Faith. Remonstrance to the home authorities was long useless. Among the early Irish political felons transported to Botany Bay were three priests who had been sentenced for alleged complicity in the political troubles of 1798 in Ireland. These priests were Father James Harold, pastor of Rathcoole, Dublin; Father James Dixon, a native of Castlebridge, County Wexford; and Father Peter O’Neil, pastor of Ballymacoda, County Cork, a grand-uncle of the Fenian leader, Peter O’Neill Crowley, who was killed in the rising of 1867. Father O’Neil was not only sentenced on a trumped-up charge of sedition, but was most barbarously flogged before he left Ireland. The frequent remonstrances to the home authorities against the injustice of denying them the ministrations of their Faith had led to the granting to the governor in 1802 to allow one of these transported ecclesiastics to exercise his spiritual functions. Governor King accordingly designated, on 19 April, 1803, Father Dixon to take charge of the Catholic congregation, and under this government supervision the first Mass was said by him in Sydney, on Sunday, 15 May, 1803. The ceremony was made of tin by one of the convicts; the vestments were fashioned out of some old damask curtains. For a time there was no altar-stone, and the sacred oils had to be brought from Rio de Janeiro. The Holy See, in 1804, made Father Dixon Prefect Apostolic of this territory, then called New Holland, the first ecclesiastical appointment for the new church. Fathers O’Neil and Harold also received faculties from Rome. The former was allowed to return to Ireland 15 January, 1803, and the latter was sent to Tasmania, but there is no record that he was allowed to officiate there. The lack of toleration and the persistently circulated reports of bigoted fanaticism that the congregations at the Masses were gatherings of traitors and mere subterfuges of the Irish convicts to mature plans for another rebellion, the governor, before the close of 1804, revoked the permission for the celebration of Mass in the colony. Twenty-five lashes for the first, and fifty for the second absence, all the colonists without distinction were ordered to attend the Church of England service. Worn out by his long labour and hardships, Father Dixon returned, in 1808, to Ireland, where he died 4 January, 1840, in his eighty-second year, pastor of Crossabeg in the Diocese of Ferns.

In the archives of Propaganda at Rome there is a memorandum presented to the congregation, 28 August, 1816, by Reverend Richard Hayes, O.S.F., which begins: “The undersigned certifies that neither in the Colony of Sydney Cove, nor in any part of New Holland, is there at present any priest or Catholic Missionary.” Father Hayes’ brother, Michael, a native of Wexford, was there as one of those United Irishmen transported after the rebellion of 1798, and had sent word to Rome, where Father Hayes was residing in St. Isidore’s convent, of their spiritual destitution. The appeal for help was answered by a Cistercian Father, Jeremiah F. Flynn, who was then in Rome, after labouring for three years on the missions in the West Indies, part of the time under the direction of Archbishop Carroll of Baltimore. He volunteered to go to Australia, was secularized and appointed Prefect Apostolic of New Holland with faculties to administer the Sacraments of Confirmation. After some delay in getting enough funds for his outfit and a dispensation to the Government for an official sanction for his project, he set out without this permission and landed at Sydney, 14 November, 1817. Governor Macquarie, on whom he called the next day to ask permission to exercise his ministry, bluntly announced his determination not to support missionary activity on this Protestant colony, and ordered him to depart by the ship that brought him. On the pretext, therefore, that he had come to the colony without the sanction of the British authorities, Father Flynn was arrested shortly after his arrival and deported back to England. Previous to this, he had remained concealed for several weeks in the house of an Irishman named William Davis, who had been transported for making pikes for the insurgents of 1798, venturing forth only at night to minister to the faithful. He said Mass in the house, reserving the Blessed Sacrament in a cedar press. When he was arrested he was not allowed by the governor to return there, and the pyx with the Blessed Sacrament remained enshrined in the cedar press, guarded carefully by the pious Davis family and their friends for more than two years, until the next priests arrived in the colony. Davis later gave the house as a gift to the Catholic church at Surry Hills to the Rev. Mr. Barry, of St. Patrick’s church. He was flogged twice and then imprisoned for refusing to attend the Protestant services. At his death, 17 August, 1843, he was 78 years old.

The great Bishop John England of Charleston, U. S. A., who was then a pastor and a leader in the struggle for Catholic Emancipation in Ireland, was among those who interested themselves in bringing the persecution of the Australian Catholics to the attention of the authorities in England, and so great was the indignation aroused that the Government was forced to make provision for two Catholic chaplains to be sent to New South Wales. Fathers Philip Connolly, a native of Kildare, and John Joseph Therry, a native of Cork, at once volunteered and landed at Sydney, 4 May, 1820. Father Therry remained at Sydney and Father Connolly soon after proceeded to Hobart, Tasmania, where he arrived in March, 1821, and dedicated his first humble chapel to the Immaculate Conception. At not vast long, Father Connolly remained in charge until 1838 when he was transferred by Bishop Polding to be his representative and vicar-general in Tasmania. In 1832 there were from 16,000 to 18,000 Catholics in the colony of New South Wales, nearly all of them of Irish birth or descent. Dr. Ullin’s “History of the Church in Australia,” published in London, in 1837, set down the number of transported prisoners then in the colonies at 53,000. He was largely instrumental in bringing about a reform of the abuses of transportation and the prison system in the colonies, and during a visit to Ireland in 1839 secured several priests for the Australi-
moters of the progress of the Church in Australasia. From the first his main energy was constantly bent on the establishment of an Australian hierarchy. He sent a letter direct to the pope. "As in all new colonies," he tells the Holy Father, "so in this few subjects can be found for the priesthood for many years to come. As regards the objection," he replied, "that the bishops of Australia are all Irish it appears to me to have no solid foundation to rest upon; on the contrary any other course would be ridiculous. As a matter of fact the Catholic Europeans who form our congregations in Australia are, with very few exceptions, Irish. It must be added that the purport of the aforesaid objection is to introduce English instead of Irish bishops into the Australian Church, and hence the expediency of appointing Irish prelates becomes the more apparent, for every one is aware of the special antipathy of the English to the Irish. Right reverend Father in Dublin, Reverend Patrick Bonaventure Geoghegan, was the first pastor in Victoria and celebrated the first Mass in Melbourne on 19 May, 1839. In May, 1841, the number of Catholics there was 2073, and on St. Patrick's Day, 1843, the St. Patrick's Society had a parade of 150 members.

An Irishman, Thomas Poynton, was the first Catholic settler in New Zealand, where he took charge of a store and sawing station at Hokitika, in 1828. He had married at Sydney the daughter of a Wexford Irishman, Thomas Kennedy. In the course of time a daughter was born and the mother sent the child to Sydney to be baptized, a distance of 1000 miles. Their next child was a boy who was also taken to Sydney for baptism, but this time the ship went round by Hobart, and the distance was 2000 miles. Mr. Poynton himself made three visits to Sydney to try to get missionaries to devote themselves to the care of the New Zealand Catholics, and when the Marists and Bishop Pompallier finally did arrive there he was of much assistance to them. Among the settlers they ministered to was an Irishman named Cassidy who had married the daughter of a Māori chief.

In all this it can be seen how large a part Irishmen had in laying a foundation for the Church in Australasia. The details of their association with secular affairs are equally prominent and honourable. They contributed their share and more than their share in building up responsible governments in the four eastern States and in the culminating federation of the great Commonwealth on 1 January, 1901. In the development and solution of the important public issues of education, the tariff, vote by ballot, adult suffrage, the selection of land, agrarian legislation, the labour movement of 1877, Irish energy, executive ability, and political acumen, Irishmen contributed the most. It is only necessary to mention as types such men as Sir Charles Gavan-Duffy, Sir John O'Shanessy, Nicholas Fitzgerald, Augustus Leo Kenny, James Coghlan, M. O'Grady, Daniel Brophy, Sir Patrick Buckley, John Curnin, and Morgan S. Grace (see also lists in article AUSTRALIA). In the delegates to the three great Australasian Catholic Congresses (the first at Sydney in September, 1900, the second at Melbourne in 1904, and the third at Sydney in September, 1909), the numerical strength and influence of the Irish in Australia was amply evidenced. The million Catholics that the estimates for 1910 give to Australasia show without question that the early proportion of the Irish element is well maintained. Nor have they ever been forgetful of the land of their birth and their ancestors. In the famine years of the last century generous contributions were sent back to help the sufferers. The Hibbertian Australian Catholic Benevolent Society, founded in 1871, has many thousand members, and has spread to every state of the Commonwealth and to New Zealand. (See AUSTRALIA.)

Flies of the Freeman's Journal (Sydney); New Zealand Tablet (Wanganui); Advocate, Tribunus (Wellington); Southern Cross (Perth); Duffy, Life in Two Hemispheres (London, 1908), and the bibliography given with the article AUSTRALIA.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.
The presence of a battalion of the Irish Brigade in Canada between 1755 and 1760 has always been a moot topic. In his "Documentary History" O'Callaghan gives a letter of Doreil, the French Commissary General, to Count d'Argenson, Minister of War, in which he says that, "agreeably to the wish of the Marquis de Vaudreuil, Governor of New France, several battalions of reinforcements should be sent to Canada and among them one Irish battalion", that reason being that the Irish could be recruited from their fellow-countrymen already in Canada, or from deserters from the enemy. O'Farrell asserts that this battalion landed in Quebec on 29 June, 1755; but this is evidently an erroneous statement, for Doreil's appointment was not made until two months prior to the departure of the fleet, which he and de Vaudreuil accompanied to Canada. Three years later a "battalion of foreign volunteers"—possibly the Irish battalion suggested by Doreil—landed at Louisbourg, where they met officers in the French service with such names as Admiral Macnamara, Captain McCarty, M. de Hagerty, and others, who were then operating on Isle Royale. If, however, Irish soldiers were incorporated in the Béarn Regiment, as O'Callaghan supposes, they saw active service on four historic occasions: (1) on 8 September, 1755, under others had taken prisoners by the French; others were deserters from the English ranks. The President of the Navy Board, at Paris, in a letter to the Canadian Intendants, de la Galissonière and Hoqcourt, in 1748, wrote: "If the Irish Catholics, taken prisoners to Canada, ask to remain, the King of France sees no difficulty in their being allowed to do so. The manner in which the English treat their nation ought not to cause them to regret such a change." Desertion was a very common practice in the eighteenth century among the Irish soldiers who were pressed into the English service, and once engaged they were obliged to enlist. The author of "The Irish Brigade in the Service of France" gives instances of such desertions to the famous corps of their countrymen in France, where they might enjoy the exercise of their religion then interdicted in the British army, and further, "that they might obtain in battle some of the generous successes for the many oppressed and insults so long inflicted on their creed and race". The Protestant Lord Primate of Ireland, in a letter from Dublin, in 1730, to the Duke of Newcastle, wrote: "All recruits raised here are generally considered as such that may, some time or other, pay a visit to this country as enemies to their own nation. They are enlisted here... hope and wish to do so, there is no doubt." This spirit of retaliation will help to explain the presence of so many Irish deserters in Canada in the eighteenth century. They were so numerous, in fact, that they became a menace to British military efficiency in America. It was to the desertions of 'Irish papists' that Sir William Johnson, Agent General of Indian affairs, attributed the uneasiness existing among the Mohawks and other more westerly tribes who had remained loyal to the British. In a letter to the Lords of Trade, in London (28 May, 1756), he asked to be empowered to reward any Indians who would deliver up Irish soldiers who were living amongst them. Letters exist in the Archives of the Marine, in Paris, giving Irish soldiers permission to remain in Canada, or to return to France, where they might join their countrymen in the Canadian service. Many of these letters remain and settle in New France, where they would be safe from the law enforced by Britain, after the victory of Fontenoy, which stipulated that 'Irish officers and soldiers who had been in the service of France... should be disabled from holding any real or personal property, and the real or personal property should belong to the first Protestant discoverer'.
against him. However, owing to the precautions taken by the Irish soldiers to identify themselves with the French Canadian peasantry, there is no record of reprisals. The Irish settled down in the Province of Quebec and, while retaining their names, or French variations of them, they were in a few years absorbed by the number of persons who declared the case of Dr. Timothy O’Sullivan is typical. He was the son of a lieutenant-general in the army of James II, and had during sixteen years served as captain of dragoons among the Irish in Spain. In 1716 he started for Ireland with his regiment, but later the case of Dr. Timothy O’Sullivan is typical. He was the son of a lieutenant-general in the army of James II, and had during sixteen years served as captain of dragoons among the Irish in Spain. In 1716 he started for Ireland with his regiment, but later

Succeeding governors of Canada, especially Haldimand and Craig, were less accommodating to Catholics than Carleton, and it was not till the diplomatic and uncompromising Bishop Plessis, one of the illustrious figures in Canadian history, took up the struggle for the liberties of the Church, that Catholics began to breathe freely. This prelate succeeded in having the rights of the Church recognized, and left the way open for the immigration to Canada of Catholics of every nationality. When he visited the Upper St. Lawrence, on a pastoral tour, in 1816, he found seventy-five Catholic families in the neighbourhood of Kingston, among them twenty Scotch and Irish, and others as far west as Niagara. Ferland tells us that during the summer of 1820 over thirty families arrived from Quebec and Ireland. They had hoped to better their condition by emigrating, but, owing to the unsettled condition of the country and the stagnation of business, they failed miserably. These poor exiles were in the direst poverty, and, as winter was approaching, the noble-hearted Bishop Plessis wrote a touching letter to his parish priests in their favour.

Meanwhile groups of Irish colonists had begun to arrive and settle in Upper Canada and in the Maritime Provinces. In 1830, a Talbot, a Malarkey, more particularly the desire to control the “Paradise of the Hurons” he had read about in Charlevoix, secured six hundred and eighty thousand acres in Western Ontario and gradually opened this vast district to settlement. Talbot was one of the first to draw his countrymen to that province. In 1830 Peter Robinson began to work on similar lines north of Lake Ontario. He brought two thousand colonists and located them along the banks of the Otonabee, in the neighbourhood of Peterboro. Other groups continued to arrive from time to time to strengthen the Irish element; between 1830 and 1850 two hundred thousand settled in Ontario; and in several counties the Irish still predominate. The Nova Scotia Archives show that Irish settlers were numerous in this province, many of whom were undoubtedly disbanded soldiers of the Cornwallis Regiment. Shortly after the treaty of 1763, Irish Scotch-Canadians had settled in Windsor, Truro, Londonderry, and other inland points, where their descendants may still be found. Although the intolerant laws of England were still in force against Catholics, the provincial governors showed themselves more or less conciliatory to the proscribed religion, and in 1818, continued to increase in numbers. The appointment of a vicar Apostolic for Nova Scotia, in 1818, prov
that they were already numerous enough to need episcopal care. Bishop Plessis has left us some edifying pages in his "Journal" on the Catholicity of the Irish colony in Halifax in 1815, and the warm receptions he met with from the Irish during his tour along the coast of Nova Scotia.

He was separated from Nova Scotia in 1784, when the United Empire Loyalists, among whom were a few Protestant Irish, began to arrive. The records of this Province reveal the presence of Irish Catholics even in the early years of the nineteenth century. The Bishop of Quebec found about twenty families at St. John in 1815, and he named St. Malachy as titular of the small church they were about completing there. Immigration to New Brunswick did not start in earnest until after 1830, when the Irish began to carve out homes for themselves along the beautiful St. John River and the shores of the Bay of Fundy, where their descendants are now prosperous. Prince Edward Island, or Isle St-Jean, as it was originally called, was ceded to Great Britain and made a separate province in 1769. It was first settled by the French, but in 1772 MacDonald of Glenaladale brought his hardy Scottish Highlanders over, who took up land in the colony. A few Irish, from Ireland and Newfoundland, also settled in Charlottetown during the closing years of that century. According to the Abbé de Calonne, a French missionary working among them, they had neither social nor political influence. This was natural and yet it was not for the best of the British authorities, the first governor, Patterson, would have changed the name of the island from Isle St-Jean to New Ireland. Irish Catholics continued to arrive every year in groups and singly, and settled on farms and in the growing centres of population. Some of the most distinguished names in the history of Prince Edward Island are found among those early settlers. Manitoba and the Northwest Territories were then, and for many years later, an unknown land as far as the Irish were concerned.

Emigration from Ireland to Canada continued in earnest between 1820 and 1850. Davin asserts that in the two years following 1832 over eighty thousand Irish landed on Canadian soil, and proportionate numbers continued to arrive every season in sailing vessels, wooden tubs most of them that had been used in the Canadian lumber trade. According to the report of the Agent for Emigrants, in the ten years ending 1839, 164,593 Irish emigrated and a convenient stopping place on the way to the Far West'. Thousands, however, made their homes in Lower Canada. A writer in the "Dublin Review" (Oct., 1837) asserts that even then the Irish were an influential body in Quebec and Montreal, and that in the troubles leading up to the Insurrection of 1837 they threw in their influence with the French Canadians and the House of Assembly against the oligarchy that were trying to withhold responsible government.

The cholera epidemic of 1832 wrought havoc among the Irish as well as the French, but the year 1847 will always stand out in the history of the Irish in Canada. In the summer of that year, one hundred thousand men, women, and children, fleeing from famine and death in Ireland, "were stricken with fever and were lying helpless in the seaports and riverports of Canada". Thousands of those unhappy people died and found only graves where they had hoped to find peace and plenty. Rarely in the annals of a civilized nation have such scenes been witnessed as those enacted, during the eventful summer of 1847, among the fever-stricken Irish in all the quarantine stations along the St. Lawrence and at other points in Canada. Numbers of heroic priests and nuns faced death to bring the sick to the stations, and the Irish, conscious of past wrongs, and forced to abandon their beloved homeland, were yet confident of suc-

cess in their fight for existence, if only the chances were given them, but who found themselves, on the threshold of their new home, facing a struggle with disease and death. The official figures tell us that in 1847 four thousand one hundred and ninety-two died at sea, four thousand five hundred and seventy-nine died at Groose Isle, seven hundred and five thousand three hundred and thirty at Montreal, seventy-one at St. John, N. B., one hundred and thirty at Lachine, eight hundred and sixty-three in Toronto, three thousand and forty-eight at other places in Ontario, but, owing to the circumstances of the time and the dearth of accurate statistics, these figures are hardly reliable. Other and more trustworthy reports declare that the number of the dead and buried on Groose Isle alone exceeded ten thousand, while Dr. Douglas, a medical superintendent of the time, estimated that at least eight thousand had been buried at sea. The survivors of the famine years—the few who still survive—recall with tears the memory of those scenes witnessed in their early childhood; and yet what seemed an irreparable disaster only proved, as in so many other instances in the history of the Irish race, to be a triumph of the patience of their land and history has not failed to record it. The Irish, in 1847, brought their Catholic traditions with them across the Atlantic, and in those moments of direst sorrow and misery it was their religion that buoyed them up. It will ever be to their glory that, far from yielding to despair at the sacrifices demanded, they accepted them with sublime resignation, and went to their death blessing the Hand that smote them. A Celtic cross, fitting symbol of Erin and her undying faith, was raised during the summer of 1909, on Groose Isle, by the Ancient Order of Hibernians, to recall the victims of the fever years and the heroism of those who assisted them.

The holocaust of 1847 threw thousands of Irish children on the charity of the public. Those of them who were without friends and relatives were adopted by French Canadians, and were, with all tenderness and sympathy, reared to manhood and womanhood. They learned the language of their foster parents, and, as their forebears, the Irish soldiers in the eighteenth century, had done, they married into French families and became identified with the French, very often revealing their origin only in their Celtic names. Their Celtic blood, however, was inflamed with that spirit of patriotism generously infused into the dominant French race, proved a rare asset to this older people living along the banks of the St. Lawrence, and was a noble influence. But this Irish element was not confined to the Irish alone, and was the indirect result of social stagnation consequent on the Confederation Act of 1867.

These figures show an increase in thirty years of 142,307. In 1871 there were still 219,451 persons who had been born in Ireland; in 1901 there were only 101,820, a number greater than ten times the emigration from Canada, of 117,822 in the foreign-born Irish population. As the emigration from Ireland...
land in those thirty years was inappreciable, the approximate figures of the native Irish-born population between 1871 and 1901 was 142,307 + 117,822 = 260,129. This shows that what the Irish element at home and in the Province during the period named, it gained in Ontario and the West. Owing to the strides which Canada is making in development, the census of 1911 will undoubtedly show an increase in the Irish population far greater than that of 1901.

The Irish-born in Canada, who now number about three-quarters of a million, are fully organized both socially and religiously. They have their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>20,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>100,643</td>
<td>83,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>62,851</td>
<td>54,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>559,442</td>
<td>624,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>123,478</td>
<td>114,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Territories</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unorganized Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>846,414</td>
<td>988,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

churches, schools, convents, colleges, orphanages, etc., many of them imposing-looking institutions. They have their bishops, priests, and their teaching and charity orders of both sexes. They have their fraternal societies of all kinds. They have their writers and their ably edited newspapers. They are represented in every avenue of public life. In commerce and in the industries the same year Irish students share to the wealth of the Canadian nation. Some of the most eminent members of the legal and medical professions in Canada, during the last fifty years, have been, and are still, Irish Catholics; several of them have been knighted for eminence in their respective callings. The Irish have had their governors of provinces, cabinet ministers, senators, members of both the Federal and Provincial Parliaments, and they are still well represented in these functions in the government of the country. Thomas d’Arcy McGee asserted forty years ago that, since 1792, London was a Catholic city now without an Irishman in its legislative councils. This tradition is kept up not merely in old Quebec, but in the sister provinces and in the Federal Parliament at Ottawa. An Irish Catholic is (1910) Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and Deputy Governor-General of the Dominion.

Daven, The Irishmen in Canada (London, 1877); O’Callaghan, Documentary History of the State of New York, X (Albany, 1858); O’Callaghan, The Irish Brigade in the Service of France (New York, 1874); Maguire, The Irish in America (London, 1877); Report of the Canadian Archives (Ottawa, 1861); MacMillan, The Life History of Prince Edward Island (Quebec, 1908); The Canada Year Book (Ottawa, 1908); Vie de Madame d’Youville (Ville Marie, 1852); Ferland, Biographical Dictionary of Quebec, Quebec, 1864; Tarte, Journal des visites pastorales de Mgr. Plenien (Quebec, 1864); Alleeau, L’Eglise Catholique au Canada (Quebec 1909); MacKethan, History of Western Canada (Toronto, 1910); Laut, The Conquest of the Great Northwest (2 vols., 1879).

E. J. DEVINE.

IV. IN GREAT BRITAIN.—England and Wales.

Mr. Joseph Cowen has called the Ireland of the sixth century “Christian Greece.” Irish monks from Iona repeated in England their work in Alba. Irish soldiers helped Athelstan to victory in 937. Early in the eleventh century Irish merchants were trading with Bristol. There, in 1247, died O’Murray, Bishop of Kilmainham, who died in his See. He remained in residence at Oxford, where, said Newman, “there was from the earliest time even a street called ‘Irishman’s Street.’” Later, a Bishop of Meath died at Oxford. A native of Dundalk, Fitz-Ralph, was Chancellor of Oxford in 1333. While the Gaelic-Irish followed the fortunes of Wallace and of Bruce, the Norman-Irish fought for the English against Scotland, 1296–1314. Thence for 400 years the Irish helped England in her continental wars.

Up to the middle of the sixteenth century there was no Irish colony in Great Britain. Then Irish traders began to settle in London and Bristol. Leland, in 1545, wrote of Liverpool: “Irish marchants come much thither as to a good haven. . . Good marchants at Lyrlplye and more Irishmen than Marchester men do buy there.” Irish music had also found favour in England. The Earl of Worcester, writing, in 1602, to the Earl of Shrewsbury, said: “Irish tunes are this time most pleasing.” Pistol’s “Calino custore me” (Henry V, Act IV, sc. 4) has been explained as Colleen agus eto (young girl, my treasures). From some dialect in the plays of this period, Knight thinks that these ostermanners were largely Irish. Among the martyrs of Elizabeth’s reign were some Irish-born. James I severely penalized in Ireland his mother’s religion. A Catholic landowner was prohibited from appointing a guardian for his heir, who, through the Court of Wards, was under the control of Protestant noblemen. Early in his reign there were 300 of such children in the Tower of London, and at the Lambeth schools. After the Act of Settlement two-thirds of the fertile land passed into Protestant hands. In 1651, Hawdon, Governor of Dublin, reported that, “in Dublin there was no man who dare speak with Papists, he knew there now but one, a surgeon and a sensible man.” Referring to 1699, Lord Clare (speech on the Union) declared: “So that the whole of your island has been confiscated, with the exception of the estates of five or six families.”—“Such of the Roman Catholic gentry as had retained their estates were stripped of all political and many civic rights, and left virtually at the mercy of a Protestant enemy” (Bryce). To provide for the education of emigrating sons consequent upon this state of things, Irish colleges were founded in several parts of the Continent. Thence they joined the armies and political life of the nations in which they were educated, some reaching high positions as officers and statesmen. Thus the idea of emigration was created.

In Charles I’s reign ambassadors of foreign powers only were allowed in England to have Catholic chaplains. It was in this reign that the Chapel in Lincoln’s Inn Fields gathered the first considerable Irish colony in London. By 1666, the year of the great fire, a considerable importation of cattle from Ireland to England was going on. To relieve the distress in London a gift of 15,000 bullocks was sent over from Ireland. Ludovic Barry, the first Irish dramatist to write in English, Sir James Ware, the antiquarian, MacFhibs, the last of the Irish annalists, Denham, Rosecommon, and Flecknoe, poets, Cherry, actor and poet, Arthur Murphy, lawyer, dramatist, and editor, and Barry, the painter, were Catholics among the many Irishmen, eminent in science, art, and literature, living in England in the seventeenth century. The comparative fewness of Catholics among these is explained by the fact that the penal laws made learning a crime. “The avowed policy of the [English] Cabinet was to discourage the teaching of the Irish ‘better orders’ in Ireland. . . . They passed out of the country’s ken and became aliens” (Bridges). The difficulty of recruiting sufficient men for the British Army and Navy; the investment abroad of money by Irish Catholics (it being illegal to invest it in Irish land), money which Protestant landowners could have profitably used, the success of the American War of Independence, and possibly ideas of liberty and toleration caught from the French Revolution made for some relaxation of the penal code. The first Relief Bill came to England in 1778 when there were about 60,000 Catholics there, of
whom from 6000 to 8000 were Irish, mostly resident in London. An Irish Relief Bill did not follow until 1793. During the eighteenth century there was a considerable trade between Whitehaven and Ulster, and the Old Catholic mission of St. Begh, Whitehaven, dates from 1706. Hawkers and labourers at this time were frequently passing through London for the Kent hop-pickings. At Croydon Assize, 1767, an Irish priest, Moloney, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment for a libel on his father-in-law, John Chapel, Lumber St., Liverpool, an Irish priest, Anthony Carroll, served from 1759 to 1766. Another Irish priest, Father P. O'Brien, was there from 1760 to 1770. The mission of St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, dates from 1766, when an Irish priest, Father T. Walsh, hired a room in which to say Mass. In 1782, Froude, writing of 1783, said, "Half the inhabitres of this country were Catholics"", and inferred that they were mostly Irish.

Consequent upon the removal of the seat of government at the Union, there was less inducement for men of political instincts, social ambition, or intellectual activities, to remain in Ireland. "Until the Catholic question was no longer a question in Ireland. Before the County and District Councils of 1898 there was neither local nor national self-government to attract the first; the absenteeism of richer men baffled the second; death of general higher education and learned distinction was felt by the third. Ireland lost the creative power of a native aristocracy, intellectual, financial, or social. Hence her genius were induced, more and more, to ally themselves to England. But this exile was not of the nobility only. In 1803 a report of a secret Commission of the House of Commons described London and other large English towns as honeycombed with secret societies in communication with the disaffected elements in Ireland. This closing of avenues of distinction; the restriction of industry and trade arising from the Penal Laws, the famines of 1817 and 1822, impelled an increasing emigration, which the famine of 1845-46, the "Irish Rev. 45", made a permanent factor in national life. England from 1851 to 1898, drained away 4,126,310 souls, or half the national population. In 1846, with only 65 miles of railways, Ireland had a population of 300 to the square mile. "Nearly half as many again as the purely agricultural districts of England support at the present time." In 1807, these emigrants were, naturally, poor. Those who came to the nearest lands, England and Scotland, were the poorest of the poor, being those who had not the means to reach far. From this cause, they were not a political element, the Gallican Church praised the number of the London-Irish coster girls and lads. Illicit connexions were, he says, the exception rather than the rule among them. Partly from these immigrants, partly for them, a large body of Irish priesthood accumulated in both countries, who, with insignificant clergy, devoted themselves to the humblest and most trying duties of their ministry. Each educated men, in many cases highly gifted, lived outwardly inglorious lives amid surroundings of the squalor, ignorance, and vice that seem inevitable in cities of our civilization. The examples of strenuous faith, of fearless Catholicism, of active piety, which this large body of men have must impress upon their English and Scots coreligionists, unquestionably deepened and was not the growth of Catholicism in "their islands. They, it has been well said, the most successful missionaries of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century. Railway development, the rise of manufacturing towns and of commercial cities, were powerful attractions to the Irish poor. Curiously enough, see, those Irishmen who had settled in an agricultural country settle in agricultural districts."

Politically, the Irish in England scarcely emerged from non-recognition under O'Connell's appeal to moral force in his agitation for Repeal. Their political awakening was not even complete under the call of Young Ireland to a more active force. Signs of life were visible among the Irish as their eyes were opened to the idea of moral force only, advanced by Isaac Butt in his Home Rule scheme in 1870—an idea broadly, but less pacifically, followed by Parnell. It is significant of this increase of political power of the Irish in England that it was the Liberal Government of 1886 that made the Butt with Parnell. Concurrent with it was the Irish National Land League originated by Michael Davitt, who, as a former worker in the cotton mills of Lancashire, was very popular with the Irish workers in England. The Irish labor of Great Britain the two facts of the Irish party have a most powerful organization, with ramifications everywhere.

From its situation Liverpool would have a large poor Irish population. In 1788-89 there were 260 Catholic baptisms out of 2332, i.e. 11.4 per cent. Approximately, the Catholic population of Liverpool in 1788 was 6916; in 1811, 21,359; in 1829, 50,000. (In 1804 there were only 12,000 to 15,000 Catholics in London.) In 1841 the Irish-born in Great Britain numbered 419,256; in 1851 there were 519,959, of whom 213,907 were in Scotland. It has been claimed that "the outward sign of the great impetus given to Catholicism in Great Britain by the immigration from Ireland and the reformation of the Catholic Church in England". It was therefore appropriate that the first head of the restored hierarchy should be a son of Irish parents. The present Archbishop of Westminster is of Irish descent, and is also his bishop auxiliary and vicar-general and one of his canons. In 1853 Irish patrons took the title of St. of int. Sheffield. Later they had a training college at Hammersmith. At present the Irish province has two houses in England. In this year there were 41,400 Catholics, mostly Irish, in the British Army, and a quarter of the Navy was estimated as Irish Catholics. In 1802 the Forty Hours was first work- ing in Hereford. In 1818 the census for the Parliamentary Borough of Manchester gives 84 per cent of its population as Irish (12,750 out of 393,380). In 1905 the Catholic population of Great Britain was 2,130,100, of which 400,000 was in Scotland. In 1908 the Catholic population of England had increased to 1,767,100, with one of its bishops Irish-born and two others of Irish descent. Irish Sisters of Charity are in the Diocese of Westminster and of Shrewsbury, and Irish Christian Brothers are at Bristol. Conferences are officially announced as heard in Irish in the Dioceses of Westminster, Cheltenham, Clifton, and Salford (bishops' churches). Of the 177 rural churches, chapels, and stations in England 48 (24 per cent) are dedicated to Irish saints, of which 42 are under St. Patrick.

Though the impress of the early Catholic Irish set-tlers on the social, political, and artistic life of Eng-
The percentages of Irish-born to the whole population of England and Wales were 2.9 in 1851; 2.1 in 1861; 2.2 in 1871; 2.1 in 1881; 1.6 in 1891; 1.3 in 1901.

Scotland. — The earliest authentic record of emigration from Ireland to Scotland is to Argyle, about the year 258 fighting men who helped kindred tribes in Alba against Roman invaders. The See of the Isles is said to have been founded by St. Patrick about 447. Irish missionaries followed. In 503 Prince Pervigus left Ireland to help the Scots of Alba against the Picts. His colony became the basis of a kingdom. In 565 St. Columba from Donegal passed into Scotland, labouring in Iona for thirty-five years. He celebrated his declaration against Scots paying tribute to Irish kings practically established the Scottish nation. The Scots of Alba tempered their prowess by religious fervour. One of the baptisms was that of the baptismal name Malcolm; i.e. "Servant of Columba." By the ninth century the Scots were politically a distinct people, though the hierarchy of Northern Ireland kept an ecclesiastical protectorate over Iona later than 1203. Intercourse between Ireland and Scotland in the thirteenth century is seen in the election of Donnell O'gheathe to chieftainship (1258), who, having lived in Scotland, spoke Albanian Gaelic. In 1495 Hugh Roe O'Donnell visited James IV in Scotland, concluding with him an offensive and defensive covenant. Through harpers and pipers Irish music penetrated into Scotland. "...and harpers as also the words, of Maggy Laidir... is Irish." Robin Adair is the Irish "Alleen Aroon"; "John Anderson, my Jo" is at least an echo of "Cruiksein Lawn".

The General Assembly of 1608 proposed to James "that the sons of noblemen professing popery should be committed to the custody of their friends as are sound in religion," which was effectively done. In 1785 Irish fishermen "were brought from Ireland to teach the natives of Uist the manufacture of kelp from seaweed. Others were brought to the Shetlands because of their dexterity in fishing. The inhabitants of Barra learned fish curing from the Irish fishermen."

When Betoun, the last archbishop of the ancient Scottish hierarchy, went into exile (1560), English archpriests had jurisdiction over Scotland. On his death, in 1603, the hierarchy came to an end. In 1623 Gregory XV established a prefecture for Scotland. In 1631 the Irish Bishop of Down and Connor, Magennis, was put over the Scottish mission by Urban VIII. The second in succession from him was an Irish Franciscan, Patrick Hogarty (1640). In 1652 two Irish Vincentians, Fras. D'Arcy and Robert White, went as missionaries to Scotland. The former worked for six years in the Hebrides, being very successful in Uist and Barra. In this latter place legends still exist of the curious miracles said to have been worked by him. Father White gave seventeen years to the Eastern Highlands. In 1715 there were about 40 Catholics in Glasgow. In 1779 Scotland had one bishop and some 17,000 Catholics. In 1793 the first Relief Bill for Catholics was passed.

In 1800 there were three bishops, forty priests, twelve churches, and about 30,000 Catholics. In 1814 the Scotch had the free exercise of their religion. St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh dates from 1814; St. Andrew's Glasgow from 1816. Glasgow, the city of St. Mungo (the Irish St. Kentigern), ground hallowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>163,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>60,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>33,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>39,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>38,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>13,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>348,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumb.</td>
<td>28,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>6443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>3657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>3353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herts.</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex (Ex.)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>6367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcesters.</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs.</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkh.</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worchesters.</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and was absolutely nil, the influence of the Irish-born or Irish descendants of to-day is important. Of such is the Church are one archbishop and four bishops (and titulars), two abbots, a prior, two rectors of colleges, two provincials, an administrator of a cathedral, the preacher of the "Papal Sermon" at the Vatican Congress, and several prelates of considerable number.

In the State: A Groom, and also a Lord, in waiting to the king, Somerset Herald, twenty-four army officers, five M. P.'s, three in the higher Civil Service, two County-Court judges, seven J. P.'s, four Aldermen, two superintendents of Scotland Yard. Referring only to those of academic position, there are in science, three orators, a portrait painter, two other artists; one musician; five actors and actresses; two singers in opera. In medicine, a king's physician and thirteen eminent practitioners. In letters, the founder and first editor of "The Windsor Magazine"; now editor of "Cassell's Magazine"; editors of five other newspapers, etc.; forty-four writers, novelists, authors, nine journalists; and many members of educational, and county, councils.

Assuming that the bulk of Irish residents in England are Catholic, the following statistics have interest. (The latest census returns are made up to 1901.)

The distribution of 348,685 (or 82 per cent) of the Irish-born inhabitants of England and Wales in 1901 was:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>163,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>60,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>33,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>39,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>38,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>13,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>348,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumb.</td>
<td>28,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>6443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>3657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>3353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex (Ex.)</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>6367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcesters.</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs.</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkh.</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worchesters.</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks.</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRISH

by the footsteps of St. Columba, in the early part of this century doubled its population in twenty years, largely caused by immigration from Ireland, a Scottish writer says. In 1829 there were 70,000 Catholics in Scotland, of whom 20,000 were in Glasgow. In 1851 Glasgow had 80,000 Catholics, of whom 62,925 were Irish. In the same year 11-34 per cent of the population of Paisley was Irish. In 1854 an Irish Vincentian, Father J. Myers, had charge of St. Mary's, Lanark. Five years later the Irish province established a house at Lanark. They have still a house in Scotland. In 1860 the Irish Catholics of Glasgow, with their priests, were much dissatisfaction with the system in which ecclesiastical patronage was distributed. Much of the friction between the Irish and Scots Catholics ensued. The vicar of the Western District, Murdoch, carried the matter to Rome and, after an energetic struggle, won; shortly after this he died (1866), and his successor, Grey, received an Irish Vincentian, Father J. Lynch, as coadjutor. Schism threatening, Grey resigned, and Lynch was transferred to Limerick. Mgr. Eyre, promoted Apostolic delegate, succeeded to the Western Vicariate, and at last secured peace. It was during this turmoil that the Irish party first raised a cry for the restoration of the hierarchy, which had been suppressed in 1835. In 1867 the Cavan and Leitrim district of Ireland was established as a diocese. In 1874 there were 300,000 Catholics in Scotland. Today there are 518,960 of whom 380,000 are in Glasgow. Mackintosh, a non-Catholic historian, says: "The Roman Catholics in recent years have relatively increased more than any other denomination."

Of the 398 Catholic churches, chapels, and stations in Scotland in 1909, 36 (or 9-75 per cent) are dedicated to Irish saints. Of these, 12 are under the name of St. Patrick. Of the 13 priests ordained in Scotland in 1909 there were three Irish-born and one of Irish descent. One of Scotland's two archbishops is of Irish descent. The Scottish political movements noted in England apply, mutatis mutandis, to Scotland; but the social and artistic impress of Irishmen is less marked than in England. By a papal decree of 15 Dec., 1909, the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Scotland is now tolerated.

Assuming that the majority of Catholics in Scotland are Irish, the following tables are of interest. In 1901 the total Irish-born population of Scotland was 205,064, being 4,885 per cent of the population. Of the town population, 5,434 or 2,4 per cent of the country population, 2,980 per cent, and distributed as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shetland</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>Stirling</th>
<th>4,639</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dumbarton</td>
<td>9,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross and Cromarty</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Renfrew</td>
<td>25,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Lanark</td>
<td>121,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nairn</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Linlithgow</td>
<td>4,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>11,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincardine</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Peebles</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfar</td>
<td>5,802</td>
<td>Selkirk</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackmannan</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>Wigtown</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BELLEHEIM, Hist. of Oath Ch. in Scotland, IV (Edinburgh, 1850); MACCARTHY, Hist. of Cath. Ch. in the Nineteenth Century, II (Dublin, 1909); O'BRIEN, Two Centuries of Irish History, 1821-1870 (London, 1908); and its Undying (London, 1908); DENVER, The Irish in Britain (London, 1892); BOSTOCK, St. Vincent de Paul and the Vincentians in France, England, and Scotland, and England and Wales (London, 1901); Census for Scotland (London, 1901); Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland (Dublin, 1899-1900); Catholic Directory for Scotland, Glasgow, 1884; Statesman's Year Book (London, 1910); The Catholic Who's Who (London, 1910.)

V. IN SOUTH AFRICA.—The Catholics of South Africa are for the most part Irish, or of Irish descent. They do not form a large proportion of the general population, and the tide of Irish emigration has set chiefly towards America and Australia. Leaving out of account the missions stations founded for work among the native population, it may be said that the distribution of the Catholic churches throughout South Africa roughly indicates the chief centres where Irishmen are to be found, and the growth of the Catholic organization in the South African colonies has run on parallel lines with the increase of the Irish Catholic population. When Bishop Ulalthorne touched at Cape Town, in 1832, on his way to Australia, he found there "but a few Catholics in the strict sense." The statistical of 1909 show that there were in South Africa in that year 298 priests and 1929 religious, men and women. Repeated attempts to gain a footing for Catholicism in South Africa had ended in a dismal failure. But in 1837 a new era began when the Holy See separated the South African colonies from the Vicariate Apostolic of the Mauritius and sent as vicar Apostolic to Cape Town an Irish Dominican, the Rt. Rev. Patrick R. Griffith. Bishop Griffith's successors at Cape Town to the present day have all been Irishmen (Thomas Grimeley, consecrated 1850; John O'Farrell, consecrated 1884), and most of the churches in Cape Colony have been founded by Irish priests. Irishmen form about 90 per cent of the Catholic population of the Colony.

In 1847 Plus IX divided South Africa into the Western Vicariate (Cape Town and district) and the Eastern Vicariate (Eastern Cape Colony, Natal, etc.). Natal was erected into a separate vicariate three years later. After the rush to the diamond-fields had brought many Irish Catholics into the district, Kimberley was erected into a vicariate in 1886, and now includes the Orange River Colony. There were very few Catholics in the Transvaal and Natal prior to 1890; but when the Rand goldfield brought a rush of Irish immigrants to what is now Johannesburg. Until 1885 the handful of Catholics in the Republic were attached to the Natal Vicariate. The Transvaal was then made a prefecture Apostolic. It was erected into a separate vicariate in 1904, when an Irish prelate, the Rt. Rev. W. Miller, O.M.I., was consecrated. Natal and Rhodesia is a prefecture Apostolic which has grown out of the Zambesi mission, founded by the Jesuits before the coming of the pioneers of the South African Company brought with it an influx of white settlers. Basutoland is another prefecture, but here there is a very limited white population, the Basutos having preserved a semi-independence under the supervision of a British "resident". The Vicariate Apostolic of the Orange River, erected in 1901, is another district which has a scattered white population living in a thinly populated country, where the mission stations have mainly to do the work. Mission stations include the north-west and part of the centre of Cape Colony, its northern boundary being the lower course of the Orange River. It is interesting to note that the Church obtained its first foothold in this district in 1873, when the Cape Government handed over to Catholic missionaries a mission station in Namaqualand, which had been abandoned by the Protes-
tant Rhenish Society during the Bushman insurrec-
tions.

The census of Cape Colony, 1904, states the total population as 2,409,804, of whom 579,741 were whites. The religious census gives the total Catholic population as 37,069, of whom 28,480 were whites. This latter figure includes Catholic soldiers in garrison. Taking 90 per cent as the proportion of Irish Catholics, the total for the two vicariates (Western and Eastern) would be about 25,000. A large proportion of the priests and religious are Irish, and it has already been mentioned that the Vicar Apostolic of Cape Town is an Irish prelate. So is the Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District at Port Elizabeth, the Rt. Rev. Hugh McCaffrey. Of the other fourteen priests and about half of the nuns and Christian brothers (167) are Irish. The nuns are mostly engaged in teaching. The Sisters of Nazareth have a house at Johannesburg.

In the scattered mission districts of the Orange River Vicariate there are very few Irish Catholics. There are perhaps twenty of them in the small white population of Basutoland. In Rhodesia there are about seven hundred. One hears of them from time to time in the narratives of the Jesuit missionaries published in the "Zambesi Mission Record". In remote regions of the mission in its earlier days the Jesuits often came upon them and were gladly received by an Irish missionary, inspector or a trooper of the mounted police. When William Woodbye was pioneering and prospecting in Mashonaland, his wagon was often for weeks at a time the centre of operations of a Jesuit missionary.

Among notable Irish Catholics in South Africa may be mentioned Sir Michael Gallewy, a lawyer of marked ability, and for many years Chief Justice of Natal; the Hon. A. Wilmot, K.G., who is Irish on the mother's side; Mr. Justice Sheil, one of the judges of Cape Colony; Sir William St. John Carr of Johannesburg; the Hon. John Daverin, M.L.C.; and Mr. Beaucleir Wippington, M.L.A., who has been the most prominent of the "Zambesi Mission Record" (monthly). The leading colleges and convent boarding-schools have their school magazines. The "Catholic Directory for British South Africa", issued annually from the Salesian Press, Cape Town, since 1904, forms a valuable aid.

The above article is based on the official census returns and on detailed communications kindly supplied to the writer by the Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District of Cape Colony, Kimberley, and Natal. A. HILLAGT ATERIDGE.

VI. IN SOUTH AMERICA.—In the records of the Latin republics of South America there is ample evidence of the tradition of the sons of St. Patrick to assimilate themselves with whatever peoples their lot may be presently cast. A number of them took a leading part in the establishment of the independence of several of these governments, and their names are enshrined among the titular heroes of these nations.

In Paraguay, in 1555, there was a revolution headed by one Nicholas Colman. He is reputed to have been a Celt, but the records are not definite. Remembering how intimated, from a remote period, were the social and commercial relations between Ireland and Spain, the parent of most of the South American republics, it is not too much to say that, even in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries so many Irish soldiers of fortune, and missionaries, and adventurers found their way across the ocean to the banks of the Amazon and the Plate. Ignoring Colman's claim as the pioneer, the first Irishman whose name appears without contradiction in South American history is the Jesuit Father Thomas Field, who
was born in Limerick in 1549, and spent ten years in Brazil and forty in the famous missions of Paraguay, of which, with Father de Ortega, he was the founder. At one time he was the only missionary in all Paraguay, and he lived there longer than any other member of his order. Father Thomas Field's parents were William Field, a physician, and his wife Janet Creagh. He was educated by Jesuits for three years at Louvain, and then entered the Society of Jesus at Rome, 6 October, 1574. After six months in the novitiate he showed such progress and solidity of virtue that he was allowed to volunteer for the missions in Brazil. Leaving Rome on 28 April, 1575, he reached his destination in 114 days. He took the Convent of Tucumán in Nuestra Señora la Granada, and then proceeded to Lima, where he remained two years, mainly at Coimbra. He arrived in Brazil in 1577, and in the records thereonforward his name is usually found transformed into "Filde". Here, under the guidance of the venerable Father Joseph Ancheta, the Apostle and Thadmaurges of Brazil, he took the spiritual care of his flock, and was selected to go to evangelize Tucumán and Paraguay.

Father Ancheta, in his "Annual Letter" to his superiors for the year 1581, says: "There are three fathers in Paraguay who it appears have been sent from the Congregation of Tucumán, and are bringing many thousands of barbarians to the fold of Christ, a work in which they are much helped by their knowledge of the Guarani language." And the "Letters" for 1592 and 1594 say: "Father Solano sent Fathers de Ortega and Filde to the Guarani, and it is known that they converted more than two thousand of them." "Father Thomas Filde and Father de Ortega were sent into the province of Guayrá, which lies between Paraguay and Brazil. They have a residence established at Villa Rica, and from thence they go out in missions to give spiritual help to the inhabitants. They are followed and served by them the Biaegaros, a nation of ten thousand cannibals. The two missionaries remained in Guayrá for eight years and then proceeded to Asunción." In the early part of 1605, Father Filde was the only Jesuit left in all Tucumán and Paraguay. During the thirteen years he toiled in these missions it is estimated that Father Filde and his companions baptized 150,000 Indians. It was at the village of Pirapó, that, on 2 July, 1610, 200 of these converts were gathered and formed by Father Machet Catalino into "Loretto", the first of the historic "Reductions", and the model for all the subsequent communities that made up the "Cape Province". In 1607 Father Filde was made the teacher of Guarani and other Indian languages to the young Jesuits who were being trained for the missions. In the catalogue of Irish Jesuits for 1617, Father "Thomas Field" is set down as being in Paraguay. He died at Asunción in 1620, retaining an extraordinary physical vigour to the end, in spite of heroic mortifications and zeal for souls.

With this illustrious pioneer, the record, honourable in all its details, of the Irish element in the Latin American countries begins. Its ramifications are as extended as they are curious and unexpected. At the period preceding the wars of independence of the Latin American countries with Spain, the most notable fact is the presence of Irish-born viceroys governing Mexico, Peru, and Chile for Spain. There were eight Irish regiments in the Spanish service at the opening of the eighteenth century. At its close the Napoleonic wars brought Spain as an ally of France under the new Richmond English schemes for the suppression of her South American power house and the emancipation from her rule of the several colonies there. In the invading as well as in the colonial armies Irish soldiers were conspicuous. It was then that the foundations of the chief Irish colony, that of the Argentine Republic, were laid. In 1765 a Captain MacNamara, with two partners, took Colonia (in front of Buenos Aires) from the Spaniards. His ship caught fire, and he, and all but 78 of his crew of 262, were lost. The saved were in large part Irish who settled down in the country and became the progenitors of many families with Celtic patronymics still to be found in the Argentine rural provinces. On 24 June, 1806, General William Carr Beresford, an illegitimate son of General Marquess of Waterford, at the head of a rather English expedition which had in its ranks hundreds of Irish soldiers, captured the city of Buenos Aires and held it for nearly two months, only surrendering then to overwhelming odds. Again these soldiers contributed numbers of Irish settlers to the country. On 27 June, 1807, a third English expedition under General W. G. R. Whippleton arrived off Buenos Aires. One of its regiments was the 88th, the famous "Connaught Rangers". It also lasted dismally, but left its Irish addition to the local population.

Following we come to the period, 1810–1824, when Buenos Aires was the revolutionary centre of the various efforts that led to the separation from Spain of her South American colonies, and in most of these Irwinmen and their sons were prominent. In Buenos Aires there is no name more honoured in the list of Argentine patriots than that of Admiral William Brown (q.v.). Heaney and vanguard of this section were the Englishmen, O'Farrells, Sheridan, Butlers, and others. Peter Sheridan, who arrived from Cavan early in the eighteenth century, and Thomas Armstrong from King's County were among the founders of Argentina's great wool industry. Sheridan's brother, Dr. Hugh Sheridan, served under Admiral Brown, and his son, who died at Buenos Aires in 1861, was a famous painter of South American landscapes. The interests of religion in the little Irish colony were first looked after by a friar named Burke, and when he died, Archbishop Murray of Dublin sent out by request Father Patrick Moran, who arrived in Buenos Aires in 1810. He died there the following May, and was succeeded October, 1831, by Father Patrick O'Gorman, also from Dublin, who was chaplain until his death, 3 March, 1847, his flock greatly increasing.

In the great Irish exodus following the famine years Argentina received a substantial part of the exile throng. Their counsellor and friend was the Dominican, Father Anthony D. Fahy. Born at Loughrea, County Galway, in 1804, he made his ecclesiastical studies at St. Clement's, Rome. Then he spent two years on the missions in the United States, in Ohio and Kentucky, after which he was sent to Buenos Aires, where he arrived in 1847. Fahy remained in this country, until his death from yellow fever, caught while attending a poor Italian, in 1871, is his name intimately identified with the progress and welfare, spiritual and temporal, of the large Irish community in Buenos Aires. In February, 1856, he brought out a community of Sisters of Mercy under Mother Mary O'Evangelist Fitzpatrick from Dublin, and built a spacious convent for them. To this have since been added a hospital, a boarding-school for girls, and a home for immigrants. In 1873 a branch convent was established at Mercedes about sixty miles distant. In April, 1881, the Irish religious sentiment rife in Buenos Aires drove the whole community of eighteen sisters to Australia. In the meantime the real Catholics of Buenos Aires had become ashamed of the cowardice that had allowed the Sisters of Mercy to be forced out of the city by the anti-clerical faction. Petitions were addressed to the Sisters and to the government of Argentina to Rome asking that the community be sent back. In 1890 six of the Sisters from the Mount Gambier convent, Adelaide, were permitted to return. Their old convent at Rio Bamba was restored to them; their schools reopened; a house for immigrant girls established and within a year $20,000 subscribed to put their orphanage on a sure financial footing. Fahy, moreover, had priests specially trained for this
mission at All Hallows College, Dublin, and established libraries, reading rooms, schools, and other means for improving the life of the colony.

An Irish Passionist, Father Martin Byrne, prepared the way for a foundation of his congregation, the pioneers of which, Fathers Timothy Facetti and Clement Finnegan, arrived at Buenos Aires from the United States, 14 December, 1880. In 1881 Father Facetti (James Kneale, S.C.), became the superior of their community, which in a short period was increased to fifteen priests and six novices, mostly Irish Americans. Their fine monastery of the Holy Cross was dedicated on 10 January, 1886, and the splendid church attached to it in 1897. In 1897 Father Facetti left for his novitate in Lisieux, France, near Valparaiso, Chile, and built and had dedicated on 19 May, 1898, the church attached to the monastery of St. Paul of the Cross at Sarmiento.

For many years the Irish colony at Buenos Aires included the famous statistician Michael G. Mulhall (q.v.). In the same field was William Bullin, editor of a Catholic weekly, "The Southern Cross". Born near Buir, Kings County, in 1862, he arrived at Buenos Aires in 1884, and spent several years in ranch and commercial life, during which, over the pen-name "The Buono", he contributed "Tales of the Pampas" and "Sketches of Buenos Aires life and institutions. In 1892 he joined forces with Michael Dineen and became a member of the staff of "The Southern Cross", which had been established in 1874, and finally its proprietor and chief editor, in which capacity he was a leader of the thought and progress of the Irish Argentine community. He died in Ireland during a visit there, 2 February, 1910. Another weekly paper circulating in this section is the "Hiberno-Argentine Review". It is estimated that the Irish form about one per cent of the population of Argentina. As the official statistics record them in the tables of natives of Great Britain, positive figures from that source are unavailable. The unmistakable names show, however, that they are well represented in all the walks of political, commercial, professional, and social life.

Chile and Peru revere the memory of a famous Irishman, Ambrose O'Higgins (q.v.), the "Great Victor" (1756-1801), President of Peru (1797-1801), the Dictator of Chile (1776-1842). In more recent years, Peru and Chile owed much to the enterprise of another Irishman, William R. Grace (q.v.). In 1851 he began his extensive business at Callao, Peru, with his partner, John Bryce. General John Mackenna, a noted力 of the battle of Chacabuco, 1817, who came from Ireland, was sent when a boy to his uncle, Count O'Reilly, at Madrid, and graduated from the military academy at Barcelona, in 1787. In 1796 he went to Peru, where he became one of the leading government functionaries. He was on a public work in Chile when the revolution against the Spaniards broke out in September, 1810, and espoused the patriot cause in which, under Bernard O'Higgins, he did remarkable service. He was killed in a duel on 21 November, 1814. Vicuna Mackenna, the statesman and historian of later years, was his grandson. Other Irishmen notable in South American history are Generals John Thomson O'Brien, Daniel Florence O'Leary, and John Devereux. O'Brien was born in the south of Ireland in 1790 and reached Buenos Aires in 1816. He was with San Martín's army during the campaigns of Chile and Peru, and at the conclusion of the war, in 1823, turned his attention to mining work which proved so remarkable an engineering feat. He visited Europe in 1847 as a diplomatic agent and tried to direct Irish immigration to South America. He died at Lisbon in May, 1861.

In January, 1819, General John Devereux, who is styled the "Lafayette of South America", because he had offered his sword and fortune to Simón Bolívar, the Liberator of Bolivia, was commissioned by the latter to go to Ireland and enlist an Irish legion for the aid of the revolution. He landed nearly 2000 men in South America in January, 1820. The legion won the decisive battle of Carabobo on 24 June, 1821. Among its officers was Colonel (afterwards General) Daniel Florence O'Leary (b. at Cork, 14 Feb., 1801; d. at Rome in 1868). He, employed by Bolivar on important diplomatic missions, compiled his memoirs, letters and documents, by his son, were published by the Venezuelan Government. General John O'Connor, who claimed to be a descendant of the last King of Ireland, raised a regiment of volunteers and brought them to Peru at his own expense and fought all through the campaigns of Peru and between Peru and Granada. After the end of hostilities he was made Minister of War in Bolivia and died in 1870 at an advanced age. Among other Irish soldiers of note in these wars might be mentioned Major Thomas Craig, Major John King, Colonel Charles O'Carroll, Lieut. Colonel Moran, Captain Charles Murphy, and Lieutenant Maurice O'Connell. All through these Latin republics there are hundreds of families, the grandchildren of these men, who bear these and other Irish names, but who are as Spanish in language and character as any of their compatriots of pure Spanish descent.

In Argentina an enterprise is engaged in the reprinting of "SOUTHERN HISTORY OF IRELAND (London, 1810; Spanish tr., Rio de Janeiro, 1862); GAY, HISTORIA (i.eu y politicas de Chile (Santiago, 1844-1845); SIMON B. O'LEARY, BOLIVIA (Caracas, 1879); DAWSON, SOUTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS (London, 1893); MARKAM, HISTORY OF PERU (Chicago, 1893); ARANA, HISTORIA GENERAL DE CHILE (Santiago, 1884-86); MARMOR, MCM, MCCALL, EXPLORERS IN THE NEW WORLD (London, 1909); FITZGERALD, IRELAND AND HER PEOPLE (Chicago, 1906-1910); WEBB, COMPREHENSIVE IRISH BIOGRAPHY (Dublin, 1878); HOOD, DISTINGUISHED IRELANDS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY (London, 1899); CARR, NAT. BISH., v. 2; THE IRISH IN THE ARGENTINE PROVINCES (Buenos Aires), files. Also the bibliographies for the articles on the several Latin American countries.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Irish College, in Rome.—Towards the close of the sixteenth century, Gregory XIII had sanctioned the foundation of an Irish college in Rome, and had assigned a large sum of money as the nucleus of an endowment. But the pressing needs of the Irish chieftains made him think that, under the circumstances, the money would be better used by supplying the Irish Catholics with the sinews of war in Ireland as by founding a college for them at Rome. The project was revived in 1625 by the Irish bishops, in an address to Urban VIII. Cardinal Ludovisi, who was Cardinal Protector of Ireland, resolved to realize the plan at his own expense and the last memorial of his protectorate, the desire expressed to the pope by the Irish bishops. A house was rented opposite Sant' Isidoro, and six students went into residence 1 January, 1628. Eugene Calahan, archdeacon of Cashel, was the first rector, but Father Luke Wadding being a sort of supervisor, Cardinal Ludovisi died in 1632; he was of a princely family with a large patrimony, and he made provision in his will for the college; it was to have an income of one thousand crowns a year; a house was to be purchased for it; and he left a vineyard at Castel Gandolfo where the students might pass their villæggiatura. To the surprise of his heirs no less than of Father Wadding, the cardinal's will directed that the college should be placed under the charge of the Jesuits. Both the heirs and Wadding suspected that provision and disputed it; a protracted lawsuit was finally decided in 1639. On 8 Feb., 1635, they took charge of the college, and governed it till 1772. A permanent residence was secured, which became the home of the Irish students until 1798, and is still the property of the college; it has given its name to the street in which it stands. The Jesuits found eight students before them: one of these, Philip Cleary, after a brilliant
academic course, left for the mission in Ireland in 1640, and suffered death for the Faith ten years later. The first Jesuit rector became General of the Society; he was Peter Walsh, who became a successor in 1637 by Father William Malone, a successful combatant in controversy with Archbishop Usher. In 1650 Monsignor Scarampi of the Oratory, on his return from his embassy to the Kilkenny Confederation, brought with him two students to the Irish college. One was Peter Walsh, who became a distinguished Oratorian; the other was Oliver Plunket, who was kept in Rome as professor at Propaganda until his appointment to the See of Armagh in 1670, whence he was promoted to a martyr's crown at Tyburn. Philip Cleary's name is amongst those with his, in the Congregation of Rites: and the cause of Oliver Plunket is so far advanced that his Alma Mater hopes ere long to venerate him on the altar of its chapel. In the archives of the college is preserved an autograph of Oliver Plunket, written by him when he was about to leave. John Burgue, was one of his contemporaries, also became professor at Propaganda; whence he was appointed Bishop of Waterford, and then Archbishop of Cashel. Soon after came several remarkable students—Ronan Maginn; James Cuaack, Bishop of Meath; Peter Creagh, successively Bishop of Cork and Clayne, and Dublin.

In the early part of the eighteenth century, one of the students, Roche MacMahon, made his name in Irish history as Bishop of Clogher; another, Hugh MacMahon, Archbishop of Armagh, asserted the precedence of that see to Dublin in a work of great learning, "Jus Primatiae Armachaneum". Richard Reynolds at the end of his course was kept in Rome as tutor to the children of the Pretender; James Gallagher became Bishop of Kildare. When we consider that the college had never more than eight students at a time, and had often so few as five, if it had produced no other distinguished alumni than those named, it would have well deserved these words written by the Irish primate, Hugh MacMahon, to the rector: "If the college on account of its slender resources cannot furnish many soldiers, it provides brave and skilful captains." It was then known as the "Seminarium Episcoporum," and was of the open type in all other ways, however, the college had its trials and changes. It came into financial difficulties. The college at Castel Gandolfo was sold to the Jesuit novitiate in 1657, and yet the difficulties did not disappear. It was thought, moreover, that too large a proportion of the able students were being drawn away from the college, which trained them for the mission in Ireland. Complaints as to administration were also made, and a Pontifical Commission was deputed to make an official inquiry. Its report was not favourable to the Jesuits, and in September, 1727, the college was put under the control of the government. The present writer thinks that the Jesuits were not without some plausible pleas to justify their management of the college; and it would be strange if a close inquiry into a rectorate of 137 years did not reveal some instances of mismanagement. The college now passed from the care of the Jesuits, and an Italian priest, the Abbate Luigi Cucagni, was made rector. He was a man of acknowledged ability. Hurter says that he was the ablest of the controversialists who wrote against that form of Jansenism which was patronized by Joseph II., supported pontifically, and had its origin in the University of Pavia. He was the author of several works which were in high repute in those days; and from the Irish College he edited the "Giornale Ecclesiastico di Roma," then the leading Catholic periodical in Rome. The first prefect of studies appointed under his rectorate was the famous Pietro Tamburini, who afterwards became the leader of Jansenism at Pavia. During his prefectship he defended his lectures and published several works which were afterwards published at Pavia. He had to leave the college after four years; and although some very brilliant students were there in his time, it does not appear that he tried to leave, or if he tried, that he succeeded in leaving, any unorthodox influence on their minds. The rectorate of Cucagni came to an end in 1738, when the college was closed by order of Napoleon; and thus we come to the close of another period of its history. During those twenty-six years it quite equalled its previous prestige. For, although the number of its students was sometimes as low as three, it sent forth Dr. Lanigan the historian, who was promoted directly from being a student of the Irish College to the chair of Scripture at Pavia; Dr. Charles O'Connell, author of "Scriptores Rerum Hibernicarum," and several other works; James B. Clerig, who never became a priest, but was a well-known Catholic leader in Ireland a century ago; Dr. Ryan, Bishop of Ferna; Dr. McGrady, Conventor Bishop of Cork; Dr. Blake, Bishop of Dromore.

Dr. Blake, who was the last student to leave the college at its dissolution in 1798, returned a quarter of a century later to arrange for its revival, which was effected by a Brief of Leo XII., dated 18 Feb. 1858. He became the first rector of the college, and amongst the first students who sought admission was Francis Mahony, of Cork, known to the literary world as Father Prout. Having set the college well at work, Dr. Blake returned to Ireland, and was succeeded by Dr. Boylan, of Maynooth, who soon resigned and died in 1830. He was succeeded by a young priest who had just completed a singularly brilliant course at Propaganda, and who governed it with great success till 1849, when he became Archbishop of Armagh, then Archbishop of Dublin, and finally Cardinal Cullen. Within two years of his rectorate he had forty students in the college; and to provide proper accommodations for the increasing numbers who sought admission, the present building with the church of St. Agatha was given to the college in 1835 by Gregory XVI. Two years later Dr. Cullen purchased a fine country house for the seminary of the college; and he took the olive groves which cover the slopes of the Sabine hills near Tivoli. Amongst the distinguished students who passed through the college during Dr. Cullen's rectorate were: Rev. C. P. Meehan; Dr. Edmund O'Reilly, S.J.; Archbishop Croke; Cardinal Moran; and Archbishop Hunt of Bristol.

Dr. Cullen was succeeded by Dr. Kirby, well known for his holiness of life. He governed the college for more than forty years. His successor was Michael Kelly, the present conlocutator to the Archbishop of Sydney. The college has received several privileges of various kinds from popes. Before 1870 the students had the privilege of carrying the baldacchino, a part of the way during the procession on the feast of Corpus Christi, on which occasion the pope carried the Blessed Sacrament. Gregory XVI paid a visit to the college in 1837; and on St. Patrick's Day, 1860, Pius IX assisted at Mass in the college church, after which he held a reception at the college. In memory of his visit he presented a rich set of vestments to the college. A similar gift was made to the college during this present year (1899) by Pius X, in memory of his jubilee. The heart of Daniel O'Connell is buried in the college church.

Archives of the Irish College, Rome: La Relazione del Cardinale Marcovich; Hurter, Nomenclator; Giornale Ecclesiastico di Roma (1780-1798).

M. O'rIordan.

Irish Colleges on the Continent.—The religious persecution under Elizabeth and James I led to the suppression of the monastic schools in Ireland in which the clergy for the most part received their
education. It became necessary, therefore, to seek education abroad, and many colleges for the training of the secular clergy were founded on the Continent, at Rome, in Spain and Portugal, in Belgium, and in France. The history of the Irish college and of the other Irish establishments at Rome is dealt with in special articles (see Irish Colleges, The, in Rome, etc.). That of the oldest Irish college in Ireland was for the sake of order, be given in separate sections, according to the countries in which they existed.

In Spain and Portugal.—Salamanca.—The most famous of the Irish colleges in Spain was that of Salamanca, founded, at the petition of Father Thomas White, P.P., at Salamanca, to enable Irish clergy to attend the大学 and opened in 1593 with the title: El Real Colegio de Nobles Irlandeses. The support of the students was provided for by a royal endowment. The discipline and management of the college was entrusted to the Jesuit Fathers at Salamanca, an Irish father holding the office of vice-rector. The Jesuits continued to govern the college until the order was expelled from Spain in 1677. Since that date the rectors of the college have been selected from amongst the Irish secular clergy, presented by the bishops of Ireland and confirmed by the King of Spain. Dr. Birmingham was the first rector after the departure of the Jesuits. Dr. Curtis, subsequently Archbishop of Armagh, held that office from 1781 to 1812, and rendered valuable service to the Duke of Wellington during the Peninsular War. In more recent years Dr. William McDonald, of the Diocese of Armagh, Dr. Cowan, of Dromore, Father Bernard Maguire, of Clogher, have been rectors. That office is at present held by the Very Rev. Michael O'Doherty, D.D., a priest of the Diocese of Achony. The Irish college at Salamanca was open to students from all the provinces of Ireland, but in the seventeenth century there was a selection from the western, and eastern provinces. It was made cause of complaint that Father White, S.J., was unwilling to receive students from Ulster and Connaught, and the exiled Irish chiefs, O'Neill and O'Donnell, presented a remonstrance on the subject to the King of Spain. The students attended lectures in the famous University of Salamanca, and the college was the nursing mother of many eminent Irish ecclesiastics. Dr. Curtis of Armagh, Dr. Murray of Dublin, Dr. Kelly of Tuam, Dr. Laffan, and Dr. Everard of Cashel were all alumni of Salamanca, the last four being fellow-students. At present the Irish students at Salamanca are decided against sending their sons to the diocesan seminary which has taken the place of the theological faculty of the ancient university. The college is supported chiefly by ancient endowments, which are subject to the control of the Spanish Government.

Seville.—About 1612 a college for Irish students was established at Seville, and managed by secular priests, one of whom was Theobald Stapleton, who afterwards died a martyr in Ireland, being stabbed while administering Holy Communion. In 1619 Father Richard Conway, S.J., was appointed rector. When he entered upon office, the personnel of the college—superiors, students, and servants—amounted to eighteen. They suffered much from poverty. Their condition moved many to compassion. The fishermen at Seville obtained an indulit from Pope Paul V, permitting them to fish on six Sundays and holy days. The profits of their labour for the support of the Irish students. For the same purpose Irish merchants at Seville granted to the college a percentage on every cask of wine they sold. Soldiers of the Irish Brigade in the Spanish service gave a portion of their pay. With assistance besides the college was able to send every year two priests to the Irish mission. One of the students of the college, Dominc Lynch, became professor in the University of Seville. In 1769 the Irish college at Seville, with all its goods, rents, and rights, was, by royal authority, amalgamated with that of Salamanca.

Madrid.—In 1629 a college for Irishmen was founded by Father Theobald Stapleton, who has already been mentioned in connexion with the college at Seville. The number of students varied from ten to twenty, supported by the charity of benefactors. The college served as a hospice for those Irish ecclesiastics who, having completed their studies, came to the capital to claim the bounty of £10 which the King of Spain had granted to Irish students in the chancellorship of the university. In 1677, Dr. James Lynch, Archbishop of Tuam, resided for some time at Madrid and succeeded in restoring the college to greater prosperity. But eventually it was closed, and its property lost to the Church in Ireland.

Alcalá.—In Alcalá, anciently Complutum, famous for its university, and for its polyglot edition of the Bible, an Irish college was founded in 1590, by a Portuguese nobleman named George Syleneis, a descendant, through his mother, of the Macdonnells of Ulster. He bestowed on the college an endowment of the value of £200 a year, and at a cost of £200 built a chapel dedicated to his patron, St. George. At Alcalá there were four masters, twenty students, and eight servants. This ancient college has long since ceased to exist.

Santiago de Compostela.—In 1605 a college for Irish ecclesiastics was founded at Compostela. Philip III bestowed upon it an endowment of £100 a year. It was under the direction of the Jesuits. In 1671 there were six students. At the conclusion of the philosophy course all went to Salamanca for their theological studies. In 1709 the property of the Irish college at Compostela was amalgamated with that of the college at Salamanca.

Lisbon.—Besides the colleges in Spain there existed also an Irish establishment at Lisbon. The college was founded by Royal Charter in 1593, under the title: Collegio de Estudiantes Irlandeses sub invo- caçao de San Patricio en Lisboa. Like the other Irish colleges in the Peninsula it was placed under the management of the Jesuits. The celebrated Stephen White, S.J., was one of its earliest pupils. During the great earthquake which almost destroyed the city of Lisbon in 1755, the Irish college and its inmates suffered no injury. Not long after it suffered from the malice of enemies. In 1761 it was entirely confiscated by Pombal, under the pretext that it was a Jesuit establishment. But in 1782 an Irish secular priest, Dr. Michael Brady, succeeded in having the college restored to the Irish. Dr. Brady was succeeded in the office of rector by Dr. Bartholomew Crotty, subsequently President of Maynooth, and Bishop of Cloyne. Dr. Crotty held the office of rector from 1801 to 1811. During his tenure of office an invitation was addressed by Dr. John Baptist Walsh, rector of the Irish college in Paris, to the students at Lisbon, to come to his college in Paris, an invitation of which the bishops of Ireland expressed their disapproval. The number of students in the Irish college at Lisbon in the eighteenth century was from twelve to fourteen. During the French Revolution it increased to thirty or forty, to fall again to fourteen after 1815. Dr. Burke, Archbishop of Tuam; Dr. Griffin, Bishop of Roscommon; Dr. Carpenter, Archbishops of Dublin; Dr. Verdon, Bishop of Ferns, and Dr. Kelly, Bishop of Waterford, were Lisbon students. During the civil war in Portugal, in the nineteenth century, the college was closed, and has not since been reopened.

In Spain the secular clergy at Lisbon there was also a convent of Irish Dominican Fathers, and a convent of Irish Dominican
nuns, both of which exist at the present day, the former at Corpo Santo, Lisbon, and the latter at Belem in the vicinity.

Tournai.—While the colleges in the Peninsula were doing good service for the preservation of the Faith in Ireland, other colleges for the same purpose were established in Flanders. In 1624 a college for the education of priests, with the title "Collegium Pastorale," was founded at Louvain, in virtue of a charter granted by the Holy See as an instance of the Most Rev. Eugene Maehamon, Archbishop of Dublin. Urban VIII gave a donation for the support of the college, and the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda bestowed upon it an annual allowance of 240 scudi. Burses were also founded by various benefactors, and the aggregate value of the endowment amounted to 75,217 florins. The first rector of the college was Nicholas Aylmer. The students at the commencement were six in number. In 1643 there were four priests, and three students in philosophy. At the close of the eighteenth century the number had increased to forty. Many distinguished Irish ecclesiastics were students of the pastoral college at Louvain. One of its rectors, Thomas Stapleton, held also the office of rector of the university for several terms.

Besides the secular colleges, convents for the Irish regular clergy were established at Louvain. Of these the most ancient and the most important was the Franciscan College of St. Anthony of Padua, founded in 1606 at the request of Florence Conry, Archbishop of Tuam. The number of Irish friars at St. Anthony's in the seventeenth century was about forty. In this convent lived John Colgan, the celebrated Irish hagiologist, author of the "Tract Thaumaturga" and of "Lives of the Irish Saints." Here, too, lived Hugh Ward, Father Mooney, Brendan O'Connor, and Bonaventure O'Doherty, who so ably assisted Michael O'Leary in collecting materials for the great work known as the "Annals of the Four Masters." The Franciscans of St. Anthony's did great service to the cause of religion by printing books of instruction in the Irish tongue. At Louvain were printed the Irish Catechism of Bonaventure O'Hussey (1608), "The Mirror of Penance," by Hugh Maccaughwell (1611), "The Mirror of Religion," by Florence Conry (1626). "O'Leary's Vocabulary of the Soul," by Anthony Gerson (1645), and a moral treatise in English and Irish, by Richard MacGilla-cuddy (Arsdakin) (1667). It has been truly said of the convent of St. Anthony of Padua at Louvain, "No Franciscan College has maintained with more zeal than this, the character of the order, as is evident in their motto Doctrina et Scientia." At the close of the eighteenth century the number of friars at St. Anthony's was seventeen. In 1796 the convent was closed to the Irish, and sold. There existed also at Louvain a convent of Irish Dominicans founded in 1608, and known as the convent of Holy Cross. In 1627 there were twelve fathers in this convent. A letter of the nuncio at Brussels, in 1675, gives the names of thirty-three Dominicans, who had gone from Holy Cross to labour on the mission in Ireland. The Irish Dominican convent at Louvain was closed in 1797. A convent of Irish Benedictine nuns was established at Ypres in 1652 where for more than two centuries Irish women aspiring to religious perfection found a home. This convent has survived to the present day (1910). The colleges, secular and regular, at Louvain during the two centuries of their existence included in Ireland 32 bishops and about 300 priests, of whom 200 at least were graduates in arts of the University of Louvain.

Antwerp.—In 1629 a pastoral college was founded at Antwerp by the Rev. Lawrence Sedgrave, a Leinster priest, who, together with his nephew, the Rev. James Talbot, expended 19,220 florins on the establishment of the college, and became its first rector, as his nephew became its second. After their time the college suffered much from poverty and was on the point of being closed and sold to the creditors. But during the rectorate of John Egan, prothonotary Apostolic, it received a fresh impulse. Donations were received, and creditors satisfied. Through the pro-nuncio at Brussels, the Holy See sent subventions from time to time. The number of students, usually about twelve, increased eventually to thirty. They attended lectures at the Jesuit college at Antwerp, where their distinguished countryman, Fr. Richard Archdeacon (Arsdakin), S.J., died in 1699. The pastoral colleges at Louvain and at Antwerp continued to flourish until 1795, when they were closed on the one part by the French, and on the other part by the British. At various times the bishops of Ireland made representations to the Belgian Government with a view to obtain the transfer of the burses to Ireland, and they have been so far successful that at the present time the annual revenue of the burses is paid through the medium of the university. A college was founded as early as 1845 for the education of students at Maynooth College.]

Tournai.—An Irish college was founded at Tournai by Christopher Cusack. In 1689 there were eight ecclesiasties at Tournai, with an income of 200 scudi. Choiseul, Bishop of Tournai, in a letter to Innocent XII, speaks thus of the Irish college: "We have here a college of seminary of Irish youth where some poor students are supported, receive a Christian education, and are taught the Humanities. They attend the classes at the Jesuits, and are generally the first in merit." The Tournai college, like those at Louvain and Antwerp, was closed in 1795. In 1793, at the instance of the Most Rev. Dr. O'Higgins, Bishop of Ardagh, the Belgian Government consented to transfer to the Irish college in Rome the sum of 4000 francs from the funds of the old Irish college at Tournai.

In France.—The colleges in the Peninsula and in Flanders rendered great service to the Church in Ireland. But the most important of all the Irish colleges on the Continent were those established in France.

Douai.—The most ancient amongst these was the college at Douai, founded about 1577 by the Rev. Ralph Cusack. Douai was a French parish in territory subject to Spain, and in 1604 Philip III conferred on the Irish college in that town an endowment of 5000 florins. In 1667 Douai was taken by Louis XIV, and the Irish college there became subject to French authority. For some years means of subsistence were secured at the University of Paris, and in 1795 the college recovered its prosperity. It was subject to a board of provisors who nominated the rector from a list of three candidates presented by the superiors of the Irish college in Paris. The students, about thirty in number, attended lectures at the University of Douai. In 1793 the college was closed, and in 1795 the buildings, valued at 60,000 francs, were alienated by the French Government.

Lille.—An Irish college was founded at Lille by Ralph Cusack in virtue of letters patent granted in 1610 by the Archduke Albert, and Isabella, Infanta of Spain, then Governors of the Netherlands. Foundations were made for the education of students from the Province of Leinster, more particularly for those from Meath. The right of nominating the rector was vested in the superior of the Irish Capuchins at Bar-sur-Aube. The college suffered much from poverty. Its means of support were derived partly from collections made at the church door, and partly from fees received for the services the students rendered by carrying the dead to funerals. The study and use of the Irish language was encouraged, and no one unacquainted with that tongue was eligible to the office of rector. The students numbered from
eight to ten, exclusively from Leinster. The college, which was valued at 20,000 francs, was confiscated and sold in 1793.

**Bordeaux.**—In 1603, the Rev. Dermot MacCarthy, a priest of the Diocese of Cork, made his way to Bordeaux with about forty companions. These Irish exiles, though forcibly received by Cardinal Sunier, Archbishop of Bordeaux, who gave them a house and placed them in charge of the church of St. Eutropius. The rules of the Irish community were approved by the archbishop in 1603, and again in 1609, and were finally ratified by Paul V, in the Bull "In supremo apostolica figuratione," 26 April, 1613. In the nearby students of Bordeaux, like the Petit Lille, derived their support from alms collected at the doors of the churches in the city, and from fees received for their services at funerals. In 1653, at the conclusion of the War of the Fronde, about 5000 Irish troops, previously in the service of Spain, at the suggestion of Father Cornelius O'Scanlan, rector of the college at Bordeaux, elected to take service under the flag of France. In acknowledgment of the seal of Father O'Scanlan for the interests of France, the queen regent, Anne of Austria, bestowed on the college an endowment of 2000 livres a year, as a support of ten priests and ten clerics, and conferred on the students the privilege of naturalization to enable them to receive gifts and possess benefices in the kingdom. On the same occasion the title of "Sainte-Anne-la-Royale" was given to the college. Besides the endowment of Anne of Austria, various bequests were made by benefactors; yet in 1766 the total annual revenue of the college amounted only to 2531 francs. From twenty in the seventeenth century, the number of students increased in the eighteenth, to thirty, and eventually to forty. They attended the classes at the University of Bordeaux. Here, too, Geoffrey Keating is said to have been a student. The Abbé Edgeworth and Dr. Richard O'Reilly, subsequently Archbishop of Armagh, studied for a short time at Bordeaux, whence the former proceeded to Paris, and the latter to Rome. The last superior of the college was the Rev. Martin Glynn, D.D., a native of the Diocese of Tuam, who suffered death by sentence of the Revolutionary tribunal, at Bordeaux, 19 July, 1794. The vice-rector of the college, Dr. Everard, escaped. The students were cast into prison, but were eventually liberated and put on board a vessel bound for Ireland. The college church, valued at 21,000 francs, was confiscated in 1793. The college was also seized but was saved from confiscation by the vigilance of an Irish priest named James Burke. After the Revolution, all that remained of the property of the college was the books. In 1825, the College of France was the first consul under the control of the board of administrators of the Irish college in Paris. In 1885 the property at Bordeaux was sold for 285,635 francs, and the price invested in French securities in the name of the "Fondations Catholiques Irlandaises en France".

**Toulouse.**—From the commencement of the seventeenth century there existed at Toulouse a little colony of Irish ecclesiastical students. The Irish college in that town owes its origin to Anne of Austria, who bestowed upon it, at the same time as upon the college of Bordeaux, the title of "Sainte-Anne-la-Royale", with an endowment of 1200 livres a year for the support of twelve priests. The endowment was confirmed by Louis XIV in 1659. At Toulouse, were a number of students, the progeny of the ten native Bretons on 31 August, 1753. The course of studies extended over a period of eight years, during which the students returned to the mission in Ireland. When the French Revolution broke out, the college possessed an annual revenue of 10,000 francs. In 1793 the college buildings and furniture, valued at 36,700 francs, were confiscated and sold by the French Government. Nantes, on the coast of Brittany, was also the seat of an Irish college founded about 1680. In 1728 a new and more commodious college was constructed, and in 1765, by royal letters patent, the priory of St-Crispin was united with it. The number of students, at first about thirty-five, increased to sixty in 1765, and by 1792 it had reached eighty. The college was subject to the University of Nantes, but it had its own staff of professors—two for philosophy, and two for theology—who were obliged each term to report to the authorities of the university the names of their students and the treatises they were to explain. The last rector of the college was Dr. Patrick Byrne, subsequently president of Maynooth College. In 1793 the students of the college were cast into prison and then put on board a vessel which brought them to safety. This college was not reopened in the nineteenth century. The buildings which escaped alienation were placed under the control of the administrators of the Irish college in Paris. They were sold, with the sanction of the Minister of Public Instruction, in 1857, and the proceeds of the sale (100,000 francs) invested in the name of the "Fondations Catholiques Irlandaises".

**Poitiers.**—A college of the Irish Jesuits was founded at Poitiers, in virtue of letters patent granted by Louis XIV, in April, 1674. Five burses for the education of students for the secular priesthood were founded here, two in 1738 by Mrs. John Maher, an Irish lady resident at Bordeaux, and three in 1746 by Jemima Crowly, of Cork, in 1735. On the suppression of the Jesuits in France, these five burses were transferred to Paris. The college buildings, valued at about 10,500 francs, were alienated by the French Government. The Abbé Thomas Gould was a student of this college; known as the Missionary of Poitou, he preached with great success in French, and published several works in that language. The Irish Franciscans had convents in provincial France, at Bar-sur-Aube, at Sedan, and at Charleville, and for some years a convent in Paris. The most important of the Irish establishments in France, and on the Continent, was the Irish college in Paris. That venerable institution, which has preserved its existence to the present day, owes its origin to the Rev. John Lee, an Irish priest who came to Paris, in 1578, with six companions, and in 1579 founded the College of France. After his studies he became attached to the church of Saint Severin, and made the acquaintance of a French nobleman, John de l'Escalepier, President of the Parliament of Paris. That charitable man placed at the disposal of the Irish students in Paris a house which served them as a college, and became the first rector about 1605. By letters patent dated 1623, Louis XIII conferred on the Irish priests and scholars in Paris the right to receive and
In 1792 the two Irish colleges in Paris, namely the Collège des Lombards, and the junior college, rue du Cheval Vert, were closed, as were all the other Irish colleges in France. The closing of the colleges on the Continent encouraged the bishops of Ireland of the means of educating their clergy. They therefore petitioned the British Government for authorization to establish an ecclesiastical college at home. The petition was granted, and Maynooth College was founded in 1795. In support of their petition the bishops submitted a statement of the number of Irish ecclesiastics receiving education on the Continent when the French Revolution began. It runs thus:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGES</th>
<th>MASTERS</th>
<th>SCHOLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paris: Collège des Lombards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheval Vert</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total in France</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Total on the Continent</strong>: 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this statement it appears that out of a total of 478 Irish ecclesiastics receiving education on the Continent, 348 were resident in France, and of these 180 were students in the Irish colleges in Paris. More than one-half, therefore, of all the Irish secular clergy in the eighteenth century were educated in France, and more than one-third in Paris. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, forty students of the Irish college in Paris were raised to the episcopal bench. At the same period Irishmen held an honourable place in the University of Paris. Between 1650 and 1750, more than sixty Irishmen held the office of professor of law in one of the four sections of the faculty of arts in the ancient university. Dr. Michael Moore, an Irish priest, long held the office of principal of the Collège de Navarre, and was twice elected rector of the university. Many Irishmen held chairs in the university colleges. Irish colleges also existed at the Sorbonne. Dr. Power was professor at the college of Lisleux; Dr. O'Longeran at the college of Reims. Dr. John Plunket, Dr. Patrick J. Plunket, and Dr. Flood, superiors or provosts of the Irish college, were in succession royal professors of theology at the Collège de Navarre. The students of the Irish college in Paris were pronounced opponents of Jansenism. When they returned to their native land, they, like the students of Rome, Salamanca, and Louvain, brought with them "the manners and feelings of cultivated gentlemen and a high sense of clerical decorum".

After the French Revolution the Irish college in Paris was re-established by a decree of the first consul, and placed under the control of a Board appointed by the French Government. To it were united the remnants of the property of the other Irish colleges in France which had escaped destruction. The college in Paris lost two-thirds of its endowment owing to the depreciation of French state funds, which had been reduced to one-third consolidated. The total loss sustained by all the Irish foundations in France amounted to 2,416,210 francs, or about 483,000. After the Restoration, the French Government

possess property. The Irish college was recognized as a seminary by the University of Paris in 1624, and at that time it had already sent a large number of priests to the mission in Ireland. But the college foundered among the attentions of St. Vincent de Paul and others, who sought to provide them with a more commodious residence. Later still, in 1672, it engaged the attention of the bishops of Ireland, who deputed Dr. John O'Molony, Bishop of Killala, to treat with Colbert as to the establishment of a new college. What the bishops desired was eventually obtained through the influence of two Irish priests resident in Paris: Dr. Patrick Maginn, formerly first chaplain to Queen Catherine, wife of Charles II of England, and Dr. Malachy Kelly, one of the Chaplains of Louis XIV. These two ecclesiastics obtained from Louis XIV authorization to enter on possession of the Collège des Lombards, a college of the University of Paris founded for Italian students in 1333. They rebuilt the college, then in ruins, at their own expense and became its first superiors. The acquisition of the college was confirmed by letters patent dated 1677 and 1681. Some years later the building was extended by Dr. John Farsley, and all the Irish ecclesiastical students in Paris found a home in the Collège des Lombards. The number of students went on increasing until, in 1764, it reached one hundred and sixty. It was therefore found necessary to build a second college. The building was commenced in 1776, in rue du Cheval Vert, now rue des Irlandais, and the junior section of the students was transferred to the new college in 1776.
placed at the disposal of the British Government three million and a half sterling, to indemnify British subjects in France for the losses they had sustained during the Revolution. In 1816 a claim for an indemnity was presented on behalf of the Irish college. That claim was rejected by the Privy Council in 1826 on the ground that the building was in a state of repair. In 1832 the claim was renewed by Dr. M’Sweeney, rector of the college, with the same result. Another attempt to obtain compensation was made by the Rev. Thomas McNamara in 1870. On 9 May in that year a motion was made in the House of Commons for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the claims of the college to compensation for losses sustained during the French Revolution. The motion was introduced on 30 April, 1876, by Isaac Butt, M.P. for Limerick, and, after a prolonged discussion, it was negatived by 116 to 54 votes.

After 1805 the administration of the college was subject to a “Bureau de Surveillance” which gave much trouble until it was dissolved by Charles X, in 1824. After that date, the superior appointed by the presentation of the four archbishops of Ireland, became official administrator of the foundations, subject to the minister of the interior, and at a later period to the minister of public instruction. The students no longer frequented the university. The professors were Irish priests appointed by the French Government on the presentation of the Irish episcopate. In 1858, with the sanction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, and with the consent of the French Government, the bishops of Ireland placed the management of the college in the hands of the Irish College Society. In recent years the number of students has been between sixty and seventy. They are nominated on the nomination of the bishops, and, after a course of two years in philosophy and four years in theology, they are ordained and return to Ireland. In the nineteenth century the college gave to the Church a long array of good priests and bishops, including Dr. Fitz Patrick, Abbot of Mellary; Dr. Maginn, Coadjutor Bishop of Derry; Dr. Keane, of Cloyne; Dr. O’Hea and Dr. Fitz Gerald of Ros, Dr. Gillooly of Elphin, and Dr. Croke of Cashel. Dr. Kelly, the present Bishop of Ros, and Dr. MacSharry, of Ennis, were educated in the College. Dr. Fort Elizabeth, South Africa, are also alumni of the college. The present occupant of the see of St. Patrick, H.E. Cardinal Logue, held the chair of dogmatic theology from 1866 to 1874.

In the three hundred years of its existence the college has not been without a share in the ecclesiastical literature of Ireland. Among the rectors of the college have been Thomas Messingham, prothonotary Apostolic, author of the “Florilegium Insulæ Sanctorum” (Paris, 1624); Dr. Andrew Donlevy, author of an “Anglo-Irish Catachism” (Paris, 1749); Dr. Daniel O’Collins, rector of St. Mary’s College (Dublin, 1852); Father Thomas MacNamara, author of “Programmes de Sermons” (Dublin, 1880), “Enchiridion Clericorum” (1882), and several other similar works. Abbé Magecoghegan, Sylvester O’Hal- laran, Martin Haverty, and probably Geoffrey Keating, all eminent Irish historians, were students of the college. Dean Kinane, a student and then a professor in the college, is widely known for his “Dove of the Tabernacle” and numerous other devotional works. More recently, the Rev. John MacGuinness, C.M., vice-rector, has published a full course of dogmatic theology. Among the students of the college, Dr. John Farey and Dr. John Baptist Walsh, in the eighteenth century, and Dr. MacSweeney and the Rev. Thomas MacNamara, in the nineteenth, have been administrators of marked ability. Since

1873, the administration of the property of the college has been vested in a board created by a decree of the Conseil d’Etat. On that board the Archbishop of Paris was represented by a delegate, and he was also the official medium of communication between the Irish episcopate and the French Government. In December, 1873, the French law of the foundation of the Church and State in France came into operation. In the January following, the French Government notified the British Government of its intention to reorganize the Irish Catholic foundations in France so as to bring them into harmony with the recent legislation regarding the Church. The letter further stated that the purpose of the Government was to close the Irish college, to sell its immovable property, and to invest the proceeds of the sale, to be applied together with the existing burses for the benefit of Irish students who shall be admitted, on the presentation of the British Ambassador to France, either to the state schools or to the schools of theology which have taken the place of the diocesan seminaries. A plea for the preservation of the college has been presented on behalf of the bishops of Ireland, through the British Foreign Office. The question is still undecided.


Patrick Boyle

Irish Confessors and Martyrs.—The period covered by this article embraces that between the years 1540 and (approximately) 1713. Religious persecution in Ireland began under Henry VIII, when the local Parliament adopted acts establishing the king’s ecclesiastical supremacy, abolishing the pope’s jurisdiction, and nullifying the concept of corporate immunity. The first act against the pope came into operation 1 November, 1537. Its penalties were sufficiently terrible, but the licence of those enforcing it was still more terrible. When they had been at work little over a year the Bishop of Derry wrote to Pope Paul III that the King of England had given him power to regenerate Ireland, to acknowledge the pope, were burning houses, destroying churches, ravishing maids, robbing and killing offending persons. They killed, he said, all priests who pray for the pope or refuse to erase his name from the canon of the Mass, and they torture preachers who do not repudiate his authority. It would fill a book to detail their cruelty. Intolerable as these evils seemed, they were aggravated beyond measure, three years later, when the general suppression of religious houses was superadded. Then
ensued the persecution which the Four Masters likened to that of the early Church under the pagan emperors, declaring that it was exceeded by no other, and could be described only by eyewitnesses. The extirpation was so thorough that even remembrance of the victims was obliterated. In the period described, the Irish martyrs submitted recently to the Congregation of Rites, there are but two cases belonging to Henry's reign. The absence of records for this period is easily explained. The destruction of all kinds of ecclesiastical property, and documents especially, accounts for much, since few but churchmen escaped; but it is perhaps a more probable explanation that scarcely any were made, as it was neither safe nor practicable to have or transmit what reflected upon government under Tudor despotism. Few memorials could be committed to paper before places of refuge had been secured in foreign countries. Then they were taken down from the lips of aged refugees, and as might be expected they exhibit the vagueness and confusion of dates and incidents to which personal reminiscences are subject when spread over long and unsettled periods.

For the time of the suppression there is a partial narrative in the recital of an old Trinitarian friar, written down by one of his brethren, Father Richard Goldie or Goold (Goldaeus), an Irish professor at the University of Alcala. According to this account, on the first announcement of the king's design, Theobald (Burke), provincial of the order, came to Dublin with eight other doctors to maintain the pope's supremacy. They were cast into prison; Theobald's heart was torn from his living body; Philip, a writer, was scourged, put into boots filled with oil and salt, roasted till the flesh came away from the bone, and then beheaded; the rest were hanged or beheaded; Cornelius, Bishop of Limerick, was beheaded there; Cormac was shot and stoned to death at Galway; Maurice and Thomas, brothers-german, hanged on their way to Dublin; Stephen, stabbed near Wexford; Peter of Limerick and Georgfrey, beheaded; John Macabrigus, lay brother, drowned; Raymond, ex-superior, dragged at a horse's tail in Dublin; Tadhg O'Brien of Thomond, torn to pieces in the vicerey's presence at Bombrate bridge between Limerick and Kilmallock; the Dublin community, about fifty, put to various deaths; those of Dungua were burned to pass away the fire; those of Galway, twenty, burned to death in their convent or, by another account, six were thrown into a limekiln, the rest weighted with stones and cast into the sea; those of Drogheda, forty, slain, hanged, or thrown into a pit; at Limerick, over fifty butchered in choir or thrown with weights into the Shannon; at Cork and Kilmallock, over ninety slain by the sword or dismembered, including William Burke, John O'Hogan, Michael, Richard, and Giliallaighde. This is the earliest narrative as regards period. It deals only with the Trinitarians. It had the misfortune to be suppressed by Lope de Vega, writer, and consequently has incurred perhaps more discredit than it deserves. The promoters of the cause of the Irish martyrs have not extracted any names from it. Nevertheless, the version given by O'Sullevan Bearn in his "Patriciana Deenas", despite many apparent inaccuracies and exaggerations, contains in its main statements a not improbable picture of the experiences of this single order when the agents of rapine and malignity were let loose upon the members. It is as a cry from the torture chamber, expressing the agony of a victim who loses the powers of speech. In July the extent of his sufferings or the manner of their infliction.

The first general catalogue is that of Father John Houlings, S.J., compiled in Portugal between 1688 and 1699. It is styled a very brief abstract of certain cases and is directed towards canonisation of the eleven bishops, eleven priests, and forty-four lay persons whom it commemorates as sufferers for the Faith by death, chains, or exile under Elizabeth. Cornelius O'Devany, the martyred Bishop of Down and Connor, took up the work and revised the catalogue; and he continued it until his own imprisonment in 1611. Shortly before that time he forwarded a copy to Father Holywood, S.J., desiring him to take steps to have the lives of those noted therein illustrated at length and preserved from oblivion. O'Devany's catalogue was in manuscript until the licensing of the "Processus Martyriales", published, in 1619, as the third part of his "Analecta", which still remains a most important contribution to the subject. During the next forty years Copinger (1620), O'Sullivan Bearn (1621 and 1629), Molanus (1629), Morison (1659), and others sent forth from the press works devoted either wholly or in part to advancing the claims of Irish martyrs to recognition and veneration. In 1669 Antony Brudin, O.S.F., published at Prague a thick octavo volume of about 800 pages, entitled "Propagaculum Catholicae Veritatis", a catalogue of Irish martyrs under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Elizabeth, and James I, containing notes of about 200 martyrs, with an index of 164 persons whose Christian names come first as in a martyrology. Brudin based his work on Rothe's "Analecta", but he made large additions from other writers, as Good, Bourchier, Gonsages, Baresus, Sanders, Wadding, Alejandre, and Nadain, and particularly from a manuscript ascribed to Matthew Creagh, Vicar-General of Killaloe, which had been brought to the Irish Franciscans of Prague in 1660. Practically nothing was done for about two centuries after Brudin's publication. A proposal to take up the cause of Patrick Oliver Plunket within a few years of his martyrdom was discredited by the Holy See, lest at that critical juncture such action should become an occasion of political trouble in England. After the English Revolution and the commencement of the new era of oppression that succeeded the capitulation of Limerick, it was manifested that any movement towards canonisation of the victims of laws still in force would result in merciless reprisals on the part of the ascendancy. At length, in 1828, the last political hindrances were removed by Catholic Emancipation, but over thirty years were spent in the preparation of an illuminated deputation to Rome with more immediate demands pressed upon the energies of the Catholic community or because, during the long period for which the matter had been laid aside, the sources of trustworthy information had become so inaccessible or forgotten that the task of accumulating evidence seemed too formidable to undertake. In 1861 Dr. Moran, then Vice-Recter of the Irish College, Rome, and subsequently in succession Bishop of Osory and Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney, reopened the question by his life of Oliver Plunket, the first of a series of important historical publications, in which he reconstructed the fabric of Irish Catholic history from Henry VIII to Charles II. All these publications were effectively, if not professedly, directed towards hastening the Church's solemn recognition of the martyrs. The first of these writings (1861) expressed the hope that the day was not far distant when the long afflicted Church of Ireland would be consecrated by the canonisation of Oliver Plunket. In 1884, when the last of them, a resuscit of Rothe's "Analecta", was published, the intermediate advance had been so great that the editor, then Rothe's successor in Osory, noted the expression of a wish both in Ireland and abroad for an effect which to that people might be regarded as a nation of martyrs with none few names, at least, among the most remarkable for constancy and heroism would be laid before the Sacred Congregation of Rites and, if found worthy, be en-
rolled among the privileged martyrs of Holy Church. While Dr. Moran was thus engaged, Major Myles O'Reilly also entered the long neglected field, and in 1868 he published a collection of memorials in which he brought together, from all the original sources his great industry could reach, biographies of those who suffered for the Faith in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. This collection was made with both zeal and discrimination; it was the first general compilation since Brudoin's, and, coming down to a later date, it contained twice the number of notices in the former one. As a result, in great measure, of these several publications, the case was brought to such a degree of celebrity as to be termed "Analecta," that the ecclesiastical authorities were in a position to make preparations for holding the processus ordinarius informativus, the diocesan inquiry which is a preliminary in the process of canonization. The work of collecting evidence, greatly facilitated by the previous labours of Moran and O'Reilly, was entrusted to Father Denis Murphy, S.J. He, unhappily, did not live to submit his testimony; but before his death he had reduced to order a great mass of materials extracted from a larger number of writers than had been used by O'Reilly. The number of individual notices is very great, perhaps much larger than Father Murphy excluded, with one or two exceptions, all those whose trials did not culminate in death. His materials were published in 1896, under the title of "Our Martyrs," and the record begun by Father Houling was thus, after three hundred years, completed by his brother Jesuit in form to be submitted in a regular process of canonization.

The usual practice of conducting the preliminary process in the diocese where the martyrs suffered would have entailed the erecting of a tribunal in every diocese in Ireland, a course attended with no advantage as far as the compilation of the necessary documents goes. The united request of all the Irish bishops, accepted the responsibility of conducting a general investigation for the whole country. But, before further progress could be made, certain unforeseen causes of delay arose which were not removed until the end of the year 1903. In December of that year the vice-postulator issued his requests for the attendance of witnesses in the February following. The initial session was opened by the Archbishop of Dublin, 15 February, 1904. Between that date and 3 August, when the taking of evidence in Ireland was completed, sixty sessions had been held in the diocese of Dublin. The remaining sessions were taken by commission in Sydney. When it arrived in Ireland meetings were resumed, 23 October, and continued for some twenty further sessions to complete the return, a transcript of the evidence with exhibits of books and documents. This work was brought to a conclusion at Christmas, and on 5 February, 1905, the full return of the inquiry was delivered to the Congregation of Rites. The number of sessions held was about eighty, in all of which the Archbishop of Dublin presided. Evidence was taken in respect of about three hundred and forty persons, with a view to establishing a case of martyrdom as a traditional belief among learned and pious Catholics that many persons suffered death for the Catholic Faith in Ireland under the penal laws; that these persons did, in fact, suffer martyrdom in defence of the Catholic Faith and of the pope's spiritual authority as Vicar of Christ; and that there was a sincere desire among Irish Catholics, in Ireland and elsewhere, to have their case recognized by the Church. The chief portion of the evidence was necessarily that derived from records, printed or written. In addition, witnesses testified to the public repugnance of martyrdom, and traditions to that effect preserved in families, religious orders, various localities, etc.; of which the evidence was fitted to be given in every case as to the source of the information furnished by the witness. Subsequent to this inquiry the further minor process (processus), to collect writings attributed to some of the martyrs, was held January–March, 1907.

The investigation of the claims to the title of martyr made for those who suffered under the Irish penal enactments since 1537, is attended by difficulties that do not arise in the case of their fellow-sufferers in England, of difficulties due to the lack of information as to the character of the available evidence. Not more than one-third of Ireland was subject to the rule of Henry VIII when he undertook to detach the island from the Catholic Church. The remainder was governed by hereditary lords under native institutions. The king's deputy, Sir Thomas Butler, demanded submission of the over-lordship supposed to be conferred by the Bull "Laudabiliter"; but the acknowledgment was so little valued that the population was commonly classified as the king's subjects and the Irish enemies, not, as yet, the Irish rebels. The Church, however, was the Church of Ireland, not the Church of the English Pale, and the claim to Supreme Headship of the Church entailed the effective reduction of the whole island to civil obedience, which, as then understood, required acceptance of the whole English system of laws and manners. Hence, it is not always easy to discern how far the faith of a man was determined by the requirements of his fidelity to religion, and how far from defence of ancestral institutions. Again, the evidence is not always satisfactory, for reasons already mentioned. The public records are very defective, as in a country that has experienced two violent revolutions, but the loss so caused might possibly be over-estimated. No large proportion of those put to death had been brought before a regular court. There was a general immunity from consequences which encouraged captains of roving bands and stationary garrisons, provost-martials, and all that class, to carry out their duty as a matter of course, without regard to the desire of those there are no records. During the year of the Armada a Spanish ship made prize of a Dublin vessel bound for France. A Cistercian monk and a Franciscan friar were found on board. They said they were the sole survivors of two large monasteries in the North of Ireland which had been burned with the rest of the inmates. There seems to be no other mention of this atrocity.

The list which follows (p. signifying priest; l. layman) includes the names of those persons only in respect of whom evidence was taken at the inquiry held by the Commission of Inquiry. The citation given in the list already been conducted successfully through the Apostolic Process by Cardinal Logue, his successor:

(1) Under King Henry VIII.—1540: The guardian and friar, Franciscan Convent, Monaghan, beheaded. 1541: Robert and other Cistercian monks, St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, imprisoned and put to death; as the Cistercians of Dublin surrendered their house and its possessions peacefully, there is possibly confusion as to this instance.

(2) Under Queen Elizabeth.—1555: Conacius Macarta (Conn McCourt) and Roger MacCongaill (McConnel), Franciscans, hanged to death, Armagh, 12 December, for refusing to acknowledge the queen's supremacy. 1576: John Lochman, Donagh O'Rourke, and Edmund Fitzsimon, Franciscans, hanged, 21 January, Downpatrick; Fergall Ward, Franciscan guardian, Armagh, hanged, 28 April, with his own girdle. 1577: Thomas Courcy, vicar-general at Kings, hanged, 30 May. William O'Lochlainn, Franciscan, Bishop of Meath, died, 4 January, in exile at Alcaïd. 1578: Patrick O'Hely (q. v.), Bishop of Mayo, and Cornelius O'Rorke, p., Franciscans, tortured and hanged, 22 August, Kilmallock; David Hurley, dean of Emily, died in prison; Thomas Moeran, dean of Cork, taken in the field to be burnt, and executed. 1579: Thaddaeus Daly and his companion, O.S.F., hanged, drawn, and quartered at Limrick,
1 January. The bystanders reported that his head when cut off distinctly uttered the words: "Lord, show me Thy ways." Edmund Tanner (q.v.), S.J., Bishop of Cork, died, 4 June, in prison at Dublin; John O'Dowd, p., O.S.F., refused to reveal a confession, put to death by having his bowels torn out with a twisted cord; Thomas O'Herlay (q.v.), Bishop of Ross. 1580: Edmund MacDonnell (q.v.), p., S.J., 16 March, Cork (but the year should be 1575 and the name perhaps O'Donnell); Laurence O'Moore, p., Oliver Plunkett, gentleman, and William Walsh or O'Wull, an Englishman, tortured and hanged, 11 November, after the surrender of Dun-anoir in Kerry; Daniel O'Neilan, p., O.S.F., fastened round the waist with a rope and thrown with weights tied to his feet from one of the town-gates at Youghal, finally fastened to a mill-wheel and torn to pieces, 28 March. He is obviously the person whom Mooney commemorates (notes under the name O'Duillian, assigning the date, 22 April, 1599, from hearsay; Daniel Hanrichan, Maurice O'Scanlan, and Philip O'Shee (O'Lee), priests, O.S.F., beaten with sticks and slain, 6 April, before the altar of Lislaachtin monastery, Co. Kerry; the prior at the Claremont, an Englishman; Robert Murphy, quoting O'Sullevan, says the monastery was Graignamanagh; O'Sullevan names the place Seripons, Jerpoint. 1581: Nicholas Nugent, chief justice, David Sutton, John Sutton, Thomas Eustace, John Eustace, William Warden, and other Englishmen; Clon, Town, Netherfield, or Netterville, Robert Fitzgerald, gentleman of the Pale, and Walter Lakin (Layrmus), executed on a charge of complicity in rebellion with Lord Baltinglass; Matthew Lamport, described as a parish priest (pastor) of Dublin Diocese, but more probably a baker (pastor) of Wexford, executed for harbouring Baltinglass and Father Rochford, S.J., Robert Meyer, Edward Cheever, John O'Lahy, and Patrick Canavan, sailors of Wexford, hanged, drawn, and quartered, 5 July, for conveying priests, a Jesuit, and laymen out of Ireland; Patrick Hayes, shipowner of Wexford, charged with aiding bishops, priests, and others, died in prison; Richard French, p., Ferns Diocese, died in prison; Nicholas Fitzgerald, Cistercian, hanged, drawn, and quartered, September, at Dublin. 1582: Phelim O'Hara and Henry Delahoyde, O.F.M., of Moyne, Co. Mayo, hanged and quartered, 1 May; Thaddaeus O'Maran, or O'Morachue, O.S.F., guardian of Enniscohry; Phelim O'Corra (apparently Phelim O'Hara, above); ÓÉneas Penny, parish priest of Killarne (Killasser, Co. Mayo), slain by soldiers while saying Mass, 4 May; Roger O'Donnellan, Cahill McGoran, Peter McQuilan, Patrick O'Kenna, Joannes Pillon, priests, and Roger O'Hanlon (correctly McHenlea, in Curry), lay brother, O.S.F., died, 13 February, Dublin Castle, but the date can scarcely be correct for all; Henry O'Fremlamhaidh (anglicized Frawley); John Wallis, p., died, 20 January, in prison at Worester; Donagh O'Reddly, parish priest of Colmer, hanged, drawn, and quartered with swords, 12 June, at the altar of his church. 1584: Dermot O'Hurley (q.v.), Archbishop of Cashel; Gelasius O'Cullenan, O.Cist, Abbot of Boyle, and his companion, variously named Eugene Cronius and Hugh or John Mulcharen (per Eoghan O'Macchiariain), either Abbot of Trinity Island, Co. Roscommon, or a secular priest, hanged, 21 November, at Dublin; John O'Daly, p., O.S.F., trampled to death by cavalry; Eleanor Birmingham, widow of Bartholomew Ball, denounced by her son, Walter Ball, Mayor of Dublin, died in prison; Thaddaeus O'Mulloony, O.F.M., hanged. 1585: Richard Creagh (q.v.), Archbishop of Armagh, poisoned, 14 October, in the Tower of London—he is included amongst the 242 Pretermisses in the article ENGLISH CONFESSIONS AND MARTYRS; Maurice Kenaghty (q.v.), p.; Patrick O'Connor and Maolachy O'Kelly, O.Cist., hanged and quartered, 19 May, at Boyle. 1586: Maurice, or Murtagh, O'Brien, Bishop of Emly, died in prison at Dublin; Donagh O'Murheety, a companion, O.S.F., Stoned and tortured to death at Muckross, Killarney. 1587: John Cornelius, O.S.F., of Askeaton; another John Cornelius, S.J., surnamed O'Mahony, born in England of Irish parents from Kilmekey, Co. Cork, is included among the venerables of the English list; Walter Ferrell, O.S.F., Askeaton, hanged with his own girdle. 1588: Dermot O'Mulroney, p., O.S.F., Brother Thomas, and another Franciscan of Galbally, Co. Limerick, put to death there 21 March; Maurice Eustace (q.v.), Jesuit novice, hanged and quartered, 9 June, Dublin; John O'Mollo, Cornelsius O'Doherty, and Geoffrey Farrell, Franciscan priests, hanged, drawn, and quartered, 15 December, at Abbeyleix; Patrick Plunkett, knight, hanged and quartered, 6 May, Dublin; Peter Miller, B.D., Diocese of Ferns, tortured, hanged, and quartered, 4 October, 1588; Robert O'Scullin (or Petho; his O'Muliney); Murphy, withstanding the different places of martyrdom assigned, these two names may be those of the same person, a native of Wexford executed at Galway; Patrick O'Brady, O.S.F., prior at Monaghan—Murphy, on slender grounds, supposes him to be the same as O'Muliney of Monaghan. 1589: Francis O'Muliney, or Murtagh O'Cuinny, in his "Civil Wars in Ireland", states that six friars were slain in the monastery of Moynihin (Monaghan) under Elizabeth; Thaddaeus O'Boyle, guardian of Donegal, slain there, 13 April, by soldiers. 1590: Matthew O'Leyn, p., O.S.F., 6 March, Kilcrea; Christopher Roche, i., died, 13 December, under torture, Newgate, London. 1591: Terence Maghane, Magnus O'Friedlinen or O'Todridy, Loughlin og Mac O'Cadhia (? Mac Eochadhia, Kehig), Franciscans of Multifarnham, died in prison. 1594: Andrew Strich, p., Limerick, died in Dublin Castle. 1597: John Stephens, p., Dublin province, apparently chaplain to the O'Byrnes of Wicklow, hanged and quartered, 4 September, for saying Mass; Walter Ferman, p., torn on the rack, 12 March, at Dublin. 1599: George Power, Vicar-General of Ossory, died in prison. 1600: John Walsh, Vicar-General of Dublin, died in prison at Chester; Peter O'Hagen, 4 December, Dublin—probably the Patrick Hayes of 1581 (supra); James Duddal (Dowdall, q.v.), died either 20 November or 13 August, Exeter; Nicholas Young, p., died, Dublin Castle. 1601: Redmond O'Gallagher, Bishop of Derry, slain by soldiers, 15 March, near Dungiven; Daniel, or Donagh, O'Molloyn, Vicar-General of Killaloe, died of torture, 24 April, Dublin Castle; John O'Kelly, p., died, 15 May, in prison; Donagh O'Cronin, clerk, hanged and dismembered, Cork; Bernard Moriarty, dean of Ardagh and Vicar-General of Dublin, having a day's leave of absence, 12 June, 1602: Dominic Collins, lay brother, S.J., hanged, drawn, and quartered, 31 October, Youghal. The following Dominicans suffered under Elizabeth (1558–1603), but the dates are uncertain: Father MacFergie, prior, and twenty-four friars of Coleraine, thirty-two members of the community of Derry, slain there the same night, two priests and seven novices of Limerick and Kilmallock, assembled in 1602 with forty Benedictines, Cistercian, and other monks, at Scattery Island in the Shannon to be deported under safe conduct in a man-of-war, were cast overboard at sea. This year, 1602, another, somewhat earlier, incident, Eugene MacEgan, styled Bishop-designate of Ross, of which he was vicar Apostolic, mortally wounded while officiating in the Catholic army. There was no Catholic army on foot in 1606, at which date his name
appears in the official list. He was buried at Timoleague.


(4) Commonwealth (1649–1659).—1649: Robert Nettiville, p., S.J., died at Drogheda, 19 June, of a severe beating with sticks; John Bath, p., S.J., and his brother Thomas, secular priest, Dominic Dillon, O.P., prior at Urragh, Richard O'Veton, O.P., prior at Athy, Peter Taffe, O.S.A., prior at Drogheda, slain in Drogueda massacre; Bernard Horumly (q. v.); O.S.F., hanged; Drogheda; Raymond Stafford, p., Paul Synnot, p., John Esmond, p., Peter Stafford, p., Didacus Cheeveres and Joseph Rochford, lay brothers, Franciscans, slain in Wexford massacre; James O'Reilly, p., O.P., slain on the Clonmel, 1650; O.P., hanged, 1650: Basilius Egan, O.S.F., Bishop of Ross, celebrated for exhorting the garison of Carrigadrehid Castle to maintain their post against Broghill, dismembered and hanged; Milor M'Grath (Father Michael of the Rosary), p., O.P., hanged, Clonmel; S. Nelligan, p.; O.P., hanged, Cork; Walter de Wallis, O.S.F., and Anthony Meeus (q. v.); O.S.F., hanged, Mullingar; John Dormer, O.S.F., died in prison, Dublin; Nicholas Ugan, or Ulagan, O.S.F., hanged, with his girdle; Thomas Plunkett and twelve other Franciscans, Eugene O'Teaman, O.S.F., dogged and cut out by forces of soldiers. Deo Nielan, p., hanged, Inchioronan, Co. Clare; Thaddeus O'Carrighey, p., hanged near Ennis; Hugh McKeon, p., died in prison, Athlone; Roger de Mara (Macnamara), p.; shot and hanged, Clare Castle; Daniel Clancy and Jeremiah O'Neachlohy (Neryn), lay brothers, Quin, hanged; Philip Flaharry, hanged near Dublin; Francis Sullivan, p., shot in a cave, Co. Kerry, December; William Hickey, p., hanged; Dominicans: Terence Albert O'Brien (q. v.), O.P., Bishop of Emily; John Wolfe, p., hanged, Limerick; John O'Cullin (Collins), p., beheaded; William O'Connor, prior at Cahir; Edmund O'Boyle, p.; hanged, Clonmel; Bernard O'Ferrall, p., slain, his brother Laurence, p., hanged, Longford; Vincent Gerald Dillon, chaplain to Irish troops in England, died in prison, York; Ambrose Aneas O'Cahill, p., cut to pieces by cavalry; Cork; Donagh Dubh (Black) and James Moran, lay brothers; laymen: Louis O'Ferrall, died in prison; Athlone; Charles O'Dowd, hanged; Donagh O'Brien, burned alive; Sir Patrick Purcell, Sir Geoffrey Galway, Thomas Strich, mayor, Dominick Fanning, ex-mayor, Daniel O'Higgins, hanged after surrender of Limerick; Henry O'Neill, Theobald of Burgo. 1650: Servants: Roger Ormoncilus O'Sullivan, and Hugh Garighy, hanged, Co. Clare; Cornelius MacCarthy, Co. Kerry; Bernard Fitzpatric, Ossory Diocese; Franciscans hanged: Eugene O'Cahan, guardian at Ennis, Sibiah Luachra, Anthony Broder, deacon, near Tuam, Bonaventure de Burgo, Nielan Loche, p., Derry, Anthony O'Ferrall, p., Tulok, John O'Ferrall, Eamon O'Bern, p., O.P., beheaded after torture, Jamestown; laymen hanged: Thaddeus O'Connor Sligo, Boyle; John O'Connor Kerry, Tralee; Thaddeus O'Connor of Beainmaid in Connaught; Bernard Mo-briody; Edmund Butler, Dublin, Bridg O'Aray, wife of Bridg O'Aray, and a woman, hanged near quarter given. 1653: Dominicans: Thaddeus Moriarty, prior at Tralee, hanged, Killarney; Bernard O'Kelly, p. or lay brother, Galway; David Roche, p., sold into slavery, St. Kitts; Honoria Burke and her


Uncertain Dates.—Forty Cistercians of Monasterneagh, Co. Limerick, may be the monks mentioned in 1602, though the manner of death is stated differently; Daniel O'Hanlan, I., died in prison; Donagh O'Kennedy, Donagh Serenan, Fulgentius Jordan, Raymund O'Malley, John Tullis, and Thomas Deir, Augustinians, Cork, 1654; James Chevers, O.S.F., James Roche, O.P., and Thomas Meecker, O.S.F., 1660; Alphonse O'Loughlin, O.P., two Dominican fathers, Kilmalkedar; apparently the lay brothers Fitzgibbon and Fox, 1648; Michael Fitzsimon, I.; Conn O'Kiennan, hanged, drawn, and quartered, 1615; Daniel O'Boyle, O.S.F.; Dermot MacCarra (MacCarthy), p.; Donchus O'Fally, 1659; perhaps the Daniel O'Flahavey, friar, remained in Kilkenny; Kerry Lent Assizes, 1703; John MacConan, p., possibly the John O'Conan (Conan) of Copinger, executed by martial law, Dublin, 1618, and the John Honan, O.S.F., 1617 (the correct date is 1618—see above); John O'Grady, p., Thomas Fleming, I.; Lewis O'Lav¬ery, I., hanged, drawn, and quartered, 1615.

O'Reilly, Memorials of those who suffered for the Catholic Faith in Ireland (London, 1888); Murray, Our Martyrs (Dub¬lin, 1883); Stack, Historical Record, XIV (1903), 421; Stack, Historical Sketch of the Persecutions suffered by the Catholics of Ireland under Cromwell and the Puritans (Dublin, 1884); ibid., History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1884); Spicilium Osoriorum, I. (Dublin, 1873). III (Dublin, 1884); Rotha, Analecta Nova et Mora, ed. Moran (Dublin, 1884); O'Sullivan Betar, Patriciana Deoc (Dublin, 1820); Bruodin, Propugnaculum Catholicæ Veritatis (Paris, 1869).

CHARLES MCNEILL.

Irish Dames of Ypres. See BUTLER, MARY JOSEPH.

Irmerius (Garnerius), Italian jurist and founder of the School of Glossators, b. at Bologna about 1050; d. there about 1130. Though he was one of the most famous jurists of the Middle Ages, very little is known concerning his life and works, and it is only during the last twenty years that he has received the attention which his influence on the history and development of medieval jurisprudence demands. He was probably little over twenty years of age when he already taught didactics and rhetoric at Bologna. At the instance of Countess Matilda of Tuscany he began to devote himself to the study of jurisprudence, taking the Justinian code as a guide. Up to his time the study of jurisprudence had been neglected in the empire, and he had to depend to a great extent on private studies, though it is probable that for a time he frequented a law school in Rome. After ten years, however, he returned to Rome, where he returned to Bologna, where he founded a new school of jurisprudence in 1084. It appears that some jurisprudence had been taught at Bologna, before Irmerius founded his school, by a certain Pepo and a few others; but the great impulse which juridical studies received at this time, and which spread throughout Europe, was entirely due to the school of Irmerius. He introduced the custom of explaining the Roman law by means of glosses, which originally were mere interlinear elucidations of the text. But since the glosses were often too extensive to be inserted between the lines of the text, he began to write them on the margin of the page, thus being first to introduce the marginal glosses which afterwards came into general use. After the death of Pope Paschal II, he defended the rights of Emperor Henry V in the papal election and upheld the legality of the election of the imperial antipope, Gregorius VII.

Irmerius is the author of numerous juridical works, but most of them have either been lost, or their genuineness is not sufficiently established. His chief work is "Summa Codicis", which is of a special historical value, because it is the first medieval system of Roman jurisprudence. It was commonly fitted with a critical introduction by Fitting, "Summa Codicis des Irmerius, mit einer Einleitung" (Berlin, 1894). Another important work generally ascribed to Irmerius is "Questiones de juris substantiis". It was also edited by Fitting, "Questiones de juris substantiis des Irmerius, mit einer Einleitung" (Frod. 200jährigm Jubiläum der Universität Halle-Wittenberg, 1894). The other juridical works and glosses that are ascribed to Irmerius are in fact only fragments, or their authorship is still too uncertain.

BARTA, L'EPOCA D'IRMERIUS (2 vols. Turin, 1896); FITTING, DIE ANFÄNGE DER RECHSCHULE IN BOLOGNA (Berlin, 1888); RAYNOULT, Geschichte des Lateinischen Rechts in Mitteleuropa (Berlin, 1882); SCHUPPEN, LA SCUOLA DI ROMA E LA QUESTIONE IR¬MERIUS IN ATTICA ELEUSA, Lecce (Rom, 1898), 3-16; PERZKYER, A Survey of the Sources of the Glosses des Irmerius (Graz, 1897); SUMMA CODICIAE ET IREMIUS (Turin, 1897); DIE SUMMA IRMERIUS IN ZEITSCHRIFT FUR RECHTSCHAFT, XVII (1896), 1-98; IREMIUS pdo la nuova critica storica in Rivista Storica Italiana, XI (Turin, 1994), 607-925.

MICHAEL OTT.

Iroquois.—A noted confederacy of five, and afterwards, six, cognate tribes of Iroquoian stock, and closely cognate languages, formerly occupying central New York, and claiming right of conquest over nearly all the tribes from Hudson Bay to Tennessee River, and westward to Lake Michigan and Illinois River. The name by which they are commonly known is a French derivative of disputed origin and meaning; but possibly may come from the Algonquin Irinahkote (red snakes), snake being the term by which the Algonquin tribes denoted hostile tribes of alien stock. To the English they were known as the "Five", and afterwards the "Six Nations". They called themselves "Irogo'onionsinni" (We are friends), "Hodinonysonnii", frequently written and translated "Konehionni" and "Hodenosane" (People of the long house). The five original tribes, from east to west, were the "Ganinge-haga" (Plint place people), "Onenio-te-sga" (Standing stone people), "Ononde¬go-e" (Mountain lake people), "Gononei-a-nta-cus-ta-coming-out-place people", and "Tsonontowa¬ga" (Big mountain people), known to the French as "Agne-roron", "Onnieount", "Onontauge", "Goy¬goouen", and "Tsonontouan", and to the English as Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca. To these were added the cognate Tuscarora (Hemp gatherers) from North Carolina, after the war of 1711-12. Each tribe also had one or more figurative names used commonly in the confederate council, the term "Long house" itself being a figurative designation for the confederacy, of which the Mohawk were considered to guard the eastern door, as the Seneca did the western, while the Onondaga watched the sacred council fire in the centre.

The numerous broken tribes "adopted" or taken under protection were never accounted equal members of the confederacy, and full political equality was not accorded to them. There began a period of probation as "infants", "boys", and "observers". Other tribes of Iroquoian stock were the Wyandot, or Huron; Tionontati, or Tobacco Nation; and the Neutral Nation of Ontario; the Erie and Conestoga (Andaste, Susquehanna), in Ohio and Pennsylvania, and the Nottoway, Tuscarora, and Cherokee, of Vir
orichards so extensive as to be a constant theme of wonder to both French and later American invaders. Besides corn they cultivated squashes, beans, and tobacco, in addition to which their woods and waters furnished abundant supplies of game and fish. Fam-

ine, so common in some tribes, was unknown among the Iroquois. The women dressed in deerskin, who buck-

skin, and their women were potters and basket makers, but not weavers. Their ordinary weapons were the bow, knife, and stone or wooden club, afterward superseded by the steel hatchet or tomahawk of civilised manufacture, but they sometimes in ancient times used also the stone and iron, and in fact they did a rude kind of wicker work, and a rude form of body armour. Learning to their sorrow the power of firearms, in their first encounter with Champlain they made eager efforts to buy guns from contraband Dutch traders with such success that by 1640 a large proportion of their warriors were well equipped and expert gunners, enabling them to start upon a career of conquest which made the Iroquois name a terror for a thousand miles. Even among savages they were noted for their cruelty, cannibal feasts and sickening torture of captives being the sequel of every successful war expedition. After the war, the woman of the Iroquois, their awful savagery, was visited upon the devoted missionary.

In Iroquois cosmogony, the central figure is Thar-

onyawagon, the “Sky Holder”, dwelling above the firmament, whose pregnant wife, cast down to the earth in a fit of jealousy, bears a daughter, who, mak-

ing a turtle in human form—the turtle being symb-

olic of power over earth and water—becomes in turn

the mother of twin boys. These, as they grow up, are thenceforth in perpetual conflict, the one, the god of winter and death, forever destroying what his brother, the god of spring and life, as he constantly rebuilds. Their mythology and ceremonial are rich and well-

preserved, almost the whole of their ancient ritual forms being still kept up on the Ontario reserve. Among the principal ceremonies may be noted the Green Corn Dance, a thanksgiving for the new crops, and the “Burning of the White Dog”, a solemn sacri-

fice. Another, in ancient times, was the Feast of the Dead, when the bones of all who had been dead for a term of years were gathered from their temporary resting places and deposited in a common sepulchre. The temporary disposal was by safeguard burial. The ball that was played there, was their principal cere-

monial game. Unlike most eastern Indians, the Iro-

quois were monogamists, but divorce was easy and frequent, the children remaining always with the mother.

The Iroquois languages have been the subject of much study by missionaries and others, and have an abundant literature, philologic, religious, and general. Principal in the first class are Brueyas’s “Radices ver-

borum Iroquoorum”, and Cuoq’s “Lexique de la langue Iroquoise”, besides an extensive Iroquois-

French grammar and dictionary, still in manuscript, by Father Marcoux.

According to Iroquois tradition, as interpreted by Hewitt, our, best living authority, the league was established through the effort of Hiawatha (River Maker), probably of the Mohawk tribe, about the year 1570, or about forty years before the appearance of the French and Dutch in their country. At the time they met they agreed upon a league, with a chief and assistant chief within strong palisades. In less important settle-

ments the houses were scattered about in a straggling fashion. Surrounding the villages were cornfields and  

in Carolina. Of these only the Wyandot and Cherokees survive. Wherever found, the tribes of this stock showed a marked and recognized intellectual superiority. No other native Indian government north of Mexico has been the subject of so much study as the Iroquois, and it might be plausibly said that no other was so complex and exact in detail and so wisely adapted to permit the fullest measure of freedom to each component tribe, while securing united action in all that concerned the whole. In general plan, it might be compared to our own system of inde-

pendent Federal states, the original name being that borne by his direct predecessor on the original formation of the league. All nominations to hereditary

chiefs, while originating with the women’s council, had to be ratified by the tribal and league councils. Elaborate installation or condolence cere-

monies signalled the inauguration or the death of a member of the league council, but no official notice was taken of the passing of a lesser chief. No alien

could become a member of the tribe except by formal adoption into a clan, and as the right of adoption rested solely with the women as mothers of the clan, the motive of captives for life or death depended upon the will of the women. As the cultivators of the ground, the women also held jurisdiction of the territorial domain, and again, as mothers of the warriors, they de-

cided questions of war and peace. Except for the veto power of the league council, it might be said that the women of the confederated tribes constituted the legislative body while the warriors were the execu-

tive.

The Iroquois dwelling was the so-called “long house”, from 50 to 100 feet in length and from 15 to 20 feet in width, the frame of stout posts set upright in the ground, kept in place with cross-pieces, and covered and roofed with bark. The chief’s was divided into compartiments of equal size along each side, opening upon a central passageway along the whole length of the building. Each compartiment, excepting those at the end for storage or guest purposes, sheltered one family, so that as many as twenty families might live and take their meals in the central passageway, so disposed that one fire accommodated four families. All the occupants of a house were usually closely related by clan kinship, thus constitut-

ing a larger family. In the principal towns, fre-

quently designated as “castles”, the houses were constructed in tiers, nearly side by side, and inclosed within strong palisades. In less important settle-

ments the houses were scattered about in a straggling fashion. Surrounding the villages were cornfields and  

Iroquois.
largely due the final fall of Canada. Through contraband trade with the Dutch at Albany, after 1615, the Iroquois quickly supplied themselves with guns, and at once inaugurated a systematic war of conquest or extermination against all the surrounding tribes, particularly those in the French interest. In 1642 the heroic Jesuit missionary Jogues, while on his way to the Hurons, was taken by a Mohawk war party and cruelly tortured until rescued by the Dutch. The same capture and torture, and the same kindly rescue, befell the Jesuit Bressani, in 1644. In 1646, on the conclusion of an uncertain peace with the savages, Father Jogues again offered himself for the Mohawk mission, but was taken by his captors and tortured to death on the charge of being the cause of a pestilence and a plague upon the crops.

In the meantime the Iroquois were making constant raids upon the Huron missions about Georgian Bay, as also upon the partly missionized tribes of the lower St. Lawrence. In 1648, a grand army of invasion of at least 1500 Iroquois warriors, largely armed with guns, swept over the Huron country, and within a few months had practically destroyed the tribe, burning the towns and missions, slaughtering hundreds upon hundreds of their people, carrying off 700 captives, one boy and whole families, and killing the missionaries, Daniel, Garnier, Lallemand, and the great Brébeuf. Between then and 1675 they wiped out in the same way the Tionontati (1650), Neutrals (1651), Erie (1655) and at last after a long and hard conflict the Conestoga (1675), all of their own kindred stock, those left alive being incorporated into the Iroquois towns. At the same time they were carrying on almost equally desolating warfare with the Mohican on the east, the Algonquin and Ottawa in the North, the Illinois in the far west, and the Cherokee, Tutelo, and Catawba in the South, while knowing the French under a constant terror. They were careful, however, to maintain friendship with the Dutch and the later English, from whom they obtained their war supplies. A careful estimate by Greenhalgh in 1677 gave them then about 2150 warriors—perhaps 8000 souls—of whom, according to Jesuit authorities, nearly one-half were incorporated captives. In 1656, during a brief truce with Canada, a Jesuit mission colony was established among the Onondagas at their own request, with Father Le Mercier as superior, but two years later, upon the discovery of an intended massacre and general flight of Canadians, the mission was abandoned. Another truce, consequence upon a successful expedition by De Tracy, gave brief opportunity for re-establishment, and in 1668 there were three missions in the Iroquois country.

Notwithstanding the hostile attitude of the league, a large number in each tribe, including the incorporat ed captives from the old missions, was now Christian and disposed to friendship with the French. Accordingly it was decided to attempt to draw out these Christians from the tribes and colonize them into mission towns in the neighbourhood of the French, to be a means of both additional strength against the Iroquois enemy. One reason for this conclusion was the hostile attitude assumed toward the French missionaries by the new English government of New York. As a consequence of the colonizing policy, mission settlements of Christian Iroquois were established in the Quintay, Bay, Ontario (Sulpician, 1668; Recollet, 1675); at Losangeles, near Montreal, of 1667; at François Xavier des Prés (Jesuit, 1669; removed to Sault St. Louis and renamed St. François Xavier du Sault, 1676, now Caughnawaga); the Mountain, near Montreal (Sulpician, 1676; transferred to Sault au Recollet in 1678; c. 1704, and to Lake of Two Mountains c. 1730; Ob. 1759). In 1677 Denonval, invaded the western Iroquois territory with a detachment of the mission warriors, destroying towns and cornfields, but without bringing the enemy to an important engagement. In 1689 the Iroquois retaliated by landing 1500 warriors at Montreal, ravaging the whole country and butchering 200 men, women, and children, carrying off over a hundred more to be tortured in their towns. In the subsequent Great King William War the Iroquois turned the English against the French, suffering such losses that in 1698 the league numbered only 1230 warriors, not counting those now permanently identified with the French interest.

Largely through the effort of Sir William Johnson, the resident British superintendent, they, as a nation, held to the English interest throughout the French and Indian Wars of 1744-48 and 1754-63. Within this period was established the Sulpician mission of the Presentation, at Oswego, now Ogdenburg, N. Y., by Father Francis Picquet, which flourished until the transfer of dominion to England. About 1755 the present mission settlement of St. Regis (St. Francis Regis), now bisected by the international boundary line, was established by emigrants from Caughnawaga.

Under Johnson's encouragement Episcopalian missionaries worked with success among the Mohawk, for whom the "Book of Common Prayer" was translated into their language. Unsuccessful efforts were also made by the Moravians, but later work by Congregationalists and Methodists has had more result. On the breaking out of the Revolution, about one half of the New York Iroquois fled to Canada, where they enlisted in the Iroquois regiments, already established behind, particularly the Senecas, were hobbled by an expedition under command of General John Sullivan, in 1779. The refugees were subsequently assigned lands by the British Government, near Brantford, Ontario, on which they still reside, keeping many of their old native religion. Those remaining in New York, now largely Protestant, have gradually reduced their territorial holdings by successive treaty cessions. About 1843 the larger part of the Oneida removed to Wisconsin. The whole body of the Iroquois in 1908 was distributed as follows: United States—New York, 5455; Wisconsin (Oneida), 2204; Oklahoma (Seneca), 398; Pennsylvania (Seneca), 120; Canada—Ontario, Six Nations on Grand River, 4226; Mohawk of Quinté, 1327; Oneida of the Thames, 772; Iroquois of Gibson, about 140; Quebec, Caughnawaga, 200; Lake of Two Mountains, 403. Total about 18,725.

Irregularity (Lat. in, not, and regular, rule, i.e. not according to rule), a canonical impediment directly impeding the reception of tonsure and Holy Orders or preventing its being received. It is called a canonical impediment because introduced by ecclesiastical law, for the canons pre-
IRREGULARITY

scribe certain requisites for the licit reception of orders, e.g. moral probity, proper age, legitimate birth, knowledge proportionate to each order, integrity of body, mind, will, and faith. A defect in these qualities prescribed by church regulations is rightly called a impediment, a direct effect of which is twofold: first, it prohibits the reception of orders and, second, prevents an order received from being licitly used. Indirectly it impedes one who has become irregular from obtaining an ecclesiastical benefice.

TITULAR OR FATAL.—Irregularity is total when it precludes the acts of every order already received. Such, for example, is the irregularity arising from voluntary homicide. If partial, it interferes with some exercise of an order or prevents only the ascent to a higher order. Thus, the absence of the left eye would not prevent one from ministering as a deacon, but he could not receive the priesthood, and a priest who lost his thumb would become irregular for sacrificing at the altar, but not for hearing confessions.

PERPETUAL OR TEMPORAL.—The former irregularity is of its nature enduring; the latter, existent only for a certain period, and a defect against it is called "Expurgatur."—The main division of irregularities is into those which are the consequence of crime (ex delicto) and those which arise from defect (ex defectu), according as they have been imposed by law on account of crimes by reason of which a person becomes unworthy of the reception of orders or their exercise or have been imposed on account of certain defects which would be indecorous in a sacred minister. It is not to be supposed however that irregularity ex delicto has been directly and proximately imposed as a punishment; for when the Church declares one irregular on account of crime, she does not primarily intend the punishment of the guilty one, but rather desires to shield the sanctuary from profanation. As a consequence, irregularity ex delicto resolves itself logically into irregularity ex defectu. The distinction, however, must be retained in practice, both on account of the laws of dispensation and because irregularity ex delicto is a result of wrongdoing. This distinction has been taken by canonists from a decree of Pope Innocent III (cap. "Aedoeclens," xiv, X, "De purga. canon.").

IRREGULARITIES EX DELICTO OR ON ACCOUNT OF CRIME.—In the primitive Church those who had performed public and private crimes, or who were guilty of sacrilege, were not allowed to receive orders; and if already ordained were not admitted to higher orders. This was the first form of irregularity in the legislation of the Church, if we except certain prescriptions which appear in the New Testament (I Tim., iii, 2; v, 22; Titus, i, 6). After public penance and de- desuetude all faults were atoned for by private penance, and then began the distinction found in the "Corpus Juris Canonici" (e. xxxii, § 3, d. 1) between public and private crimes, to the effect that the former produced irregularity, while the latter did not. This was defined; and seems that irregularity is present, however, a different rule obtains, namely, that only those crimes which are expressly mentioned in law, whether they be public or private, can produce irregularity ex delicto; though it must be noted that crimes to which irregularity is attached on account of infamy do not make a person irregular if they remain secret, while the other crimes mentioned in law do produce irregularity, whether they be public or occult. For the incurring of irregularity ex delicto the act must be external, consummated, and of mortal gravity. Hence, if, on account of circumstances, the act be not a crime, it is not true that irregularity is not constituted precisely on account of crime, yet, as a matter of fact, it is never imputed unless there be a crime of mortal gravity. The exception to this rule is homicide, which may sometimes make a person irregular when the fault is only venial. It is to be noted that penance cannot prevent the incurring of an irregularity. Suppose there be question of a doubtful crime. If the doubt be one concerning the law (dubium juris), viz. whether or not a crime is a direct effect of the irregularity, then the doubt is not in the case of a particular crime, then an irregularity is not incurred. If the doubt concern the fact (dubium facti), viz. whether the crime was actually committed or, if so, whether the act was of mortal gravity, canonists reply with a distinction: if the doubtful fact concerns homicide, then it is probable that irregularity was abstracted, on account of the peculiar iniquity of homicide with the clerical state; but if the doubt concerns any other fact, then it is probable that the irregularity has not been incurred, for the accused has the benefit of the doubt.

Homicide and Mutilation.—(a) Voluntary homicide, even if occult, is a perpetual irregularity both for the reception of Sacraments and for the obtaining of any ecclesiastical benefice or office. The same holds for procuring the actual abortion of a living fetus. The penitential practice of the Church, however, provides that the male for forty days, and the female after eighty days. All those who concur in the homicide as instigators or counsellors also incur irregularity, unless they retracted before the deed was committed and so that their retraction could have been known to the actual perpetrators. As for co-operators in homicide, if several conspire together, or if in a public brawl all joined in the attack and it can not be known who inflicted the fatal wound, all become irregular, at least in the external forum. Those who are in justice bound to prevent a homicide and neglect their duty also incur irregularity. Homicide for the necessary and just defence of one's own life, when no other means would ward off the danger, is free from irregularity; but this is not the case if the killing was unnecessary or if the act was perpetrated in defence of goods or even of the life of another. Accidental homicide or that performed by a person who is irresponsible produces no irregularity. When a person performs a licit act, but omits to use all proper diligence or is not sufficiently skilled, and a death follows, he becomes irregular if he could have foreseen the consequence of his act. It is on this account that Benedict XIV declares that physicians wishing to receive Sacred orders should obtain a statement from the ailing person to the effect that he is not conscious of his illness in a canonical sense, is the separation from the body of one of its principal members or of some part of the body having a distinct office, as a hand or a foot or an eye. He, therefore, who cuts off a finger is not a mutilator, unless it be the index finger or thumb, which, for a priest, are accounted principal members. Those who mutilate themselves or procure mutilation without just cause incur irregularity. In practice, these two points are to be observed concerning homicide and mutilation: first, in doubt as to the fault where the fact is certain, a conditional dispensation must be obtained; second, if the crime be undecided, an accidental, a priest must abstain from the altar until the case be passed on by proper authority. Abuse of Baptism.—This is an irregularity contracted by those who unconditionally reiterate baptism knowingly and openly. In such a case the persons baptizing, receiving baptism, and those co-operating in it all become irregular. Some authors hold that the same irregularity is contracted by those who confer conditional baptism where there is no prudent doubt that the first baptism was valid. Other canonists deny this and their opinion seems preferable. A person who allows himself to be baptized and is afterwards proved to be a heretic falls also under this impediment. It is evident, however, that this does not affect infants baptized by heretics. Violation of Censure.—Irregularity is incurred under this head by those who presume to
exercise orders while under censure, i.e. while excommunicated or suspended. It applies equally to all clerics whether in major or minor orders and to the excommunicate silandi and tolerandi. But to incur it, the inculminating act must be one of order, not jurisprudence. The other, of course, must be performed by the accused in knowledge and temerity. Abuse of Ordination.—

Those who in bad faith receive Sacred orders from bishops who are under censure become irregular and incur suspension from the order received. If the defect is principally in the one ordained, however, he is suspended, but probably does not incur an irregularity. Heresy, Apostasy, and Schism.—Heretics in general are irregular, whether they were born in heresy or lapsed into it from the Catholic Faith. This irregularity also includes the children of heretics to the second degree in the paternal line, and to the first degree in the maternal. If the parents embrace the Catholic Faith, their offspring is no longer irregular. Those born of Jews and pagans are not comprehended under this irregularity. Children are held irregular if born after their parents have fallen into heresy, and if the parents die in heresy. Some older canonists held that in cases where Catholics and non-Catholics live mixed together this irregularity is in effect in the offspring of the latter. A decree of the Holy Office (9 July, 1884), however, declares that the children of those who die in heresy are irregular, even in countries where heresy is rampant and unchecked. A schismatic is not irregular, unless he be at the same time a heretic. Such schismatics, however, where heresy is conjoined, even after restoration to the unity of the Church, remain irregular, as do also heretics after abjuration and apostates after penance. Defect of Fame, or Infamy.—This is defined by canonists as a state of lowered dignity, or a privation or diminution of the esteem of men. It is called infames in the law when the law declares one to be infamous either ipso facto or after judicial sentence. To the first class of infames belong those who are guilty of marriage with a prostitute, who attack cardinals, commit rape, engage in duels, embrace heresy. Children of those who commit high treason or lay hands on a cardinal are also infamous. If civil laws intend to brand a guilty person with infamy he is held as infamous by canon law. To the second class, or those who are held infamous only after judicial sentence, belong all convicted of certain crimes expressed in law or who have been condemned to very degrading penalties. The defect of fame is not incurred when one perpetrates any crime which forfeits the good opinion of the community. When one's good name is lost only through a widespread suspicion this is deemed sufficient to impede the reception of Sacred orders. In ancient times certain classes of people, such as harriers, actors, and others, were considered infamous by their very employment, but at present the actual opinion of the community must be consulted.

(2) Irregularities ex Defectu or on Account of Defect:—

Proper Age.—The Church has prescribed a certain age at which a layman can be consecrated to the sacred orders, stipulating that the candidate's age, and the age of the ordaining bishop, must be observed. Defect of Birth.—In primitive times illegitimacy was no bar to ordination. In 655 the Ninth Council of Toledo decreed that illegitimate sons of clerics in major orders should be held as serfs of the Church and not be admitted to Holy orders unless first manumitted by the bishop. In the ninth and tenth centuries those born of violated virgins or of incest began to be held as irregular. Various canons were also formed concerning different details of illegitimacy, until finally a general prohibition against all spurious children being admitted to orders was set down. The Sacraments of Holy orders unless the ordained or the ordaining bishop would be a stain on the sacred ministry. At present, therefore, all illegitimate persons are irregular unless they have been legitimated by the subsequent marriage of their parents or by profession in a religious order or by papal rescript. Foundlings of unknown parentage should receive conditional dispensation. Those also are held to be irregular who, though sprung from valid marriage, were born while their parents were bound by solemn vow or after the reception of Sacred orders. The ordination is thus invalid and the person is less liberated by their masters. The same irregularity affects those who are responsible to the civil government for the administration of certain offices or duties, as judges, magistrates, guardians, administrators, soldiers. These are not to be ordained until they have freed themselves from their civil duties and dispelled any suspicion of fraudulent dealings. Those, however, who administer charitable funds or have the care of the poor or orphans are not included. Owing to the defect of liberty a husband cannot receive orders during the lifetime of his wife, unless she enter religion or make a vow of chastity. Defect of Matrimony, or Bigamy.—In canonical phraseology, bigamy may be of three kinds. It is called true bigamy when a man has contracted a second marriage after the death of his first wife. Such a person is considered irregular for Sacred orders, because according to Innocent III a second marriage does not signify the union of Canon, with His Caus sui, the same as the union of the first marriage. Hence this irregularity is technically called defectus sacramentorum (i.e. matrimonii). The impediment is not contracted, however, if either the first or second marriage had not been consummated. Bigamy is called interpretativa, when, by fiction of law, a person is accounted as having had two wives, when in reality he had but one. This is the condition of a man who marries a widow or one corrupted by another. Simultaneous bigamy is contracted by a person who, bound by solemn religious vows or by Sacred orders, enters into a so-called marriage. Such a one is considered as having contracted two marriages, the one valid and spiritual with Christ, the other carnal and invalid with his guilty partner.

Defect of Mildness.—This impediment, termed in Latin defectus lentitiae, makes those persons irregular who voluntarily, actively, and proximately take part in any form of public authority in the lawful killing or mutilating of another. The reason of this irregularity is that since Christ was the gentlest of men, and priests are His representatives, they should likewise be models of mildness. This irregularity may be contracted in war. Canonists hold generally that an act of just war does not impede the reception of Sacred orders. The irregularity is not, however, contracted by the mere fact of a person's entering military service. Defect of mildness also constitutes an irregularity for those concerned in legal capital punishment, as judges pronouncing sentences of death, witnesses, accusers, clerks writing out the sentence, and those who carry it into actual execution. As jurymen with us are really judges, they would seem to contract this irregularity likewise. The law is so strict that a judge who decrees a death sentence which was not carried out remains irregular for the reception of Sacred orders. In the case of the clergy, however, before a court for injuries done to themselves must protest, according to Boniface VIII, that they do not desire sentence of capital punishment, if they wish to keep clear of irregularity. Similar protestation must
be made by the ordinary who allows a corpse to be disinterred from the cemetery with a view to proving that some other person can be shown to have incurred the imputedly remotely concur in a death sentence, as legislators, chaplains, and the like, are not included in this irregularity. As to clerics who practice surgery there is divided opinion among canonists, and while some hold that they contract this irregularity, others deny it, unless they can be shown to have incurred the imputedly fault of homicide or mutilation. Mere disobedience of the Church’s laws as to the practice of surgery by a cleric may be a sin, without necessarily being an irregularity. Bodily Defects.—These constitute an impediment to Sacred orders, either because they render a candidate incapable of performing his duties, or because they would make him an object of horror and derision. The following are, therefore, irregular: mutilated persons, those having an artificial limb or who are unable to use their hand or thumb or index finger; the blind and those whose vision is too dim to allow them to read the Missal. Some authors, e.g. Noldin, think that, owing to the present ingenious construction of artificial limbs, this defect is no longer an irregularity, as it has ceased to be a deformity. The absence of an eye, even the left eye, may not constitute an impediment if the person can read the Mass without deformation. In case the bishop is doubtfully when the defect exists, he makes his declaration to Rome, but in practice the Sacred Congregation generally inclines to the severer view. Total deafness, dumbness, and stammering to such an extent as to make it impossible to pronounce complete words are likewise impediments. Paralytics, the lame who cannot properly perform the ceremonies, those who cannot drink wine without vomiting, lepers, those afflicted with the falling sickness, and in general all whose deformity is very notable are irregular. Defect of Reason.—This irregularity includes the insane, enervates, and simpletons. Defect of Knowledge. Those who have not acquired the knowledge prescribed by the Council of Trent for the various grades of Holy orders cannot be lietely promoted to them. This defect is one that cannot be dispensed in, say canonists, because it falls under the natural law. When its cause, ignorance, disappears, however, the irregularity disappears with any defect of reason. Defect of Confirmation in Faith.—This irregularity embraces neophytes recently converted and those who have not received the Sacrament of Confirmation.

Cremation of Irregulars.—Many of the irregularities are defects cease without dispensation which do not disappear until the decease of the person. A person was accounted irregular on account of some occupation in life, the dismissal of such occupation or condition will remove the impediment without any dispensation. All other irregularities need formal dispensation. In this matter the pope has absolute juridiction. A limited power of dispensation is conceded to bishops either by law or special faculties. By canon law a bishop can dispense from irregularities arising from similitudinary bigamy: likewise from illegitimacy, but only for minor orders. The Council of Trent declares that bishops may also dispense in all cases of doubt concerning bishops and those concerning which proceedings have been instituted before legal tribunals. The bishop can use his dispensing power, however, only for his own diocesan subjects. In voluntary homicide which is public or notorious the pope himself rarely dispenses. In homicide committed for one’s own defence as well as secret accidental manslaughter, the bishop can dispense. If the latter deed be public the ordinary’s dispensation extends only to the person. Heresy, schism, and apostasy are reserved to the pope, and for them the bishops need special faculties. Bodily defects are to be passed on by the local bishop, but the dispensation must come from the pope. Illegitimacy as an impediment to Sacred orders is reserved to the pope, but he need not desist from ordaining a religious profession. Faults committed before baptism do not produce any irregularity. From this it will be seen that Irregularities have been constituted by the Church to preserve the dignity and sanctity of the sacred ministry.

LITURGY, THE ELEMENTS OF (London, 1906). s. v.; AICHELER, Compendium Juris Ecclesiasticum (Brixen, 1893); FERLAND, Bibliotheca Prompta, IV (Rome, 1886); s. v.; LATZ, Instituciones Juris Ecclesiasticum (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 49-79; BÖNNINGHAUSEN, De Irregularitatibus (Münster, 1863-77); RICHERT, Das Anfangs der Irregularitäten (Freiburg im Br., 1901).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Irremovability (Lat. in, not, and removere, to remove), a quality of certain ecclesiastical offices and dignities. It implies that the incumbent’s appointment is, under certain conditions, a perpetual one, or for the term of his natural life. This quality of irremovability, or perpetuity, is attached to the principal ecclesiastical offices, such as archbishop, cardinal, bishop, parish priest, etc. A pope can resign his dignity; cardinals, bishops, and parish priests can either resign or be removed only for cause. It is of the removability of the latter especially that this article treats. According to the principal canonists the constitution of the canonical parish includes among its requisite conditions that its rector be irremovable. However, this does not mean that no exception is permitted, for occasionally the rectors of such canonical parishes may have only a vicarious charge for another who is the true parish priest. In some countries the bishop seems to be the parish priest of all or most of the parishes in his diocese, and the actual incumbents are simply his vicars. Thus in France after the Revolution the custom obtained that some thirty thousand secular parish priests (deservents) were created without canonical institution, and without the right of perpetuity, so that they could be removed and transferred by the bishops. The attitude of the Holy See towards this state of things has been one of passivity and toleration, not of approbation. In many missionary countries, as in the United States and England, a similar condition has been permitted. According to the general law of the Church, however, a canonical parish priest is appointed for life and he can be removed from his benefice or office only for grave crimes expressed in law and after a canonical trial, either formal and solemn or, at least, summary, in those countries to which the decree on that subject (1880) of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars has been extended.

Irremovable Rectors in the United States.—Up to a comparatively recent date all the rectors having cure of souls in this country were removable at the will of the bishop (ad nutum episcopi). As we have said above, however, this was not in accord with the general law of the Church. Pope Innocent III, in the Fourth General Council of the Lateran (cap. "Extirpanda", xxx, § 10, "Vero de praet., iii, 5), and Pope Boniface VIII (cap. "Unic. de capell. mon." in Decretals, III, 18) insist that these clerics, except voluntary homicide and those concerning which proceedings have been instituted before legal tribunals, are removable. The bishop can use his dispensing power, however, only for his own diocesan subjects. In voluntary homicide which is public or notorious the pope himself rarely dispenses. In homicide committed for one’s own defence as well as
notwithstanding any custom to the contrary. Indeed, in the early ages of the Church, as soon as priests were appointed to definite curacies (tituli), their appointment seems to have been in perpetuity. The reason for this irremovability of one having cure of souls is found in the fact that he is required to be the shepherd of the flock, to which the sheep are known. It is, moreover, to the benefit of a parish that its administrator realize that he is secure in his office, as it will inspire him with greater zeal for the spiritual and temporal improvement of his charge. In order to extend these benefits to the United States, a law was passed in the Congregation of the Propaganda in 1883 that rectors having cure of souls in that country should be made canonical parish priests and as such irremovable. The American bishops, however, did not think the time ripe as yet for such development, and finally it was determined that irremovable rectors, who would not, however, have all the rights of canonical parish priests, should be constituted instead. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1884, decreed that in three years from the promulgation of the council each bishop was to select, with the advice of his consistory, five new curacies in his diocese, and erect them into quasi-parishes, whose rectors would be irremovable. These quasi-parishes were to constitute at least one in ten of all the curacies or missions in the diocese. The first irremovable rectors might be appointed by the ordinary, with the advice of his consultants, without the formality of an examination, or concursus, but after that only when the prescribed examination had been undergone. An exception to the latter rule is made for certain priests whose learning and ability have been already abundantly proved. To obtain the right of making the concursus for an irremovable rectorship, a candidate must have already exercised the sacred ministry in a worthy manner for ten years in the diocese, and demonstrated his capacity for spiritual and temporal administration as a removable rector or in some equivalent office. The examiners having approved all the candidates whom they find worthy of the position, it devolves upon the bishop to designate one from among them who is to be made irremovable rector. Such rectors have quasi-parochial rights and join with the diocesan consultants in recommending candidates for the bishopric when it becomes vacant. In some cases, where diocesan or other duties would make a special concursus for every irremovable rectorship very inconvenient, it is allowed to hold a general examination once a year, and those approved for their learning at that time are qualified for appointment to any irremovable rectorship which falls vacant within the next six years. The other requisite qualifications for such office are to be passed on each time there is question of an appointment.

Irremovable rectors in the United States may be dismissed from their parishes only for very grave crimes, as dismissal is a very grave punishment. The nature of these crimes is that they shall be designated by ecclesiastical law. Dismissal is inflicted either ipso facto, in which case, however, a declaratory sentence is as a rule necessary, or after a condamnatory sentence following on a trial. The common law of the Church distinguishes those circumstances and shows that there is a necessary formal procedure of trial from those which require a condamnatory sentence after canonical trial. The former are: heresy, falsification of papal documents, assassination, bodily attack on cardinal or bishop, procuring abortion, unnatural vice, simony, duelling, usurpation of church property, mendacity, irregular ordination or neglecting to receive Sacred orders within a year after appointment to a parish. The latter are: neglect of the prescribed clerical costume, non-residence in the parish, usury, inebriety, murder, gambling, perjury, theft and the like, remaining obdurately under censure for a year, incurring certain irregularities, concubinage. To these crimes the Third Council of Baltimore (1884) added other causes for the dismissal of irremovable rectors other than the ordinary in matters of grave moment, open neglect of the bishop's mandates concerning parochial schools, repeated incurring of debts without permission of the ordinary and manifest disobedience in payment of debts, collusion with lay trustees in issuing false and fraudulent evidence of the benefit of the rector, fraudulent deception of the ordinary in including the annual parochial statement concerning matters of grave import, public and persistent charges against the morals of the incumbent involving great harm to the parish. The council adds that if an irremovable rector be found incapable of administering his parish, he is to be asked to resign his charge. If he refuse, and it be not possible to appoint a vicar with sufficient revenue for support, the bishop can dismiss the irremovable rector, but in that case he must provide a proper pension for him. As to removable rectors, they are not absolutely to the arbitrary will of the ordinary, but must be dismissed only for cause, which, however, need not be one expressed in law nor necessarily as grave as such. The form of trial to be used in all cases in the United States is prescribed in the instruction "Cum Magnopere" (1884). Missionary Rectors in England.—These incumbents correspond to irremovable rectors in the United States. They have been appointed since 1852 in virtue of a decree of the Propaganda. Their office is perpetual and they have quasi-parochial rights, and they may not be removed except for canonical cause. The Most Honorable Chapter of Westminster declares (decree xxv, 12) that an assistant priest acquires no right to a permanent appointment to the cure of souls owing to his service, but that such appointment to a missionary rectorship is a right reserved.

Irvingites, a religious sect called after Edward Irving (1792–1834), a depose Presbyterian minister. They themselves repudiate this name, saying Irving was not their founder but only their "forerunner," and claim to be the "Catholic Apostolic Church." The sect arose from certain extraordinary "manifestations of the spirit"—tongues, prophecies, healings, even raising of the dead—which were said to have taken place during Irving's ministry in London, after his deposition. These led some of his followers to band themselves together for the purpose of forming a religious body modelled exactly on the lines of the primitive Apostolic Church, as they conceived it. The specificity of their religious belief consists in this: They hold apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors (Ephesians, iv, 11–14) to be abiding ministries in the Church, and that these ministries, together with the power and gifts of the Holy Ghost, dispensed and distributed among her members, are the necessary continual foundation of the Church for the Second Advent of the Lord; and that the supreme rule in the Church ought to be exercised, as at first, by twelve apostles, not elected and ordained by men, but called and sent forth immediately by God. They are not separated from the church of Christ, one of the parts of the Church of Christ, but are an integral part of it, their worship apart, indeed, because they believe that they have a special call to do so. They accept the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.
It is their form of church government and liturgy which are peculiar to them. During Irving's lifetime six apostles were "separated" for the work of the ministry. After his death six others were added. These twelve apostles were to ordain twelve "prophets", twelve "evangelists", and twelve "pastors". Seven "deacons" were to be chosen for the management of the moral affairs of the body. This number of central officials has not in fact been adhered to. Each congregation has at its head an "angel", or bishop, who ranks as a "pastor", and who has under him twenty-four priests and seven deacons. The ritual is exceedingly elaborate, resembling in many respects those of the Catholic Church. At Matins and Vespers they have "Proposition" (Exposition) of the Sacrament. On Sundays and holidays they have solemn celebration of the Eucharist with lights, incense, and vestments. They use oil and water in their ritual observances. Their two principal churches are at Albury (Surrey, England), and at Gordon Square, London (England). It should be stated that the so-called Irvingites owe much more to Henry Drummond (1786-1880) than to Irving. At his seat, Albury Park, the earliest meetings of the sect were held, and his wealth was at its disposal. He was one of its office-bearers, and wrote numerous works in its defence. The last of the "apostles" died in 1901, and none has since been appointed. No official statistics are published, but there are known to be congregations not only in England, but also in America, Germany, France, and Switzerland. In 1900 there were 80 churches altogether.

Baxter, John. *Sunrise, Progress, and Present State (1667).*
Story, Life of Story (London, 1862).

T. B. Scannell.

**Isaac** (Heb. יְחָזָק; in a few places יְחָזָי; in Sept. and in N. T. read), the son of Abraham and Sara. The incidents of his life are told in Gen. xxv-xxxv, in a narrative the principal parts of which are traced back by many scholars to three several documents (J, E, P) utilized in the composition of the Book of Genesis (see ABRAHAM). According to Gen., xvii, 17; xviii, 12; xxii, 6, his name means: "he laughs". He was circumcised eight days after his birth, weaned in due time, and proclaimed the sole legal ancestor of the chosen people (xxi, 1-12). His early years were spent in Bersabee, whence he was taken by his father to Mount Moriah to be offered up in sacrifice, and whither he returned after his life had been miraculously spared (xxi, 33; xxii, 19). His mother died when he was thirty-six years of age (Gen. xxvi, 17; xxx, 1). A few years later, he married Rebecca, Bethuel's daughter, whom one of his father's servants had, according to Abraham's directions, brought from Mesopotamia (xxiv). The union took place in "the south country", where Isaac then lived, and continued to live after he had joined with Nahuel in committing the body of Abraham to burial in the cave of Machpelah (xxiv, 62, 67; xxv, 7-11). Many years elapsed before Isaac's longing entreaty to God for children was actually heard. Of the twins to whom she then gave birth, Esau was beloved by Isaac, while Jacob was Rebecca's favourite (xxvi, 21-28). Drought and famine made it necessary for Isaac to take the road down to Egypt, but, at Yahweb's bidding, he stopped on his way thither and sojourned in Gerar, where an incident similar to that of Abraham's disavowal of Sara is recorded of him (xxvi, 1-11). We are told next how, through envy of Isaac's prosperity as a husbandman and a herdsman, the Philistines among whom he dwelt began petty persecutions, which he bore patiently, but on the birth of his sons he finally withdrew to Bersabee. There he was favoured with a new vision from Yahweh, and entered a solemn covenant with Abimelech, King of Gerara (xxvi, 12-33). During the last years of Isaac's career, there occurred the well-known incident of his conferring upon Jacob the Divine blessing, which he had always intended for Esau (xxvii), followed by Isaac's concern to prevent Jacob from his brother's resentment and to secure for him a wife from his mother's kinsred in Mesopotamia (xxviii, 1-5). After Jacob's return, Isaac died at the age of one hundred and eighty, and was buried by his sons in the cave of Machpelah (xxx, 27-29; xlii, 9). As delineated in Genesis, the figure of Isaac is much less striking than that of Abraham, his father. Yet, by his manner of life, always quiet, gentle, guileless, faithful to God's guidance, he ever was the worthy heir and transmitter of the glorious promises made to Abraham. He was pre-eminent a man of peace, the fitting type of the Prince of Peace whose great sacrifice on Mount Calvary was foreshadowed by Isaac's sacrifice on Mount Moriah. The New Testament contains few, but significant references to Isaac (cf. Matt., viii, 11; Luke, xiii, 28; xx, 37; Rom., ix, 7; Gal., iv, 28; Heb., xi, 17 sqq.; James, ii, 21).

The legends and various details concerning Isaac which are found in the Talmud and in rabbinical writings are of no historical value.

(Catholic authors are marked with an asterisk.) *Commentaries on Genesis*: DELITZSCH (tr. New York, 1889); CHELIER* (Paris, 1863); VON HUMMEL* (Paris, 1895); DUMMANN, (tr. Edinburgh, 1897); HUBERG* (Freiburg im B., 1890); GUNZEL (Gottingen, 1901); DRAPER (London, 1904).

Biblical Histories: DABNÉ* (Leon, 1898); HALDEMAR* (4th ed., Ratilson, 1876); SCHOFER* (Brienz, 1895); KITTEL* (tr. London, 1898); BAYE* (London, 1897); PELL* (Paris, 1897); GOGOT* (New York, 1897); Dettel* (New York, 1901); SMITH* (New York, 1903); WADE* (New York, 1904); HEITZER* (Freiburg, 1908).

FRANCIS E. GILOT.

**Isaac of Armenia** (Sahag), Catholicos or Patriarch of Armenia (388-439), otherwise known as ISAAC THE GREAT and sometimes as PARTHEV owing to his Parthian origin. He was son of St. Narceus and descended from the family of St. Gregory the Illuminator. Left an orphan at a very early age, he received in Constantinople an excellent literary education in the Eastern languages. After his election as patriarch he devoted himself to the religious and scientific train-
ing of his people. Armenia was then passing through a grave crisis. In 387 it had lost its independence and been divided between the Byzantine Empire and Persia; each division, with its local, semi-autonomous character, was slowly falling into a feudalistic king. In the Byzantine territory, however, the Armenians were forbidden the use of the Syriac language, until then exclusively used in Divine worship: for this the Greek language was to be substituted, and the country gradually hellenized. In the Persian districts, on the contrary, Greek was not only allowed, but was greatly favoured. In this way the ancient culture of the Armenians was in danger of disappearing and national unity was seriously compromised. To save both Isaac invented, with the aid of St. Mesrop, the Armenian alphabet, and began to translate the Bible; their translation from the Syriac Peshito was revised by means of the Septuagint, and even, it seems, from the Hebrew text (between 410 and 430). The liturgy also, hitherto Syriac, was translated into Armenian, drawing at the same time on the Liturgy of St. Basil of Cæsarea, so as to obtain for the new service a national colour. Isaac had already established Collections for higher education with the aid of disciples whom he had sent to study at Edessa, Melitene, Byzantium, and elsewhere. Through them he now had the principal masterpieces of Greek and Syriac Christian literature translated, e.g. the writings of Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Baruch (of Antioch and of Nyssa), John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.

Armenian literature in its golden age was, therefore, mainly a borrowed literature. Through Isaac's efforts the churches and monasteries destroyed by the Persians were rebuilt, education was cared for in a generous way, the pagan worship of Ormuzd which Shah Yesidgerd tried to set up was cast out, and three councils held to re-establish ecclesiastical discipline. Isaac is said to have been the author of liturgical hymns. Two letters, written by him to Theodosius II and to Atticus of Constantiople, have been preserved. A third letter addressed to St. Proculus of Constantinople was not written by him, but dates from the tenth century. Neither did he have any share, as was wrongly ascribed to him, in the Council of Ephesus (431), though, in consequence of disputes which arose in Armenia between the followers of Nestorius and the disciples of Monothelites, he and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proculus obtained the desired explanations. A man of enlightened piety and of very austere life, Isaac owed his deposition by the king in 426 to his great independence of character: in 430 he was allowed to sell the monastery he had founded and his church did appeal to Constantinople and through St. Proclus

Neumann, Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Literatur, 23-30; Muret, Mémoire sur la Collection des historiens syriens et modernes de l'Arménie, II (Paris, 1869), 159-73; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, I, 1757-7; Bardenhewer, Pauly, 346; Ter-Micelian, Die armenische Kirche (Leipzig, 1892), 33-4; Finck in Gesch. der christl. Literatur des Orients (Leipzig, 1885), 83-5; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, III, 290.

S. VAILHÉ.

Isaac of Nineveh, Nestorian bishop of that city in the latter half of the seventh century, being consecrated by the Nestorian Patriarch George (660-80). Originally a monk of the monastery of Bethabe in Kurdistan, he abdicated for unknown reasons after an episcopate of but five months, and retired to the monastery of Rabban Shapur, where he died at an advanced age, blind through study and austerity. Towards the end of his life he passed under a cloud as his Nestorian orthodoxy became suspect. He was author of three theses, which found but little acceptance amongst Nestorians. Daniel Bar Tubanita, Bishop of Beth Garmai (some 100 miles south-east of Mosul), took umbrage at his teaching and became his harshest opponent. Contests between the theses are not known, but they were of too Catholic a character to be compatible with Nestorian heresy. From an extant prayer of his, addressed to Christ, it is certainly difficult to realize that its author was a Nestorian. Excerpt to claim so great a writer, the Monophysites falsified his biography, placing his life at the beginning of the seventh century. His tomb, as monk of the Jacobite monastery of Mar Mattai, and stating that he retired to the desert of Scete in Egypt. Since the discovery of Iahodenins's "Book of Chastity" by Chabot in 1896 the above details of Isaac's life are beyond doubt, and all earlier accounts must be corrected accordingly. Isaac was a fruitful ascetical writer and his works were for centuries the main food of Syrian piety. Only very little of the original Syriac has been published—two chapters on "Grades of Knowledge" and the "Essential Qualities of Virtues" by Zingerle ("Monum. Syriacæ", I, 1869, 97-101) and three dialogues by Chabot at the end of his treatise "De Isacii vita" (see below). A German translation of some six chapters was made directly from the Syriac by Bickell ("Bibl. der Kirchenv.", Kempten, 1874). A complete list of Isaac's works is given by Chabot in "De Isacii vita " and in "Revue Semitique" (1896), p. 254. Isaac's works were early translated in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Greek. The Greek translation was made by two monks of St. Saba, Patrick and Abraham, and published by Nicephorus Theodocus under the title Teo tria epistulae (Leipsic, 1870). This publication, however, does not represent any precise work of Isaac, but is rather a corpus ascetica, containing treatises, letters, colloquies, all in one. Two Latin recensions thereof have been published: the one entitled "Sermones beati Isacii de Syria" (Venice, 1566) and the other in the "Max. biblioth. vet. Patrum., XIII (Lyons, 1677). This latter recension is reprinted in Gallandi, XII, and again in Migne, P. G., XXXVI, I, 811-86, and bears the title "De Contemptu Mundi". It is erroneously ascribed to Isaac of Antioch, with whom Isaac of Nineveh is often confused. The Fragments of Isaac is a collection of fragments in Greek, which itself has undergone a number of manipulations. The long letter to Simeon of Cessarea published in Mai's "Nov. Patr. Biblioth.", VIII, 3, forms the last chapter of Theodorus's Greek. Marius Benson published apophthegmata of Isaac's in Greek in "Sphinx" (1901), 46-50. The Arabic translation of this corpus ascetica is much fuller than the Greek, and divided into four books. Isaac's writings possess passages of singular beauty and elevation, and remind the reader of Thomas a Kempis.

Chabot, De Isacii Niniænæ vita, in (Paris and Louvain, 1867); Duval, Anc. Littérature chrest. et syriac. (Paris, 1871); Woehl, Short History of Syriac Literature, 2nd ed. (London, 1884); Bardenhewer, Hist. of Ancient Church Literature (tr., Baltimore, 1898).

J. P. ARENDSEN.

Isaac of Seleucia, Patriarch of the Persian Church, d. 410. Isaac is celebrated among the patriarchs of the Persian Church for having reorganized it after the terrible persecution that overwhelmed it under Sapor (Shapur) II. We know little or nothing definite of his early days. According to the most probable tradition he was enabled, through the presence he had with King Vardan I, to restore the Catholikon of Seleucia, which had been vacant for twenty-two years. Another account says he was chosen to replace a certain Qayqom, who had been deposed by his fellow-bishops for incapacity. Isaac's great work was the organizing of the Council of So-
son of John II of Aragon, and heir; at the same time, to the Kingdom of Navarre. 'This Henry did in spite of the opposition of the King of Aragon, who wished to obtain the hand of Isabella (which carried with it the crown of Castile) for his younger son Ferdinand. Negotiations were protracted until the unhappy death of the Prince of Viana. In 1465 an attempt was made to arrange a marriage between Isabella and Alfonso V of Portugal, but the princess had already chosen Ferdinand of Aragon for a husband and was therefore opposed to this alliance. For the same reason she subsequently refused to marry Don Pedro Girón, Master of Calatrava, a member of the powerful Pacheco family, whom the king sought to win over by this means. Other aspirants for Isabella's hand were Richard, Duke of Gloucester, brother of Edward IV of England, and the Duke of Guienne, brother of Louis XI of France. The Cortes was assembled at Ocaña in 1469 to ratify the Pact of Guisando, when an embassy arrived from Portugal to renew the suit of Alfonso V for the hand of Isabella. When she declined this alliance, the king went so far as to threaten her with imprisonment in the Alcazar of Madrid, and although fear of the Infanta's partisans prevented him from carrying out this threat, he exacted of his sister a promise not to enter into any matrimonial negotiations during his absence in Andalusia, whither he was on the point of setting out. But Isabella, as soon as she was left alone, removed, with the aid of the Archbishop of Toledo and the Admiral of Castile, Don Paolino Enríquez, to Madrigal and thence to Valladolid, and from there sent Gutierre de Cárdenas and Alfonso de Palencia in search of Ferdinand, who had been proclaimed King of Sicily and heir of the Aragonese monarchy. Ferdinand, after a journey the story of which reads like a novel, for its perils and its dramatic interest, was married to Isabella in the palace of Juan de Vivero, in 1469.

On the death of Henry IV, Isabella, who was then at Segovia, was proclaimed Queen of Castile. But La Beltraneja had been betrothed to Alfonso V of Portugal, and Henry, revoking the Pact of Guisando, had caused her to be proclaimed heiress of his dominions. The Archbishop of Toledo, the Marqués de Villena, the Master of Calatrava, and other nobles, who in her father's lifetime had denied La Beltraneja's legitimacy, now defended her claims. And thus was begun a war between Spain and Portugal which lasted five years, ending with the peace of 1479, when a double alliance was arranged. La Beltraneja, however, abandoned her claims, taking the veil in the monastery of Santa Clara de Coimbra (1480), and with that event the right of Isabella to the throne of Castile became unquestioned. Ferdinand had meanwhile succeeded to the throne of Aragon, and thus the unification of the Spanish nation was accomplished in the two monarchs to whom a Spanish pope, Alexander VI, gave the title of "Catholic" which the Kings of Spain
still bear. Isabella displayed her prudence and gentleness—qualities which she possessed in a degree seldom equalled—in the agreement she made with Ferdinand as to the government of their dominions: they were to hold equal authority, a principle expressed in the device or motto, “*Tanto monta, monta tanto*—Isabel como Fernando (As much as the one is worth so much is the other—Isabella as Ferdinand).” The union of the peoples and the crowns being thus realized, it was necessary to reduce the power of the nobles, who had acquired a position almost independent of the crown and rendered good government difficult. Towards this object the Catholic sovereigns directed their efforts; among the means which they should be mentioned chiefly: (1) the establishment of the *Santa Hermandad* (Holy Brotherhood), a kind of permanent military force, very completely organized, supported by the municipal councils, and intended for the protection of persons and property against the violence of the nobles; (2) an improved and properly ordered administration of justice, with a wiser organization of the tribunals, the establishment of the Chancery at Valladolid, and the promulgation of the royal edicts generally called “Edicts of Montalto” after the jurisconsult who drew them up; (3) the abolition of the right of coining money, which certain individuals held, and the regulation of the currency laws so as to facilitate commerce; (4) the revocation of extravagant grants made to certain nobles during the reigns of the late monarchs, the demolition of their castles, which constituted a menace to public peace, and the vesting in the crown of the masterships of military orders. To preserve the purity of the faith and religion, against the intrigues of the Jews, who were employing the influence of their wealth and their usurping deceptions to pervert Christians, the Catholic sovereigns solicited of Pope Sixtus IV the establishment of the Inquisition (q. v.).

Their government thus strengthened at home, the sovereigns proceeded to bring to a completion, by the conquest of Granada, the great work of reconquest which had been virtually at a standstill since the time of Alfonso XI. The taking of Zahara, of which the Moors possessed themselves by surprise, afforded an occasion for the war, which opened happily with the conquest of Alhama (March, 1482). The Christians were favoured by the internal troubles of Granada, which were due to the party of the Emir Muley Hassan and his son Boabdil, and, after the death of the former, to the supporters of his uncle Abdallah el Zagal. The sovereigns kept up the war in spite of the serious defeats sustained by them at Ajarquia and Las Navas, they deemed it advisable to make a separate submission of each of the cities or castles of Guadix, Almeria, Loja, Velez, Malaga, and Baza. Isabella took a prominent part in this war; not only did she attend to the government of the kingdom, and provide for the support of the army while Ferdinand did battle at its head, but she repeatedly visited the camp to animate the troops by her presence. This was the case at the siege of Malaga and at that of Baza, where the stern usages of war did not hinder the Moorish leader, Old Hisa, from showing his chivalry towards the queen. She was in danger of being assassinated by a Mohammedan fanatic before the walls of Malaga, and of perishing in the confederation of the besieging camp at Granada. In consequence of this confederation the city of Santa Fe was built, to put an end to the mixture of the peoples and the crowns being thus realized, it was necessary to reduce the power of the nobles, who had acquired a position almost independent of the crown and rendered good government difficult. Towards this object the Catholic sovereigns directed their efforts; among the means which they should be mentioned chiefly: (1) the establishment of the *Santa Hermandad* (Holy Brotherhood), a kind of permanent military force, very completely organized, supported by the municipal councils, and intended for the protection of persons and property against the violence of the nobles; (2) an improved and properly ordered administration of justice, with a wiser organization of the tribunals, the establishment of the Chancery at Valladolid, and the promulgation of the royal edicts generally called “Edicts of Montalto” after the jurisconsult who drew them up; (3) the abolition of the right of coining money, which certain individuals held, and the regulation of the currency laws so as to facilitate commerce; (4) the revocation of extravagant grants made to certain nobles during the reigns of the late monarchs, the demolition of their castles, which constituted a menace to public peace, and the vesting in the crown of the masterships of military orders. To preserve the purity of the faith and religion, against the intrigues of the Jews, who were employing the influence of their wealth and their usurping deceptions to pervert Christians, the Catholic sovereigns solicited of Pope Sixtus IV the establishment of the Inquisition (q. v.).

Their government thus strengthened at home, the sovereigns proceeded to bring to a completion, by the conquest of Granada, the great work of reconquest which had been virtually at a standstill since the time of Alfonso XI. The taking of Zahara, of which the Moors possessed themselves by surprise, afforded an occasion for the war, which opened happily with the conquest of Alhama (March, 1482). The Christians were favoured by the internal troubles of Granada, which were due to the party of the Emir Muley Hassan and his son Boabdil, and, after the death of the former, to the supporters of his uncle Abdallah el Zagal. The sovereigns kept up the war in spite of the serious defeats sustained by them at Ajarquia and Las Navas, they deemed it advisable to make a separate submission of each of the cities or castles of Guadix, Almeria, Loja, Velez, Malaga, and Baza. Isabella took a prominent part in this war; not only did she attend to the government of the kingdom, and provide for the support of the army while Ferdin-
has been ranked as a standard of the language by the Spanish Royal Academy. She was extremely solicitous for the education of her five children (Isabella, John, Joan, Maria, and Catherine), and, in order to educate Prince John with ten other boys, she formed in her palace a school similar to the Palatine School of the Carolingians. Her daughters, too, attained to a dignity and education high for their epoch, and they so combined with their learning the industries peculiarly appropriate to their sex, that Ferdinand the Catholic could imitate Charlemagne in using no article of clothing that had not been spun or sewn by his consort and his daughters. This example of the queen, a model of virtue, piety, and domestic piety, was observed even by the king, who often met his courtiers in the palace, and dispensed it to her at times as seven times, exercised a great moral influence on the nobility in discouraging inordinate luxury and vain pastimes. It also fostered learning not only in the universities and among the nobles, but also among women. Some of the latter decided to educate themselves by their own labors—e.g., Beatris Galinda, called la Latina, Lucia Medrana, and Francesca Nebrija, the Princess Joan and the Princess Catherine (who afterwards became Queen of England), Isabella Vergara, and others who reached great proficiency in philosophy, Latin, and mathematics. Isabella died in 1267. She was buried in the convent church on 2 February, 1270, and was buried in the convent church. After nine days her body was exhumed, when it showed no signs of decay, and many miracles were wrought at her grave. In 1321 Leo X allowed the Abbey of Longchamp to celebrate her feast with a special Office. On 4 June, 1637, a second exhumation took place. On 25 January, 1688, the nuns of Longchamp obtained permission to celebrate her feast with an octave, and in 1696 the celebration of the feast on 31 August was permitted to the whole Franciscan Order. They now keep it on 1 September. The history of the Abbey of Longchamp has been recorded. The Revolution closed it, and in 1794 the empty and dilapidated building was offered for sale, but, as no one wished to purchase it, it was destroyed. In 1857 the walls were pulled down except one tower, and the grounds were added to the Bois de Boulogne.

Isabel of France, Blessed, daughter of Louis VIII and of his wife, Blanche of Castille, b. in March, 1252, d. at Longchamp, 23 February, 1270. St. Louis I, King of France (1226-70), was her brother. When still a child at court, Isabel, or Elizabeth, showed an extraordinary devotion to exercises of piety, modesty, and other virtues. By Bull of 26 May, 1254, Innocent IV allowed her to retain some Franciscan fathers as her special confessors. She was even more devoted to the Franciscan Order than her royal brother. She not only broke off her engagement with a count, but moreover refused the hand of Conrad, son of the German Emperor Frederick II, although pressed to accept him by everyone, even by Pope Innocent IV, who however hesitated (1254) to raise her fixed determination to remain a virgin. As Isabel wished to found a convent of the Order of St. Clare, Louis IX began in 1255 to acquire the necessary land in the Forest of Roovray, not far from the Seine and in the neighbourhood of Paris. On 10 June, 1256, the first stone of the convent church was laid; in 1262 the church was consecrated, and in 1267 the church was completed. The monastery was under the Rule of St. Clare. These rules were drawn up solely for this convent, which was named the Monastery of the Humility of the Blessed Virgin (Monasterium Humilitatis B. Maria Virgini). The nuns were called in the rule the "Sorores Ordinis humilitatis annulare Benedictae Mariae Virginis". The fast was not so strict as in the Rule of St. Clare; the community was allowed to hold property, and the sisters were subject to the Minorites. The first sisters came from the convent of the Sorores Clararum at Reims. Isabel herself never entered the cloister, but from 1260 (or 1262) she followed the rules in her own home near by. Isabel was not altogether satisfied with the first rule drawn up, and therefore submitted through the agency of her brother Louis IX, who had also secured the confirmation of the first rule, a revised rule to Urban IV. Urban approved this new rule on 1 September, 1267.

The difference between the two rules consisted for the most part in outward observances and minor alterations. This new rule was also adopted by other French and Italian convents of the Order of St. Clare, but one can by no means say that a distinct congregation was formed on the basis of Isabella's rule. In the new rule Urban IV gives the nuns of Longchamp the official title of "Sorores Minorum inclusum", which was doubtless intended to emphasize closer union with the Order of Friars Minor. After a life of mortification and virtue, Isabel of France died in the convent on 23 February, 1270, and was buried in the convent church. After nine days her body was exhumed, when it showed no signs of decay, and many miracles were wrought at her grave. In 1321 Leo X allowed the Abbey of Longchamp to celebrate her feast with a special Office. On 4 June, 1637, a second exhumation took place. On 25 January, 1688, the nuns of Longchamp obtained permission to celebrate her feast with an octave, and in 1696 the celebration of the feast on 31 August was permitted to the whole Franciscan Order. They now keep it on 1 September. The history of the Abbey of Longchamp has been recorded. The Revolution closed it, and in 1794 the empty and dilapidated building was offered for sale, but, as no one wished to purchase it, it was destroyed. In 1857 the walls were pulled down except one tower, and the grounds were added to the Bois de Boulogne.

Isaia—Among the writers whom the Hebrew Bible styles the "Latter Prophets" foremost stands "Isaia, the holy prophet—" the great prophet, and faithful in the sight of God" (Eccles., viii, 23-25).

I.—Life.—The name Isaia signifies "Yahweh is salvation". It assumes two different forms in the Hebrew Bible: for in the text of the Book of Isaia and in the historical writings of the Old Testament, for example in IV Kings, xix, 2; II Par., xxvi, 22; xxxii, 20, 32, it is read "Yeshayahu", whereas the collection of the Prophet's utterances is entitled "Yeshayahu, יֵשׁיַֽעַו", in Greek Ισαίας, and in Latin Isaia, but sometimes Isaia. Four other persons of the same name are mentioned in the Old Testament (I Esd., viii, 7; vii, 19; II Esd., xi, 7; I Macc., xxvi, 15); Jesoia (I Par., iii, 21; xxv, 3) may be regarded as mere variants. From the Prophet himself (i, 1; ii, 1) we learn that he was the son of Amos, zen. Owing to the similarity between Latin and Greek forms of this name and that of the Shepherd-Prophet of Theue (Heb. הֶסֶף), some Fathers mistook the Prophet Amos for the father of Isaia. St. Jerome in the
preface to his "Commentary on Amos" (P. L., XXXV, 989) points out this error. Of Isaiah's ancestry we know nothing; but several passages of his prophecies (II Kings, xxvii, viii) lead us to believe that he belonged to one of the best families of Jerusalem. A Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud (Tr. Megilla, 10b.) held him to be a nephew of King Amasias. As to the exact time of the Prophet's birth we lack definite data; yet he is believed to have been about twenty years of age when he began his public ministry. He was a citizen, perhaps a native, of Jerusalem. His writings give unmistakable signs of high culture. From his prophecies (vii and viii) we learn that he married a woman whom he styles "the propheteess" and that he had two sons, Shear-yaph and In-dﮋ. The former may mean she-acer-ly, and the latter may mean she-acer-ly, or "sorely." The latter indicates that he was twice married as some fancy on the gratuitous and indefensible suggestion that the 'almah of vii, 14, was his wife.

The prophetical ministry of Isaias lasted wellnigh half a century, from the closing year of Ozaías, King of Judea, possibly up to that of Manasses. This period was one of great prophetical activity. Israel and Judah indeed were in sore need of guidance. After the death of Jeroboam II revolution followed upon revolution and the northern kingdom had sunk rapidly into an abject vassalage to the Assyrians. The petty nations of the west, however, received from the Assyrian blows received in the beginning of the eighth century, were again manifesting aspirations of independence. Soon Teglatphalasar III marched his armies towards Syria; heavy tributes were levied and utter ruin threatened on those who would show any hesitation to pay. In 725 Ozaías, the last King of Samaria, fell miserably under the onslaught of Sennacherib, and three years later Samaria succumbed to the hands of the Assyrians. In the meantime the Kingdom of Judea hardly fared better. A long period of peace had environs characters, and the young, inexperienced, and unpromising Menahem, father of the Syro-Israélite coalition which confronted him. Panic-stricken he, in spite of the remonstrances of Isaias, resolved to appeal to Teglatphalasar. The help of Assyria was secured, but the independence of Judea was thereby practically forfeited. In order to explain clear and rational situation to which all references are made in Isaias's writings there is here subjoined a brief chronological sketch of the period: 745, Teglatphalasar III, king of Assyria; Assurias (A. V. Uzziyah), of Judah; Manahem (A. V. Menahem) of Samaria; and Sus of Egypt; 740, death of Assurias; 737, victory of Joatham, conqueror of Judah; capture of Jerusalem by Arphad (A. V. Arpad) by Teglatphalasar III (Is., x, 9); 738, campaign of Teglatphalasar against Syria; capture of Calano (A. V. Calon) and Emath (A. V. Hamath); heavy tribute imposed upon Manahem (IV Kings, xv, 19–20); victorious wars of Joatham against the Ammonites (II Par., xxxvii, 4–6); 736, Manahem succeeded by Phacees (A. V. Pekah); 735, Joatham succeeded by Achas (IV Kings, xvi, 1); Phacees replaced by Phacee (A. V. Pekah), son of Romelia (A. V. Remaliah), one of his captains; Jerusalem besieged by Phacee in alliance with Rasin (A. V. Resin), king of Syria (IV Kings, xvi, 6; Is., vii, 1, 2); 734, Teglatphalasar, replying to Achas' request for aid, marches against Syria and Israel, takes several cities of North and East Israel (IV Kings, xv, 29), and banishes their inhabitants; the Assyrian allies devastate part of the territory of Judah and Jerusalem; Phacee slain during the retreat of Samaria and succeeded by Ozaías (A. V. Hocheber); 733, a+50, under Achas against Edom (II Par., xxxvii, 17) and the Philistines (20); 732, campaign of Teglatphalasar against Damascus; Rasin besieged in his capital, captured, and slain; Achas goes to Damascus to pay homage to the Assyrian ruler (IV Kings, xvi, 19–19); 727, death of Achas; accession of Eschapes (IV Kings, xviii, 1); in Assyria Salmanasar IV succeeds Teglatphalasar III; 726, campaign of Salmanasar against Oze (IV Kings, xviii, 7); 725, Oze makes alliance with Sus, king of Assyria (cf. 724), and leads with him to Lebo-Debret (IV Kings, xviii, 4); beginning of the siege of Samaria; 722, Sargon succeeds Salamanasar IV in Assyria; capture of Samaria by Sargon; 720, defeat of Egyptian army at Raphia by Sargon; 717, Characism, the Egyptian stronghold on the Euphrates, falls into the hands of Sargon (Is., x, 8); 713, sickness of Eschapes (IV Kings, xx, 1–11; Is., xxxviii); embassy from Merodach Baladan to Eschapes (IV Kings, xx, 12–13; Is., xxxix); 711, invasion of Western Palestine by Sargon; siege and capture of Azotus (A. V. Ashdod); Is.; 709, Merodach Baladan enters Babylon, and assumes title of king of Babylon; 705, death of Sargon; accession of Nennescherib; 701, expedition of Nennescherib against Egypt; defeat of latter at El-teque; capture of Accaron (A. V. Ekron); siege of Lachis; Eschapes' embassy; the conditions laid down by Nennescherib being found too hard the king of Jude prepares to resist the Assyrians; destruction of part of the Assyrian army; hurried retreat of the rest (IV Kings, xviii; Is., xxxvi, xxxvii); 698, Eschapes is succeeded by his son Manasses. The wars of the ninth century and the peaceful security following them were the prelude to the latter part of the Assyrian century. Cities sprang up; new pursuits, although affording opportunities of easy wealth, brought about also an increase of poverty. The contrast between class and class became daily more marked, and the poor were oppressed by the rich with the connivance of the judges. A social state founded on iniquity is doomed. But as Israel's social corruption was greater than Judea's, Israel was expected to succumb first. Greater likewise was her religious corruption. Not only did idolatrous worship prevail there to the end, but we know from Oze what gross abuses and shameful practices obtained in Samaria and throughout the kingdom, whereas the religion of the people of Judah on the whole seems to have been a little better. We know, however, as regards these, that at the very time of Isaias certain forms of idolatrous worship, like that of Nohestan and of Mo-efoch, probably that also of Tammuz and of the 'host of heaven', were so many in number.

Commentators are at variance as to when Isaias was called to the prophetical office. Some think that previous to the vision related in vi, 1, he had received communications from heaven. St. Jerome in his commentary on the passage holds that chapters i–v ought to be attributed to the last years of King Joatham, then ch. vi would commence at the year of the death of that prince (740 a. p.; P. L., XXIV, 91; cf. St. Gregory Nansenian, Orat. ix; P. G., XXXV, 820). It is more commonly held, however, that ch. vi refers to the first calling of the Prophet; St. Jerome himself, in a letter to Pope Dami- us, seems to adopt this view (P. L., xxii, 371; cf. Hesychius "In l., P. G., XCVIII, 1372), and St. John Chrysostom, commenting upon Is., vi, 5, very aptly contrasts the promptness of the Prophet with the lurgive manifestations of Moses and Jeremia. On the other hand, since no prophecies appear to be later than 701 b. c., it is doubtful if Isaias saw the reign of Manasses at all; still a very old and widespread tradition, echoed by the Mishna (Tr. Yebamoth, 49b; cf. Sanhedr., 103b). Has it that the Prophet survived Eschapes and was slain in the persecution of Manasses (IV Kings, xxi, 16). This prince had him convicted of blasphemy, because he had called his enemies "swords upon a throne" (vi, 1), a pretension in conflict with God's own assertion in Exod., xxxiii, 20: "Man shall not see me and live". He was accused, moreover, of having predicted the ruin of Jerusalem and called the holy city and the people of Jude by the accursed names of Sodom and Gomorrah. According to the
"Ascension of Isaiah," the Prophet's martyrdom consisted in being sawed asunder. Tradition shows this to have been unhistorically believed. The Targum on IV Kings, xxii, 6, admits it; it is preserved in two treatises of the Talmud (Yebamoth, 49b; Sanhedr., 10b); St. Justin (Dial. c. Tryph., cxx), and many of the Tannaim, taking as unmistakable allusion to Isaías these words of the Heb., xi, 37, "they (the ancients) were cut asunder" (cf. Tertullian, "De patient."") xiv. P. L., I, 1270; Orig., "In Is., Hom." i, 5, P. G., XIII, 223; "In Matt." x, 18, P. G., XIII, 852; "In Matt." Ser. 28, P. G., XIII, 1837; "Epist. ad Jul. Alium," xiv, P. G., taking as the date of the Prophet's demise is not known. The Roman Martyrology commemorates Isaías on 6 July.

His tomb is believed to have been in Paneas in Northern Palestine, whence his relics were taken to Constantinople in A. D. 442.

The literary activity of Isaías is attested by the canonical book which bears his name; moreover allusion is made in II Par., xxvi, 22, to "Acts of Oziás first and last," written by Isaías, the son of Amoe, the prophet. Another passage of the same book informs us that "the rest of the acts of Esæach and his services, are written in the Vision of Isaías, son of Amoe, the prophet," in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel. Such at least is the reading of the Massoretic Bible, but its text here, if we may judge from the variants of the Greek and St. Jerome, is somewhat corrupt. Most commentators who believe the passage to be authentic think that the writer refers to Isaías the prophet. We must finally mention the "Ascension of Isaías," at one time attributed to the Prophet, but never admitted into the Canon.

II.—THE BOOK OF ISAIAS. —The canonical Book of Isaías is made up of two distinct collections of dis- courses, the one, cc. i-xxxv, called sometimes the "First Isaías"; the other, cc. xl-i-lxvi, styled by many modern critics the "Deutero- (or Second) Isaías"; between these two comes a stretch of historical narrative; some authors, as Michaelis and Hengsteberg, holding with St. Jerome, that the prophecies are placed in chronological order; others, like Vitringa and Jahn, in a logical order; others finally, like Gesenius, Delitzsch, Keil, think the actual order is partly logical and partly chronological. No less disagreement prevails on the question of the collector. Those who believe that Isaías is the disciple of all the prophecies contained in the book generally fix upon the Prophet himself. But for the critics who question the genuineness of some of the parts, the compilation is by a late and unknown collector. It would be well, however, before suggesting a solution to analyze cursorily the contents.

In the first collection (cc. i-xxxv) there seems to be a grouping of the discourses according to their subject-matter: (1) cc. i-xii, oracles dealing with Juda and Israel; (2) cc. xiii-xxiii, prophecies concerning (chiefly) foreign nations; (3) cc. xxiv-xxvii, an apocalypse; (4) cc. xxviii-xxxiii, discourses on the relations of Juda to Assyria; (5) cc. xxxiv-xxxv, future of Edom and Israel.

In the first group (i-xii) we may distinguish separate oracles. Ch. i arraigns Jerusalem for her ingratitude and unfaithfulness; severe chastisements have proved unavailing; yet forgiveness can be secured by a true change of life. The ravaging of Juda points to either the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic coalition (735) or the Assyrian invasion (701). Ch. ii threatens judgment upon Judah; St. Jerome, "In Isa., vii, i, P. L., XXIV, 546-548; etc.). However, little trust is put in the strange details mentioned in the "De Vit. Prophet," of pseudo-Epiphanius (P. G., XLIII, 397, 419). The date of the Prophet's demise is not known. The Roman Martyrology commemorates Isaías on 6 July.
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(717). The historical situation therein described suggests the time of Sennacherib's invasion (about 702 or 701 B. C.). Ch. xi depicts the happy reign to be that of the ideal king, and a hymn of thanksgiving and praise (xii) closes this first division.

The second group.—The first "burden" is aimed at Babylon (viii, i-xiv, 23). The situation presupposed by the Prophet is that of the Exile; a fact that inclines some to date it shortly before 540, against others who hold it was written on the death of Sargon (705). Ch. xiv, 24-27, foretelling the overthrow of the Assyrian army on the mountains of Juda, and regarded by some as a misplaced part of the prophecy against Assur (x, 5-34), belongs no doubt to the period of Sennacherib's campaign. The year (702-28) was occasioned by the death of some of theologians: the names of Achas (728), the Thothphalar- saar III (727), and Sargon (705) have been suggested, the last appearing more probable. Chapters xv-xvi, "the burden of Moáb," is regarded by many as referring to the reign of the king of Moáb (787-749); its date is conjectural. The ensuing "burden of Damascus" (xvii, 1-11), directed against the Kingdom of Israel as well, should be assigned to
about 735 B.C. Here follows a short utterance on Ethiopia (prob. 702 or 701). Next comes the remarkable prophecy about Egypt (xix), the interest of which cannot but be enhanced by the recent discovery of Egyptian tablets containing similar prophecies (vv. 16, 19). The date presents a difficulty, the time ranging according to diverse opinions, from 720 to 672 B.C. The oracle following (xx), against Egypt and Ethiopia, is ascribed to the year in which Ashdod was besieged by the Assyrians (711). Just what capture of Babylon is alluded to in "the burden of the desert of the sea" (xxi, 1-10) is not easy to determine, and during the lifetime of Isaiah Babylon was thrice besieged and taken (710, 703, 696 B.C.). Independent critics seem inclined to see here a description of the taking of Babylon in 538 B.C., the same description being the work of an author living towards the close of the Babylonian Captivity. The two short prophecies, one on Edom (Duma, xxii, 11-12) and one on Arabia (xxi, 13-17), give no clue as to when they were uttered. Ch. xxii, 1-14, is a rebuke addressed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In the rest of the chapter Sobna (Shebna) is the object of the Prophet's reproaches and threats (about 701 B.C.). These prophecies with the announcement of the ruin and the restoration of Tyre (xxiii).

The third section of the first collection includes chapters xxiv-xxviii, sometimes called "the Apocalypses of Isaiah." In the first part (xxiv-xxvi, 19) the Prophet announces for an undetermined future the judgment shall come upon the kingdom of Babylon (xxiv); then in symbolic terms he describes the happiness of the good and the punishment of the wicked (xxv). This is followed by the hymn of the elect (xxvi, 1-19). In the second part (xxv, 20-xxvii) the Prophet depicts the judgment hanging over Israel and its neighbors. The date is most unsettled among modern critics, certain passages being attributed to 107 B.C., others even to a date lower than 79 B.C. Let it be remarked, however, that both the ideas and the language of these four chapters support the tradition attributing this apocalypse to Isaiah.

The fourth division opens with a pronounceinent of woe against Ephraim (and perhaps Juda; xxviii, 1-8), written prior to 722 B.C.; the historical situation implied in xxviii, 9-29, is a strong indication that this passage was written about 702 B.C. To the same date belong xxix-xxxii, prophecies concerned with the death of Sennacherib. This series fittingly concludes with a triumphal hymn (xxxiii), the Prophet rejoicing in the deliverance of Jerusalem (701). Chapters xxxi-xxx, the last division, announce the devastation of Edom, and the enjoyment of bountiful blessings by ransomed Israel. These two chapters are thought by several modern critics to have been written during the captivity in the sixth century. The foregoing analysis does not enable us to assert indubitably that this first collection as such is the work of Isaiah; yet as the genuineness of almost all these prophecies cannot be seriously questioned, the collected work might still possibly be attributed to the last year of the Prophet. If there really be passages reflecting a later epoch, they found their way into the book in the course of time on account of some analogy to the genuine writings of Isaiah. Little need be said of xxxi-xxxvii. The first two chapters narrate the demand made by Sennacherib—the surrender of Jerusalem, and the fulfillment of Isaiah's predictions of its deliverance; xxxviii tells of Eschias's illness, cure, and song of thanksgiving; lastly xxxix tells of the embassy sent by Merodach Baladan and the Prophet's speech of Eschias.

The collection (xl-xlvi) deals throughout with Israel's restoration from the Babylonian exile. The main lines of the division as proposed by the Jesuit Condaminne are as follows: a first section is concerned with the mission and work of Cyrus; it is made up of five pieces: (a) xl-xl: calling of Cyrus to be Yahweh's instrument in the restoration of Israel; (b) xlii, 1-8, xliii, 5: Israel's deliverance from exile; (c) xliv, 1-16, xlv, 13: Cyrus shall free Israel and allow Jerusalem to be built; (d) xlvii: ruin of Babylon; (e) xlviii: Israel's restoration, dealt with in that descending to details for the future. Next to be taken up is another group of utterances styled by German scholars "Ebed-Jehovah-Lieder"; it is made up of xlix-liv (to which xlii, 1-7, should be joined) together with lx-lxxi. In this section we hear of the calling of Yahweh's servant (lx-lxi, 1-9); the ruin of Israel's glorious home-cities (li, 17-12); afterwards is described the servant of Yahweh ransoming his people by his suffering and death (lxxii, 1-7; liii, 13-15; liii, 12-17); then follows a glowing vision of the new Jerusalem (liv, llv, lxi, 13, and lx, lxi, 12). Ch. lvi, 1-8, develops this idea, that all the upright of heart, no matter what their former legal status, will be admitted to Yahweh's new people. In lvi, 9-lxvi, the Prophet inveighs against the idolatry and immorality so rife among the Jews; the shame with which their facts were observed (lxviii), in the xlix represents the people confessing their chief sins; this humble and regretful spirit and guilt prompts Yahweh to stoop to those who have "turned from rebellion." A dramatic description of God's vengeance (lxiii, 1-7) is followed by a prayer for mercy (lxiii, 7-1lxiv, 11), and the book closes upon the picture of the punishment of the wicked and the happiness of the righteous.

Many perplexing questions are raised by the exegesis of the "Second Isaiah." The "Ebed-Jehovah-Lieder," in particular, suggest many difficulties. Who is this "servant of Yahweh"? Does the title apply to the same person throughout the ten chapters? Had the writer in view some historical personage of past ages, or one belonging to his own time, or the Messiah to come, or even some ideal person? Most commentators see in the "servant of Yahweh" an individual. But is that individual one of the great historical figures of Israel? No satisfactory answer has been given. The names of Moses, David, Josiah, Eschias, Israel, Jeremiah, Josiah, Zerobabel, Jeconias, and Eleazar have all been suggested as being the person. Catholic exegesis has always pointed out the fact that all the features of the "servant of Yahweh" found their complete realization in the person of Our Lord Jesus Christ. He therefore should be regarded as the one individual described by the Prophet. The "Second Isaiah" gives rise to other more critical and less important problems. With the exception of one or two passages, the point of view throughout this section is that of the Babylonian Captivity; there is an unmistakable difference between the style of these twenty-seven chapters and that of the "First Isaiah"; moreover, the theological ideas of xl-xlvi show a decided advance on those found in the first thirty-nine chapters. If this be true, does it not follow that xlv-xlvi are not by the same author as the prophecies of the first collection, and may there not be good grounds for attributing or at least assigning them to a "second Isaiah" living towards the close of the Babylonian Captivity? Such is the contention of most of the modern non-Catholic scholars.

This is hardly the place for a discussion of so intricate a question. We therefore limit ourselves to stating the position of Catholic scholarship on this point. This is clearly set out in the decision issued by the Pontifical Biblical Commission, 26 June, 1908. (1) Admitting the existence of true prophecy; (2) There is no reason why "Isaiah and the other Prophets should utter prophecies concerning only those things which were about to take place in a near and short space of time" and not "things that should be fulfilled after many ages." (3) Nor does anything postulate that the Prophets should "always address as their hearers, not those who belonged to the future,
but only those who were present and contemporary, 
so that they could be understood by them”. Therefore it cannot be asserted that “the second part of the Book of Isaiah (xii-xvii), in which the Prophet addresses as one living amongst them, not the Jews who were already in the land of Judah, but the Jews living in the Exile of Babylon, cannot have for its author Isaiah himself, who was dead long before, but must be attributed to some unknown Prophet living among the exiles”. In other words, although the author of Isaiah xi-xvi does speak from the point of view of the Babylonian Captivity, yet this is his protest that no one else has written and written with those times. (4) “The philosophical argument from language and style against the identity of the author of the Book of Isaiah is not to be considered weighty enough to compel a man of judgment, familiar with Hebrew and criticism, to acknowledge in the same book a plurality of authors”. Differences of language and style between the parts of the book are neither denied nor undervalued; it is asserted only that such as they appear, they do not compel one to admit the plurality of authors. (5) “There are no solid arguments to the fore, even taken cumulatively, to prove that the book of Isaiah is to be attributed not only to Isaiah himself, but to two or rather to many authors”. III. APPRECIATION OF THE WORK OF ISAIAH.—It may not be useless shortly to set forth the prominent features of the great Prophet, doubtless one of the most striking personalities in Hebrew history. Without holding any official position, it fell to the lot of Isaiah to take an active part during well nigh forty troublesome years in controlling the policy of his country. His advice and rebukes were sometimes unheeded, but experience finally taught the rulers of Judah that to part from the Prophet’s views meant always a set-back for the political situation of Judah. In order to understand the trend of his policy it is necessary to remember by what principle it was animated. This principle he derived from his unshaken faith in God governing the world, and particularly His own people and the nations coming in contact with the latter. The people of Judah, forgetful of their God, given to idolatrous practices and social disorders of many kinds, had paid little heed to former warnings. One thing only alarmed them, namely that hostile nations were threatening Judah on all sides; but were they not the chosen people of God? Certainly He would protect them containing the nations which they feared as others had been. In the meantime prudence dictated that the best possible means be taken to save themselves from present dangers. Syria and Israel were plotting against Judah and her king; Judah and her king would appeal to the mighty nation of the North, and later to the King of Egypt.

Isaiah did not hear sights of this short-sighted policy, grounded only on human prudence, or a false religious confidence, and refusing to look beyond the moment. Judah was in terrible straits; God alone could save her, but the first condition laid down for the manifestation of His power was moral and social reform in Judah. Ephraim, Assyria, the rest were but the instruments of the judgment of God, the purpose of which is the overthrow of sinners. Certainly Yahweh will not allow His people to be utterly destroyed; His covenant He will keep; but it is vain to hope that well-deserved chastisement may be averted with all his might. With his keen foreght never did the faith of Isaiah waver. He first proclaimed this message at the beginning of the reign of Ahaz. The king and his counsellors saw no salvation for Judah except in an alliance with, that is an acknowledgment of vassalage to, Assyria. This the Prophet opposed, and as an Assyrian secret agent he was not from Ephraim and Syria, and that the intervention of Assyria in the affairs of Palestine involved a complete overthrow of the balance of power along the Mediterranean coast. Moreover, the Prophet entertained no doubt but that sooner or later a conflict between the rival empires of the Euphrates and the Nile must arise, and then their hosts would swarm over the land of Judah. That it was not the course proposed by Judah’s self-conceited politicians like the mad flight of “silly doves”, throwing themselves headlong into the net. Isaiah’s advice was not followed and one by one the consequences he had foretold were realised. However, he continued to proclaim his prophetic views of the current events. Every new event of importance was an additional lesson not only to Judah but to all the neighbouring nations. Damascus has fallen; so will the drunkards and revellers of Samaria see the ruin of their city.

Tyr hands of wealth and impregnable position; her doom is no less decreed, and her fall will all the more astound the world. Assyria herself, fattened with the spoils of all nations, Assyria “the rod of God’s vengeance”, when she will have accomplished her providential destiny, shall meet with her fate. God has thus decreed the doom of all nations for the accomplishment of His purposes and the establishment of new Israel cleansed from all defilements.

Judean politicians towards the end of the reign of Eschias had planned an alliance with the King of Egypt against Assyria and carefully concealed their purpose from the Prophet. When the latter came to know the preparations for rebellion, it was already too late to undo what had been done. But he could at least give vent to his anger (see Isa. xxxix), and we know both from the Bible and Sennacherib’s own account of the campaign of 701 how the Assyrian army routed the Egyptians at Altaku (Elteqeh of Jos., xix, 44), captured Accaron, and sent a detachment to ravage Judah; Jerusalem, closed by the payment of an enormous ransom. The vindication of Isaiah’s policy, however, was not yet complete. The Assyrian army withdrew; but Sennacherib, apparently thinking it unsafe to leave in his wake a fortified city like Jerusalem, demanded the immediate surrender of Eschias’s capital. At the command of Eschias, no answer was given to the message; but the king humbly bade Isaiah to intercede for the city. The Prophet had for the king a reassuring message. But the respite in the Judean capital was short. Soon a new Assyrian embassy arrived with a letter from the king containing an ultimatum. In the enclosed city there was a man of whom Sennacherib had taken no account; it was by him that the answer was to be given to the ultimatum of the proud Assyrians: “The virgin, the daughter of Sion hath despised thee and laughed thee to scorn; . . . He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow into it. . . . By the way that he came, he shall return, and in my city he shall not come, saith the Lord” (xxvii, 22, 33). We know in reality how a sudden catastrophe overtook the Assyrian army and God’s promise was fulfilled. This crowning vindication of the Divinely inspired policy of Isaiah prepared the hearts of the Jews for the reception of the renewed prophecy by Eschias, no doubt long lines laid down by the Prophet.

In reviewing the political side of Isaiah’s public life, we have already seen something of his religious and social ideas; all these view-points were indeed most intimately connected in his teaching. It may be possible to draw in some detail from the course which he has given throughout the Prophet’s message. Isaiah’s description of the religious condition of Judah in the latter part of the eight century is anything but flattering. Jerusalem is compared to Sodom and Gomorrah; apparently the bulk of the people were superstitious rather than religious. Sacrifices were offered out of routine; while the craft and divination were in honour; nay more, foreign deities were openly invoked side by side with the true God, and in secret the immoral worship of some of
these idols was widely indulged in, the higher class and the Court itself giving in this regard an abominable example. Throughout the kingdom there was corruption of higher officials, ever-increasing luxury among the masses, hostility to the handmaiden of women, contempt among the middle-class people, shameful partiality of the judges, unscrupulous greed of the owners of large estates, and oppression of the poor and lowly. The Assyrian suzerainty did not change anything in this woeful state of affairs. In the eyes of Isaías this order of things was intolerable; and he forever kept repeating it could not last. The first condition of social reformation was the downfall of the unjust and corrupt rulers; the Assyrians were the means appointed by God to level their pride and tyranny with the dust. With their mistaken ideas about God, the nation imagined it was the highest of comports itself about the dispositions of His worshippers. But God loathes sacrifices offered by "... hands full of blood. Wash yourselves, be clean, ... relieve the oppressed, judge for the fatherless, defend the widow. ... But if you will not, ... the sword shall devour you" (I, 15-20). God hence is the avenger of the neglected august of His divine rights. He cannot and will not let injustice, crime, and idolatry go unpunished. The destruction of sinners will inaugurate an era of regeneration, and a little circle of men faithful to God will be the first-fruits of a new Israel free from past defeatism and molded by a higher faith. With the reign of Eschias began a period of religious revival. Just how far the reform extended we are not able to state; local sanctuaries around which heathenish abuses had gathered were suppressed, and many 'ashrīm and mazṣūbā were destroyed. It is true the times were not ripe for a radical change, and there was little real interest in the appeal of the Prophet for moral amendment and redress of social abuses.

The Fathers of the Church, echoing the eulogy of Jesus, son of Sirach (Ecclus., xlviii, 25-28), agree that Isaías was the greatest of the literary Prophets (Euseb., "Prep. Evang."); v, 4, P. G., XXII, 370; "Synops. Script. S.", among the works of St. Athan. P. G., XXXVIII, 368; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "In Is. Proem.""); P. G., LXX, 14; St. Isidore of Pelus., "Epist."); i, 42, P. G., LXXVIII, 208; Thoerotic, "In Is. Argum."); P. G., LXXXI, 216; St. Jerome, "Prof. in Is."); P. L., XIV, 18; Pref. ad Paul. et Epist. ad Thess.; P. L., XVII, 771; St. Aug., "Conf." 5, P. L., XXXII, 769; "De civ. Dei."; XVII, xxix, 1, P. L., XII, 585, etc. Isaías's poetical genius was in every respect worthy of his lofty position as a Prophet. He is unsurpassed in poetry, descriptive, lyric, or elegiac. There is in his compositions an uncommon elevation of thought and conception, and an unexcelled wealth of imagery, never departing, however, from the utmost propriety, elegance, and dignity. He possessed an extraordinary power of adapting his language both to occasions and audiences; sometimes he displays most exquisite tenderness, and at other times surpasses severity; he successively assumes a mother's pleading and irresistible tone, and the stern manner of an implacable judge, now making use of delicate irony to bring home to his hearers what he would have them understand, and then pitilessly shattering their fondest illusions or wielding threats which strike like mighty thunderbolts. His rebukes are neither impetuous like those of Osee nor blustering like those of Amos; he never allows the conviction of his mind or the warmth of his heart to overflow any feature or to overstep the limits assigned by the most exquisite taste. Exquisite taste indeed is one of the leading features of the Prophet's style. This style is rare, energetic, full of life and colour, and withal always chaste and dignified. It moreover manifests a wonderful command of language. It has been justly said that no Prophet ever had the same command of noble thoughts; it may be as justly added that never perhaps did any man utter lofty thoughts in more beautiful language. St. Jerome rejected the idea that Isaías's prophecies were true poetry in the full sense of the word (Pref. in Is. P. L., XXVIII, 721). Nevertheless the authority of the venerable Robert Lowth, in his "Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" (1753), esteemed "the whole book of Isaiah to be poetical, a few passages excepted, which, if brought together, would not at most exceed the bulk of five or six chapters". This opinion of Lowth, at first never fully repeated, became more and more general in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and is now common among Biblical scholars.

In addition to general and special commentaries consult: "Druids", Book of Isaiah (London, 1870); "Isaïa, Prophecies of Isaiah (London, 1880); "Isaïa, intro. to the Book of Isaiah (London, 1885); "Drake", Isaïa, his life and times and the writings which bear his name (London, 1888); "Lowth", Isaïa, translation, dissert. and notes (London, 1778); "Skinner", Isaïa (Cambridge, 1898); G. A. Smith, Book of Isaiah (Expositor's Bible, 1888-1890); W. R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel and their place in history (London, 1882); "Knabenshue", Isaïa, Book of the Prophets (Baltimore, 1897); Commentaire d'Isaïa, trad. critique avec notes et comment. (Paris, 1894; a volume of introduction to the same is forthcoming); L. Héring, Les prophètes exagérés de l'avant-prophétie d'Alexandre (Paris, 1895); "Skinner", Etudes Biblique, Pass. 1899; "Thomson", J. N. S. and Comment. (Paris, 1892); L. Héring, Die Propheten des Buche Jesaja, tr. (Edinburgh, 1880); "Drake", Buch Jesaja (Gottingen, 1892); "Barnes", Der Prophet Jesaja (Leipzig, 1892); "Forke", Der Prophet Jesaja (Leipzig, 1892); A. K. Wettig, Der Prophet Jesaja. Einst und jetzt (Leipzig, 1898); "Knabenshue", Erkliirung des Prop. Jesaja (Freiburg, 1881); "Smith", J. D. Buch Jesaja (Tubingen, 1900).

Charles L. Souvat.

Isaías, Ascension of. See Apocrypha.

Isaúra, titular see in the Province of Lycaonía, suffragan of Iconium. Isaúra, the capital of the Isaurian tribes, an energetic and piling people, existed even before the extinction of Alexander. In order not to fall into the power of the Greek generals, Peridécas and Philip, its inhabitants after a desperate resistance, buried themselves beneath the ruins of their city (Diodorus Siculus, XVIII, 22). Afterwards rebuilt, Isaúra was a second time destroyed by P. Servílius, and then ceded to Amnytus, the last King of Galatia, who attempted to rebuild it and make it his capital (25 a. c.). Strabo, who gives these particulars, speaks of two cities, Isaúra Palæa and Isaúra Nova, which existed in his time, and the information is correct. In the year 266 of our era Trebíullian, one of the thirty tyrants, made his capital there, but he was slain the next year. Ammianus Marcellinus (XIV, 7) in the fourth century speaks of the city as ruined. Isaúra Nova is now Doria in the sanjak and vilayet of Koniah. Ramsay discovered there recently more than fifty Greek inscriptions, the greater number Christian, as well as magnificent tombs. These monuments date from the third, fourth, and fifth centuries of our era. Epitaphs have been found of three bishops, Theophilus, Sisamoas, and Mamas, who lived between the years 250 and 400. Three other bishops are also known, Hilarion, 381; Callistrus, somewhat later; Aetius, 451 (Lequien, Orient Antiq., I, 1035). The last name, however, bears the title of Isaúropolis, the name of a city which also figures in the "Hierocles Synecdemus" (ed. Parthey, 075, 12). As no "Notitiae episcopatuum" makes mention of Isaúra, or Isaúropolis, Ramsay supposes that the Diocese of Isaúra Nova was early joined with that of Leonotropolis, the modern Palæa, and that of Palæa which is mentioned in all the "Notitiae". The site of Isaúra Palæa has been discovered at Oloubnár in the vilayet of Koniah, where splendid ruins are still to be seen.


S. Vailhé.
Ischia, Diocease of (Isclana), suffragan to Naples, has for its territory the island of Ischia, in the Mediterranean Sea, which, geologically, forms a continuation of the volcanic district of Naples. Monte Epomeo, the highest point of the island (about 2570 feet), has been an extinct volcano since 1302. The island has frequently been visited by earthquakes; one of the most disastrous was that of Casamicciola, a small village, in 1883. The island is very fertile and rich in mineral springs, which, owing to the pleasant situation and mild climate, attract many visitors. The two most important hot springs are Fontana d'Ischia and Formello. The capital of the island is Ischia, situated on a rock of basalt, crowned by a castle, which to-day serves as a prison. It was called Pithecusae by the Greeks and Eanaria by the Romans. It was colonized by the Euboeans. In 474 B.C. it was taken by Hiero I., King of Syracuse, and in 326 by the Romans. The Emperor Augustus gave it to Naples, in exchange for Capri. In the Middle Ages it was often devastated (in 813 by the Saracens; in 1135 by the Pisans). In 1496 it was a refuge for Ferdinand II. of Naples, fleeing before Charles VIII of France. In 1497 it was occupied by the British and Savoyards, and was involved in the wars of the French. In 1719 the first Bishop of Ischia was appointed, Pietro, present at the Third Lateran Council. Other bishops were Fra Bartolomeo Borosoli (1539), an Augustinian, brother of Blessed Giacomo Borosoli, the Dominican, who is buried in the church of S. Domenico; the learned Spanish Cistercian, Michele Cozzi (1453); Girolamo Rocca (1672), who restored the cathedral and bishop’s residence; Michele Cotignola (1692), who also embellished the cathedral. Ischia has 14 parishes with 32,000 souls.

Capelliatti, Le Chiese d'Italia, XIX (Venice, 1857); Ginocchio, Ischia (Rome, 1894).

U. Benigni.

Ischia and Venafrd, Diocease of. - Isaria is a city in the province of Campobasso in Molise (Southern Italy), situated on an alluvial terraces between Monte Matese and Monte Azzo, in a fertile region not far from Vulturno. In the Middle Ages it was noted for the manufacture of parchment, which is carried on there even to-day. It was anciently called Æsaria, and was one of the principal cities of the Samnites. In 275 B.C. it was conquered by the Romans. In the Roman period Ischia was a town of the '{

Ishmael. See ISMAEL.

Isidore of Kieff. See ISIDORE OF THESSALONICA.

Isidore of Pelusium, Saint, born at Alexandria in the latter half of the fourth century; d. not later than 449-50. He is occasionally designated through mistake as Isidore of Damietta. Leaving his family and possessions, Isidore retired to a mountain near the city of Pelusium, the name of which was henceforth connected with his own, and embraced the religious life in the monastery of Lychnos, where he soon became remarkable for his exactitude in the observance of the rule and for his austerities. A passage in his voluminous correspondence affords reason to believe that he held the office of abbot. He is spoken of as a priest by Facundus and Suidas, although neither of these two writers informs us to which church of which he belonged; it may be that he had no clerical charge, but was only a priest of the monastery. His correspondence gives us an idea of his activity. It shows him fighting against unworthy clerics whose elevation to the priesthood and diocese was a serious peril and scandal to the faithful. He complains that many lamen were ceasing to approach the sacraments so as to avoid contact with these discreditable men. His veneration for St. John Chrysostom led him to induce St. Cyril of Alexandria to render full justice to the memory of the great doctor. He opposed the Nestorians, and during the conflict which arose at the end of the Council of Ephesus between St. Cyril and John of Antioch, he believed there was too much obstinacy on St. Cyril’s side. He therefore wrote to the latter in urgent terms implo

Isidore. The author of a great number of writings, but this historian tells us nothing further, save that one of these was addressed to Cyril, even leaving us ignorant whether this person was the celebrated Bishop of Alexandria or a name sake. Isidore himself tells incidentally that he composed a treatise “Adversus Gentiles” but it has been lost. Another work “De Fato”, which, the author tells us, met with a certain degree of success, has also been lost. The only extant works of Isidore are a collection of the Experience, comprising more than 2000 letters. Even this number appears to fall far short of the amount actually written, since Nicephorus speaks of 10,000. Of these we possess 2182, divided into five books which contain respectively 590, 390, 413, 230, and 569 letters. These letters of St. Isidore are divided into three classes, according to the subjects treated: those dealing with dogma and Scripture, with ecclesiastical and monastic discipline, and with practical morality for the guidance of laymen of all classes and conditions. Many of these letters, as is natural, have but a secondary importance, many are mere notes. In this whole attention can be directed only to the principal ones. Among these is the letter to Theologus against the Nestorians, in which Isidore points out that there is this difference between the mother of the gods in
fable and the Mother of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, that the former, as acknowledged by the pagans themselves, conceived and brought forth the fruits of debauchery, whereas the latter conceived without having had intercourse with any man, as is acknowledged, says he, by all the nations of the world. His later writings defend the legitimacy of the veneration of relics; that to Tuba shows that it was considered unbecoming for a soldier to carry a sword in the city in time of peace and to appear in public with arms and armor uniform.
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encyclopedia epitomized all learning, ancient as well as modern. In it many fragments of classical learning, though ten, of etymology were, it is believed, lost. The fame of this work imparted a new impetus to encyclopedia writing, which became abundant in the subsequent centuries of the Middle Ages. His style, though simple and lucid, cannot be said to be classical. It discloses most of the imperfections peculiar to all ages of transition. It particularly reveals a growing Visigothic influence. Arevalo counts in all Isidore's writings 1640 Spanish words.

Isidore was the last of the ancient Christian philosophers, as he was the last of the great. Latin Patristics and Christian tradition contributed largely to the man of his age and exercised a far-reaching and immeasurable influence on the educational life of the Middle Ages. His contemporary and friend, Brailio, Bishop of Saragossa, regarded him as a man raised up by God to save the Spanish people from the tidal wave of barbarism that threatened to inundate the ancient civilization of Spain. The Eighth Council of Toledo (653) recorded its admiration of his character in these glowing terms: "The extraordinary doctor, the latest ornament of the Catholic Church, the most learned man of the latter ages, always to be remembered, particularly, 'De differentiis verborum et differentiis rerum'. The former is a dictionary of synonyms, treating of the differences of words with considerable erudition and not a little ingenuity; the latter, an exposition of theological and ascetical ideas, dealing in particular with the Trinity and with the Divine and human nature of Christ. It suggests, and probably was inspired by, a similar work of Cato's. It is supplementary to the first two books of the 'Etymologiarum'. The 'Synonyma', or, as it is sometimes called, 'Liber Lamentationum', is in a manner illustrative of the first book of the 'De differentiis rerum' cast in the form of a dialogue between Man and Reason. The general burden of the dialogue is that Man mourns the condition to which he has been reduced through sin, and Reason comforts him with the knowledge of how he may still realize eternal happiness. The second part of this work consists of a dissertation on vice and virtue. The "De natura rerum", a manual of elementary physics, was composed at the request of King Sisebut, whom it is dedicated. It treats of astronomy, geography, and miscellaneous. It is one of Isidore's best known books and enjoyed a wide popularity during the Middle Ages. The practicality of "De ordine creaturarum" has been questioned by some critics, though apparently without good reason. Arevalo unhesitatingly attributes it to Isidore. It deals with various spiritual and physical questions, such as the Trinity, the consequences of sin, eternity, the ocean, the heavens, and the celestial bodies.

The subjects of history and biography are represented by three important works. Of these the first, "Historian", is a universal chronicle. In its preface Isidore acknowledges his indebtedness to Julius Africanus; to St. Jerome's rendering of Eusebius; and to Victor of Tornuna. The "Historia de regibus Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum" concerns itself chiefly with the Gothic kings, whose conquests and government deeply influenced the civilization of Spain. The history of the Vandals and the Suevi is set forth in two short chapters. This work is regarded as the chief authority on Gothic history in the West. It contains the interesting statement that the Goths descended from Gog and Magog. Like the other historical writings of Isidore, it is largely based on earlier works of history, of which it is a compendium and has but two recensions, one of which ends at the death of Sisebut (821), and the other continues to the fifth year of
the reign of Swintila, his successor. "De viris illustribus" is a work of Christian biography, and constitutes a most interesting chapter in the literature of patrology. To the number of illustrious writers mentioned therein Braulio added the name of Isidore himself. A short appendix to the poem was added by Braulio's disciple, Ildephonsus of Toledo. It is the continuation of the work of Gennadius, a Semi-pelagian priest of Marseilles, who wrote between 467 and 480. This work of Gennadius was, in turn, but the continuation of the work of St. Jerome.

"De Virg. et Patrum" and "De Virga patrum" are also known as "Scriptura laudibus efferentur" is a work that treats of the mere notable Scriptural characters. It contains more than one passage that, in the light of modern scholarship, is naive or fantastic. The question of authenticity has been raised, though quite unreasonably, concerning it. "Allegoriae quaedam Sacrae Scripturae" treats of the allegorical significance that attaches to the more conspicuous characters of Scripture. In all some two hundred and fifty personalities of the Old and New Testaments are treated. "Liber numerorum qui in Sanctis Scripturis occurrunt" is a curious dissertation on the mystical significance of Scriptural numbers. In "libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti" his name implies, in a general way, as compared to the Scriptures, with special instructions for particular books in the Old and New Testament. "De Veteri et Novo Testamento questiones" consists of a series of questions concerning the Scriptures. "Secretorum expositiones sacramentorum seu questiones in Vetust Testamentum" is a mystical rendering of the Old Testament books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue, Judges, Kings, Esdras, and Machabees. It is based on the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. "De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento contra Judaeos" is one of the best known and most meritorious of Isidore's works. It is of an apologetico-polemical character and is dedicated to Florentina, his sister, at whose request it is said to have been written. Its popularity was unbounded in the Middle Ages, and it was translated into many of the vernaculars of the period. It treats of the Messianic prophecies, the passing of the Old Law, and of the New Testament, with the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and His return for the final judgment. The second part is taken up with the unbelief of the Jews, the calling of the Gentiles, and the passing of the Sabbath. In all, it is an appeal to the Jews to accept Christianity. "Sententiarum libri tres" is a compendium of moral and dogmatic theology. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine are the most generous contributors to its contents. The Divine attributes, creation, evil, and miscellaneous are the subjects treated in the first book. The second is of a miscellaneous character; whilst the third is a compendium of ecclesiastical institutions and the chastisement of God. It is believed that this work greatly influenced Peter Lombard in writing his famous "Book of Sentences". "De ecclesiasticis officiis" is divided into two books, "De origine officiorum" and "De origine ministrorum". In the first Isidore treats of Divine worship and particularly the old Spanish Liturgy. It also contains a lucid explanation of the Holy Eucharist. The second treatments of the hierarchy of the Church and the various states of life. In it much interesting information is to be found concerning the development of music in general and particularly of the Gregorian chant. "Regula monachorum" is a manner of life prescribed for monks, and also deals in a general way with the monastic state. The writer furnishes abundant proof of the true Christian democracy of the religious life by providing for the admission of men of every rank and station of life. Not even slaves were debarred. "God", he said, "has made no difference between the soul of the slave and that of the freedman." He insists that in the monastery all are equal in the sight of God and of the Law.

The first edition of the works of Isidore was published in folio by Michael Somniius (Paris, 1580). Another edition that is quite complete is based upon the MSS. of Gomes, with notes by Peres and Grial (Madrid, 1599). Based largely upon the Madrid edition is that published by Reuter (Leipzig, 1801; Cologne, 1617). The last edition of all the works of Isidore, which is also regarded as the best, is that of Arevalo (7 vols., Rome, 1797—1803). It is found in P. L., LXXIX—LXXXIV. The "De natura rerum" was edited by G. Becker (Berlin, 1857). Th. Mommsen edited the historical writings of St. Isidore ("Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auct. antiquiss.", Berlin, 1884). Coste produced a German translation of the "Historia de regibus Gothorum, Vandalorum et Sueorum" (Leipzig, 1887).

**Teuffel-Schwarz, Gesch. der röm. Lit., (5th ed.), 1389 sqq.:**

**Dombrowski, De Isidori Vandal. Observationes criticas in Isidori Hispalensium Origines (Hamburg, 1896); Hertberg, Uber die Chroniken des Isidors von Sevilla in Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte, vii, 360; Werning, Die altesten Bruchstücke des Traitaris des Bischofs Isidors von Sevilla (Strassburg, 1875); Gasius, Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien, II (Rainis, 1874), ii, 102—12; Bourdelais, L'Ecole chrétienne dans la France médiévale (Paris, 1886), 89—193; Bourdelais, Vie de San Isidoro (Paris, 1853).**

**John B. O'connor.**

Isidore of Thessalonica, cardinal and sometime Metropolitan of Kiev or Moscow, b. at Thessalonica (Saloniki) towards the end of the fourteenth century; d. at Rome, 27 April, 1465. He was one of the chief Eastern defenders of reunion at the time of the Council of Florence. The date of his birth is unknown, nor is his nationality certain. He has been variously described as a Bulgar and a Greek. In any case all his education was Greek. He arrived at Constantinople, became a monk, and was made hegumenus of the monastery of St. Demetrius. He had evidently received an unusually complete education: he knew Latin well, and had considerable fame as a theologian. He was also an accomplished orator; he seems from the beginning to have been eager for reunion with the West. It was the task of Isidore, as Metropolitan of Kiev, on the eve of its final destruction by the Turks, was considering the chance of rescue from the Western princes as a result of securing union with Rome. In 1434 Isidore was sent to Basse by Emperor John VIII (1425—48) as part of an embassy to open negotiations with the Council of Basel. The Council made a mellifluous speech about the splendour of the Roman Empire at Constantinople. On his return he continued to take part in all the preparations for reunion among his own people. In 1437 he was sent by the Byzantine patriarch (Joseph II, 1416—39, a conspicuous friend of Isidore and his work) as Bishop of the metropolitan of Moscow (or was his title Kiev? He is constantly called Bishop of Kiev, though he certainly went to Moscow and stayed there. They were two separate sees. Kiev was the old metropolis of Russia; Moscow was made so about this time). As soon as he arrived he began to arrange a Russianlegation for the council about to be held at Ferrara. The Russian tsar, Vasili II (1425—62), made difficulties about this, and let him go eventually only after he had promised to come back with "the rights of Divine law and the constitution of the holy Church" unimpaired. Synods and other Greek legislation did not bear perty because in spite of this he accepted the union. Isidore set out with a great following on 8 Sept., 1437, travelled by Riga and Lübeck, and arrived at Ferrara on 15 August, 1438. On the way he offended
his suite by his friendly conduct towards the Latins. At Ferrara and at Florence, whether the council moved in January, 1439, Isidore was one of the six chief speakers on the Byzantine side. Together with Bessarion he steadfastly worked for the union, and never swerved afterwards in his acceptance of it.

After the council, the pope (Eugene IV, 1431-47) made him adviser for the Greeks and Latins. On his way back news reached Isidore, at Benevento, that he had been made Cardinal-Priest of the title of St. Peter and St. Marcellinus. This is one of the few cases in which a person not of the Latin Rite has been made a cardinal. From Budapest in March, 1440, he published an encyclical calling on the Byzantine Rite to accept the union. But when he at last arrived in Moscow (Easter, 1441), and proclaimed the union in the Kremlin church, he found that the tsar and most of the bishops and people would have none of it. Then, at the tsar's command, six Russian bishops met in a synod, deposed Isidore, and shut him up in prison. He escaped, fled to Rome, and was graciously received by the pope in 1443. Nicholas V (1447-65) sent him as legate to Constantinople to arrange the reunion there in 1452, and gave him two hundred soldiers to help the defence of the city. On 12 December of that year he was able to unite three of the bishops of the empire in a ceremony in celebration of the short-lived reunion. He saw the taking of the city by the Turks on 29 May, 1453, and only escaped the massacre by dressing up a dead body in his cardinal's robes. While the Turks were cutting off its head and parading it through the streets, the real cardinal was shipped off to Asia Minor with a number of insignificant prisoners, as a slave. Afterwards he wrote an account of the horrors of the siege in a letter to Nicholas V (P. G., CLIX, 953). He escaped from captivity, or bought himself free, and came back to Rome. Here he was made Bishop of Sessa, presumably adopting the Latin Rite. Pius II (1458-54) later took him from two titles successively, those of Patriarch of Constantinople and Archbishop of Cyprus, neither of which he could convert into real jurisdiction.

He died at Rome on 27 April, 1463.

All histories of the Council of Florence describe the adventures of Cardinal Isidore. See especially Fantuzzi, Geschichte der Pius, I (3rd and 4th ed., Freiburg im Br., 1901), 656, etc., and his references. The Monumenta Hungaria historica, XXII, 1 (1897), has a letter to Nicholas V (op. cit., 660-702); see Krummacher, Byzantinische Literaturgeschichte (Gottweig, 1850), 467; Geschichte des Abendlandes, I (Halle, 1830), 444; FROMMANN, Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Plenarinen Kirchenversammlung (Halle, 1848); and W. Pfitzner, Conulturgeschichte, VII (Freiburg im Br., 1886), passim.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Isidore the Labourer, Saint, a Spanish day-breaker; b. near Madrid, about the year 1070; d. 13 May, 1130, at the same place. He was in the service of a certain Juan de Vargas on a farm in the vicinity of Madrid. Every morning before going to work he was accustomed to hear a Mass at one of the churches in Madrid. One day his fellow-labourers complained to their master that Isidore was always late for his Mass. Upset by this, Isidore ran away. The legend, the master found Isidore at prayer, while an angel was doing the ploughing for him. On another occasion his master saw an angel ploughing on either side of him, so that Isidore's work was equal to that of three of his fellow-labourers. Isidore is said to have been the father of his master and to have caused a fountain of fresh water to burst from the dry earth in order to quench the thirst of his master. He was married to Maria Torribia, a canonised saint, who is venerated in Spain as Maria della Cabeza, from the fact that her head, now a relic, is venerated especially in time of drought. They had one son, who died in his youth. On one occasion this son fell into a deep well, and at the prayers of his parents the water of the well is said to have risen miraculously to the level of the ground, bringing the child with it, alive and well. Hereupon the parents made a vow of continence and lived in separate houses. Forty years after Isidore's death, his body was transferred from the cemetery to the church of St. Andrew. He is said to have appeared to Alfonso of Castile, and to have shown him the tomb in which he surprised the Moors and gained the victory of Las Navas de Tolosa, in 1212. When King Philip III of Spain was cured of a deadly disease by touching the relics of the saint, the king replaced the old reliquary by a costly silver one. He was canonised by Gregory XV, 7 May, 1623, and beatified by Philip Neri, on 12 March, 1622. St. Isidore is widely venerated as the patron of peasants and day-labourers. The cities of Madrid, Leon, Saragossa, and Seville also, honour him as their patron. His feast is celebrated on 15 May.

His Life, as first written in 1265 by John, a deacon of the church of St. Andrew, at Madrid, and supplemented by him in 1275, is printed in Acta SS., May, III, 515-22. It served as the basis for LOPE DE VEGA'S religious poem San Isidro (1599). Acta SS., loc. cit., 612-560; BUTLER, Lives of the Saints, 10 (London, 1854); Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, 10 (London, 1892); Marilographeus Hispaniacum, III (Lyons, 1855), 191-48; QUARTINO, Vita di S. Isidoro agricola (Turin, 1882).

MICHAEL OTT.

Isidora, a titular see in the province of Pamphylia Secunda; it was a suffragan of Perge. Artemidorus, mentioned by Strabo (XII, vii, 2; XIII, ii, 35), places this city in Pisidia, and Strabo himself (XII, iv, 17) locates it, under the name of Isinda, in the region of Termessos. Polybius (Excerpta de leg., 31), Ptolemy (v, 5), and Stephen of Byzantium call it Isiendra, Isindos, Pisindia, Indos; it is similarly referred to in the "Notitia episcopatum". Lequien (Orleans Christ., i, 1032) gives the name Isin, and assisted at the Consistorial Councils of Nicaea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Constantinople (553), and at the Photian synod in 878. The probable location of this town, which has no history, is at Istanos or Stanos, a nahiê of the sanjak of Adala, in the vilayet of Koniah.

S. VALLÉH.

Isla, José Francisco de, Spanish preacher and satirist, b. at Villavianes (Kingdom of Leon), 24 March, 1703; d. at Bologna, 2 November, 1781. Isla's life was far more eventful than that usually led by members of a religious order. Having broken off a premature betrothal, he entered the Society of Jesus at the age of sixteen, and, on the termination of his two years' novitiate, was sent to the renowned University of Salamanca. Here he studied philosophy for two years and theology for four, and was then appointed fortieth to the chair of exegesis and later to that of philosophy. He continued his professional activity at various colleges until 1747, winning at the same time the reputation of a popular preacher. At the same time he did not neglect his talent for poetry and his taste for literature, and gave proof of a wagging, satirical vein. But this talent was also the cause of not a few troubles. The first of these resulted in an assignment to pastoral duties at San Sebastian, where fortunately he was kept but a short time. In 1750 the formidable satirist was sent to the residence of the professors at Valladolid to preach. While this appointment was a disaster to Isla, as a preacher, the attempt of Queen Maria Barbera to secure him as her confessor indicates his piety. By well-put objections Isla escaped the office, but another suggestion from the court, where Isla's eminent literary gifts had already attracted notice, that the talented and prolific writer should give up his literary work, was received with favour by his spiritual superiors. In consequence Isla, in 1752, was exclusively assigned to literary work, varied only by occasional
summons to the pulpit, which he regarded as interruptions of his literary activities. The years 1758 and 1759 deprived him of his three greatest patrons—Pope Benedict XIV, Queen Maria Barbara, and King Ferdinand VI—and ushered in for him a period of bitter trials. As early as 1758 the persecution of Stanislaus Poniatowski began, and the earliest symptoms of a similar storm soon made their appearance in Spain. Sent to Galicia in 1760, Ilsa devoted himself with great spiritual fruits to giving public missions and the Exercises of St. Ignatius. The royal decree, which two years later forbade any Jesuit to accept a living, book, or literary activity, and, after various preparatory decrees of a like nature, the Jesuits were finally banished from every part of Spain in 1767. Ilsa, moreover, was visited by a personal affliction, an apoplectic stroke causing a temporary paralysis of the mouth and tongue. The painful journey into exile—first to Corsica for a residence of fourteen dreary months, and thence to the Papal States—his grief at the suppression of his order, the eight succeeding years of distress pending his deliverance by death, are described by Ilsa himself with his usual imperturbable good-humour in his letters to his sisters, the concluding years being somewhat more pleasant, thanks to the noble hospitality extended to him by Count Tedeschi at Bologna. He died in the seventy-ninth year of his age.

Ilsa’s fame rests much less on his activity as a preacher and his other pastoral labours than on his humorous and satirical writings. His earliest literary experiment was the “Juventud triunfante” (the “Triumph of Youth”), a description of a festival, in which Ilsa gives a skillfully exaggerated account of the already excessively elaborate preparations made by the University of Salamanca to celebrate the canonization of St. Francis de Sales and St. Ignatius of Loyola. His second publication may be described as a pure satire on the singular methods of the surgery of his day. For his next subject he was again to choose a national festival, celebrating for little Navarre the accession of Ferdinand VI. This work he entitled: “Triunfo del Amor y de la Lealtad: Dia grande de Navarra” (“The Triumph of Love and Loyalty”, or “The Great Day of Navarre”): it was not intended to be a formal satire on the exaggerated national consciousness of the Navarrese, but the bombastic extravagance of the language renders it rather a mixture of falsity than a satire. The novel, however, which keeps Ilsa’s name still living in the pages of literature, is his romance on pulpit oratory, the “Historia del Famoso predicador Fray Gerundio de Campanas” (History of the celebrated preacher, Fray Gerundio de Campanas, alias Zotes), whom he himself called a “preaching Don Quixote.” It is a clever satire, in which he exposes the complete decay of contemporary pulpit oratory in Spain. In the form of a broadly sketched biography, this clever romance, in spite of the condemnation of the Inquisition, circulated throughout Europe in numerous editions and translations. The latest critical edition appeared at Leipzig in 1885 (prepared by Professor Eduard Lidtorf). The work was first translated into English by Baretti (London, 1772); there are three translations in German, and many in French. One modern critic (Zarneckes, “Lit. Centralblatt für Deut.”, 1886) sets Ilsa’s romance above Don Quixote.

Another work of Ilsa’s, written in the last years of his life, long engaged the attention of literary critics, namely, his adaptation of “Gil Blas,” which appeared posthumously under the title “Adventuras de Gil Blas de Santillana, robadas & Españolas, adoptadas en France por Mon. Le Sage, restituendo á su patria y á su lengua nativa el renombrado novel de España, para no enmendarlo ni burlarle de su nación” (“Adventures of Gil Blas of Santillana, stolen from Spain and appropriated in France by M. Le Sage, restored to their country and their native tongue by a jealous Spaniard, who will not suffer his country to be made sport of”). Ilsa’s sermons were published in six volumes at Madrid in 1792 and 1793, but no new edition has been issued, nor have they been translated in other languages. They are, however, highly esteemed in Spain and occupy an important place in the history of pulpit oratory in that country. Of his many translations from other tongues, that of P. Croiset’s “Anne Chérifienne”, unfortunately not completed, is the most important. His three apologetic works for his order could not be printed at that period; one of them has been lost, the other has been recently published. Among his literary remains was discovered a translation of the Italian burlesque epic “Il Cicorone” by Abbot Gian Carlo Passeroni, a picture of contemporary Italian life in society and literary circles. Ilsa’s intimate correspondence with his sister was published in four volumes in 1755–56, a new edition being issued fifteen years later with two additional volumes. Monlaü has inserted this correspondence with forty-four further letters in the “Select Works of Ilsa” (1850; new ed., 1870). The second centenary of Ilsa’s birth was celebrated with great festivity in many towns in 1869. His life was written by his friend in a somewhat less savory light than it actually was, and his name still lives in the memory of his countrymen.

There are five or six complete Biographies of Ilsa: by de Bala (Madrid, 1803); von Müller, Journal (Nuremberg, 1796); Id. Monlaü in Le Moniteur (1850); Godbeer, Les Pèrecheres burlesques en Espagne au XVIIIe siècle (Strasbourg, 1873); Etude sur le F. Ilsa (Paris, 1888); and Stammen aus Maria-Leoca (1905), 82–92, 182–205, 299–315.

Nicholas Schmid.

Islam, an Arabic word which, since Mohammed’s time, has acquired a religious and technical significance denoting the religion of Mohammed and of the Koran, just as Christianity denotes that of Jesus and of the Gospels. It has been translated in the Prophet, and of the Old Testament.

Grammatically, the word Islam is the infinitive of the so-called fourth verbal form of the regular intransitive stem salima, “to be safe,” “to be secure,” etc. In its second verbal form (salalma) it means “to make some one safe” and “to free,” “to make secure,” etc. In its third form (salama) it signifies “to make peace,” or “to become at peace,” i.e. “to be reconciled.” In its fourth form (salama), the infinitive of which is Islam, it acquires the sense of “to resign,” “to submit oneself,” or “to surrender.” Hence the Islamic idea that Islam is the “entire surrender of the will to God,” and his professors are called Muslimin (sing. Muslim), which is the participial form, that is “those who have surrendered themselves,” or “believers,” as opposed to the “refusers” of the Divine message, who are called Kafir, Mushrik (that is those who associate various gods with the Deity, or pagans). Historically, of course, to become a Muslim was to become a follower of Mohammed and of his religion; and it is very doubtful whether the earliest Muslims, or followers of Mohammed, had any clear notion of the ethical-religious significance of the term, although its later theological development is entirely consistent and logical. According to the Shafites (one of the four great Mohammedan schools of theology), Islam, as a principle of the law of God, is “the manifesting of humility or submission, and outward conforming with the law of God, and the taking upon oneself to do or to say as the Prophet has done or said”; and if this outward manifestation of religion is coupled with “a firm and internal belief of the heart,” i.e. faith, then it is called Iman. Hence the Mohammedan theological axiom “Islam is with the tongue, and Iman with the heart.” According to the Sufis (another of the four schools), however, no distinction is to be made between the two terms, as Iman, according to them, is essentially included in Islam.
Islam is sometimes divided under two heads of “Faith,” or “Iman,” and “Practical Religion,” or “Din.” Faith (Iman) includes a belief in one God, omnipotent, omniscient, all-merciful, the author of all good, the absolute decree of goodness and evil. Practical Religion (Din), on the other hand, consists of five observances, viz.: recital of the formula of belief, prayer with ablation, fasting, almsgiving, and the pilgrimage to Mecca. For further details see Koran and Mohammedanism.

GABRIEL OUSBANI.

Isleta Pueblo, the name of two pueblos of the ancient Tiguex tribe, of remote Shoeshonean stock. The older and principal is on the west bank of the Rio Grande about twelve miles below Albuquerque, New Mexico. The other, an offshoot of the first and sometimes distinguished as Isleta del Sur (Isleta of the South), is on the Texas side of the Rio Grande, a few miles below El Paso. The original Isleta (i.e. islet) was so named by the Spaniards from its position on a tongue of land projecting into the stream; the native name is Tiguex. It was first entered by the Spanish commander, Coronado, in 1540, and again in 1582–3 by Espejo (q.v.) while trying to ascertain the fate of Father Rodrigues and two other Franciscan missionaries who had been murdered by Indians in the previous year. Before 1690 it had become the seat of the Franciscan mission of San Antonio. At a later period it received many refugees from outlying pueblos abandoned in consequence of Apache raids, until it the outbreak of the great Pueblo revolt in 1680 it may have numbered 3000 souls. Owing to the large number of Spaniards in the pueblo at the time they were not molested in the general massacre, but the natives, after having made submission to Governor Otermin the following year, secretly withdrew to join the enemy, in consequence of which Otermin burned the pueblo, carrying all the remnant of the inhabitants in all in 1683. The colonists in the new town of Isleta del Sur, re-establishing at the same time the mission of San Antonio. In 1692–3 Vargas reconquered the Pueblo country and mission work was soon after resumed. About the year 1710, or a few years later, the original Isleta was recolonized by the Tiguex, and a new mission established there under the name of San Agustin. With the growth of the Spanish population the importance of the Indian missions correspondingly decreased. In 1780–1 one-third of the whole Pueblo population was swept away by smallpox, in consequence of which most of the missions were abandoned, but that at Isleta continued to exist under Spanish and Mexican rule for fifty years longer, when it became virtually a secular church. The pueblo now has a population of about 1100, rating third among the Pueblo towns, and has both a government and a Catholic day-school. In culture, social organization and ceremonial forms the inhabitants resemble the Pueblo generally. In Isleta del Sur the few remaining inhabitants, although very much Mexicanized, still keep up some Indian forms and retain their native language.

JAMES MOONEY.

Ispip, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, b. at Ispip, near Oxford; d. at Mayfield, Sussex, 26 April, 1366. He was educated at Oxford. where he proceeded doctor in canon and civil law, being elected Fellow of Merton in 1307. His talents and learning as an ecclesiastical lawyer soon won for him many benefices and prebendaries. Having for a time been rector of Easton, near Stamford, and of Melton, he was in 1332 for the archdeaconry of Stow, which he only held for one year. He also held the rectory of Horncastle. Bishop Burghersh of Lincoln, then treasurer and Chancellor of England, made him a prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral in 1327, and he held successively the prebend of Welton, Brant, Aylesbury, and Walton Beckhall, while in 1337 he became vicar-general for the diocese. At this time he was much in London, where he entered the king's service as one of the royal chaplains. Edward III trusted him also in diplomatic and political affairs, appointed him a member of the council and in 1346 gave him, during his own absence in France. In 1343 he had been made archdeacon of Canterbury and subsequently he was made dean of arches. He also held the prebend of Mora in St. Paul's Cathedral and a stall at Lichfield. John Stratford, the Archbishop of Canterbury, died in 1348, but the Black Death was raging. His two successors, John Ufford and Thomas Bradwardine, died of the plague within a few weeks of each other, the former before consecration. On 20 Sept., 1349, Simon Ispip was elected archbishop, but within three weeks the pope conferred the see on him in accordance with the charter of Christmas and received the pallium at the following Easter. The archdiocese had suffered from the pestilence and there was a dearth of clergy, so that the first work Ispip was called on to undertake was a visitation, during which he laboured with energy to restore ecclesiastical discipline.

At this time, and after the renewed outbreak of the Black Death in 1362, he took particular pains to regulate the stipends of the unbenezzed clergy, who were induced by the greatly diminished number of priests to exact higher remuneration for their services than formerly. He next succeeded in terminating the ancient dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York, as to the right of the latter to bear his cross in the province of the former. The final arrangement, suggested by the king, agreed to by both archbishops, and confirmed by the pope, was that the Archbishops of York might carry his cross in the province of Canterbury on condition that the bishop of York should within two months of his confirmation present to the shrine of St. Thomas a golden image of an archbishop. Though he was a favourite of the king, he did not hesitate to resist royal exactions, and he addressed a vigorous remonstrance on the subject to Edward III. This being suprised Ispip by the action of a synod over which the archbishop presided, and which refused the king's demand for a tenth of ecclesiastical income for six years, proved effectual to check the corrupt system of purveyance. Copies of this remonstrance, the "Speculum Regis Edwardi," are in the Bodleian library (824), and the British Museum (Harl. MS. 2399; Cotton MSS., Cleopatra D. IX and Faustina B. i.). Ispip was a munificent benefactor of Oxford University, and founded a college which he intended should afford special facilities for monks to obtain the advantages of a university course, but the difficulties proved insurmountable, and after his death his foundation continued as a dependence on Christ Church, Canterbury, until it was absorbed by Cardinal Wolsey, in his foundation of Christ Church, Oxford. During his lifetime he had the reputation of being a sparing and niggardly administrator of the temporalities of his diocese, which he thought should be explained partly by the nature of the times, which called for economy and the wise husbandry of resources, and partly by his own temperament, which was frugal and averse to display. Both his enthronement and his funeral at Canterbury were by his own
desire marked by the utmost simplicity, but his generous bequests to the monks of Canterbury show that this was not due to lack of interest in his cathedral church. In 1363 the archbishop suffered a paralytic stroke which he survived for three years, although by depriving him of the power of speech, it practically closed his career.


EDWIN BURTON.

Ismael (Ishmael—Heb. יִשְׁמָאֵל; Sept. Ἰσμαήλ; Vulg. Ismael), in I Par., I, 28, 29, 31, the son of Abraham and Agar, the Egyptian. His history is contained in parts of Gen., xvi—xxxv, wherein three strata of Hebrew tradition (J, E, F) are usually distinguished by contemporary scholars (see Abraham). The name "Ismael", which occurs also in early Babylonian and in Minean, was given to the child before its birth (Gen., xvi, 11), and means: "may God be exalted. As Sarah, Abraham's wife, was barren, she gave him, in accordance with the custom of the time, her handmaid, Agar, as concubine, in order to obtain children through her. Agar's conception of a child soon led her to flight into the wilderness, where the angel of Yahweh appeared to her, bade her to return to her mistress, and fixed the name and character of her future son. After her return to Beresabe, she brought forth Ismael to Abram, who was then eighty-six years old. Ismael was very dear to the aged patriarch, as is shown by his entreaty of God in Ismael's behalf, when the Almighty promised him a son through Sara (xxv). To this end God disclosed to Abram the glorious future which awaited Ismael: "As for Ismael, I have also heard thee. Behold, I will bless him, and increase, and multiply him exceedingly: he shall beget twelve chiefs, and I will make him a great nation. Ismael was not the destined heir of the covenant; yet, as he belonged to Abraham's family, he was submitted to the rite of circumcision when the patriarch circumcised all the male members of his household. He was then a lad of thirteen (xxvi). Abraham's tender love towards Ismael manifested itself on another occasion. He presented Sara's complaint to him, when, on the ground of the meaning of Ismael, she requested Agar's and Ismael's summary dismissal because she "had seen the son of Agar the Egyptian playing with [mocking] Isaac her son". Ismael was Abraham's own "son", and indeed his first-born. At this juncture, God directed Abraham to accede to Sarah's request. This was attended with the reported assurance of future national greatness for Ismael. Whereupon the patriarch dismissed Agar and Ismael with a modicum of provision for their journey. As their scanty provision of water was soon exhausted, Ismael would have certainly perished in the wilderness had not God shown to Agar a well of water which enabled her to revive the dying lad.

According to God's repeated promise of future greatness for Agar's son, Ismael grew up, lived in the wilderness of Paran, became famous as an archer, and married an Egyptian wife (xxi, 8—21). He became the father of twelve sons, whose names and general quarters are given in Gen., xxv, 12—16. Only one daughter of Ismael is mentioned in Holy Writ, where she is spoken of as one of Esau's wives (cf. Gen., xxviii, 9; xxxvi, 3). The last incident known of Ismael's career is connected with Abraham's burial, in which he appears associated with Ishmael. It is not told God shown to Agar a well of water which enabled her to revive the dying lad.

In his Epistle to the Galatians (iv, 21 sqq.) St. Paul expounds allegorically the narrative of Ismael and Isaac, urging upon his readers the duty of not giving up their Christian freedom from the bondage of the Law. Of course, in so arguing, the Apostle of the Gentiles did not intend to detract in any way from the historical character of the narrative in Genesis. With regard to the literary and historical, suggested by a close study of the Biblical account of Ismael's life, suffices it to say that each and all will never cause a careful and unbiased scholar to regard that account otherwise than as portraying an ancient historical character, will never cause him to treat other accounts, by 1162, to whom every attempt, by whomsoever made, to resolve Ismael into a conjectural personality of the founder of a group of Arabic tribes. And this view of the matter will appear most certain to any one who compares the Biblical narrative with the legends concerning Ismael which are embodied in the Talmud, the Targum, and the other rabbinical works; while the latter are plainly the result of puerile imagination, the former is decidedly the description of an ancient historical figure.

See bibliography to Isaac, to which may be added, Driver in Harrods, "The Bible of the East", s. v. Ismael; Stolzenen in The Jewish Encyclopedia, s. v. Ismael.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Isaphan, a Catholic Armenian Latin see. Under the name of Aspandana it was once one of the principal towns of Media. Christianity must have penetrated into the land at an early period, for in 424 we meet the name of its bishop, Aphrahat. Several other bishops of this see are historically known: Abraham in 497, another Abraham in 584, Ahron in 576 (Chab.) "Synodic on the calendar", Paris 1876; others in 987 and 1111 (Lequien, "Oriens Christianus", II, 1305). Isaphan owes its prosperity to a shah of the Sasanian dynasty, Abbas I, who made it his capital at the end of the sixteenth century; he drew thither from all parts merchants, artists, artisans, agriculturists, embellished the town, and enlarged it to such an extent that it was about six miles in circumference, had nearly 600,000 inhabitants and was looked upon as one of the finest and richest towns in the world. Djulis, the Armenian quarter, created by the shah himself, was, and is still, separated from Isaphan by the Zander River. About 1600 Abbas I, desirous of an alliance with Christian European States in order to destroy the Ottoman power, entered into relations with Clement VIII and the King of Spain, and both promised him missionaries. The first to come were Portuguese Augustinians from Goa (1602). In 1604 the pope, who did not know of the arrival of the Augustinians, entrusted the Persian mission to the Discalced Carmelites, of whom a few settled in Isaphan in December, 1607. Then came French Capuchin missionaries in 1628, French Jesuit in 1645, and Dominicans a little later. Although the shahs did not make the Catholic missionaries welcome, they nevertheless allowed them in the course of the seventeenth century to continue their ministry to the Armenians and Chaldeans, to erect churches and schools, and even to convert a few Moslems. When the celebrated Jesuit, Father Alexander de Rhodes, died, he was given magnificent obsequies. During the entire eighteenth century persecutions were so serious as to cause the departure of the European missionaries, and even the Catholic natives left the town.

The Latin Diocese of Isaphan was created in 1629; in 1638 a second one was created, known as Babylon, and until 1693 both were under one administrator.

The bishop generally resided at Isaphan and was still there in 1699, as well as the five religious communities mentioned above, when the Bishop of Ancyra was sent by the Pope as ambassador to the shah. The tak-
ing of Isphahan by the Afghans in 1722 necessitated the closing of these Catholic establishments. In 1838, when Bergougnoun, who had the Pied Ian Apostolic Delegate for the Orientals, the Latin Diocese of Isphahan was removed from the jurisdiction of the See of Babylon, of which it had become a suffragan in 1848. To-day this diocese directly depends on the Holy See; Mgr Lesné, its administrator, who is titular Archbishop of Philippopolis and Apostolic delegate, resides at Isphahan. There are about 350 Catholics of the Latin Rite in Persia, out of a total population of over eight millions; they are under the care of fifteen Lazarist fathers. The Catholic Armenian Diocese of Isphahan, erected on 30 April, 1850, is under the jurisdiction of Monsignor Paolo Pietro Sabbaghian, the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia, and contains about 7700 Catholic Armenians, with eleven secular priests, four churches, and one convent. The faithful in Isphahan proper number 560, out of a population of 80,000 inhabitants; and there are still many in the region of Ormiah. The native Armenians in Persia, outside of Isphahan, are quite numerous at Djulfa, a suburb of Isphahan, and have a bishop of that title.

S. VAILHÉ.

Israelites. — The word designates the descendants of the Patriarch Jacob, or Israel. It corresponds to the Hebrew appellation בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "children of Israel," a name by which—together with the simple form יִשְׂרָאֵל, "Israel"—the chosen people usually called themselves in Old-Testament times. Some modern Israelis speaking of themselves to foreigners used the term בנין ישראל (Hebrews), commonly explained as denoting those who have come from "the other side" (בנין אָבִיר) of the river (the Euphrates). Another synonym for Israelis is יִשְׂרָאֵלiten, "Israelites" (Lev. 26:43), used by classical authors, but also often found in Josephus and in the New-Testament writings. The object of the present article is distinctly geographical and ethnographical, leaving, as far as possible, the other topics connected with the Israelites to be dealt with in the article on JEWS AND JUDAISM, or in particular articles on the leading personages or events in Israel's history.

I. SEMITIC RELATIONSHIP. — The Israelites belong to the group of ancient peoples who are designated under the general name of Semites, and whose countries extended from the Mediterranean to the other side of the Euphrates and Tigris, and from the mountains of Armenia to the southern coast of Arabia. According to the Biblical classification of the descendants of Noah (Gen. x.), it is clear that the Semitic group included the Arabs, Babylonians, Assyrians, Aryanized Hebrews, which peoples modern ethnographers add, chiefly on linguistic grounds, the Phœnicians and Chanaaneans. It thus appears that the Israelites of old claimed actual kinship with some of the most powerful nations of the East, although the narrowness or remoteness of this kinship cannot be determined with exactitude. As might be expected, their ethnic relation to the Semitic tribes who, together with the Israelites, make up the sub-group of the Terabites, is more definitely known. The closeness of this relationship can easily be seen by means of the following table, which is supplied by the earliest source embodied in the Book of Genesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aram</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Ammon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Araba</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Heb. Terah)</td>
<td>(Edom)</td>
<td>(Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madian et al.</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethuel</td>
<td>Aram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table plainly shows that the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Edomites, and the Israelites were tribes of kindred origin, a fact which is readily acknowledged by contemporary scholars. It shows no less plainly that the children of Israel were also conscious of a close relationship with both the Arameans (Syrrians) to the north-east and the Sinitic nomads to the south of the Dead Sea, and that despite the rejection of Israel's kinship with Aram by some recent critics, both the Aramean and the Arabian relationships of Israel should be admitted. In the abstract, these relationships are not exclusive of each other, for there is no reason to suppose that ancient Israel was more homogeneous than any other migratory and conquering people; and in the concrete, both the relationships in question are equally borne witness to in the earliest historical records (cf. Gen., xxxiv, 4, 10; xxxvii, 43; xxix, 4, etc., in favour of Israel's relationship with Aram).

II. EARLY MIGRATION. — The history of the Israelites begins with the migration of the kindred tribes mentioned in the above table, in the person of their ancestor, Thare, from Babylonia. The starting-point of this memorable migration was, according to Gen., xi, 28, 31, "Ur of the Chaldees," which has recently been identified with Mugheir (Mugayyar; Acadiana Ursum), an important city in ancient days, some six miles distant from the right bank of the Euphrates, and about 125 miles north-west of the Persian Gulf. Its actual goal, according to Gen., xi, 31, was "the land of Chanaan." The movement thus generally described is in distinct harmony with the well-assured fact that at an early date Babylonian enterprise had penetrated to Palestine and thereby opened up to the Semitic element of Chaldea a track towards the region which at the present day is often regarded as the original centre of the dispersion of the Semites, viz. Northern Arabia. The course taken was by way of Haran (in Aram), a city some 600 miles north-west of Ur, and its rival in the worship of the Moon-god, Sin. Not in worship alone, but also in culture, laws, and customs, Haran closely resembled Ur, and the call of Abraham—God's command bidding him to seek a new country (Gen., xi, 1)—was doubtless welcome to one whose purer conception of the Deity made him dissatisfied with his heathen surroundings (cf. Jos., xxiv, 2 sq.). There is also reason to think that at this time Northern Babylonia was greatly disturbed by invading Kassites, a mountain race related to the Elamites. While, then, Thare's second son, Nachor, remained in Haran, where he originated the city and settled, Abraham and Lot went forth, passed Damascus, and reached the goal of their journey. The settlements which Holy Writ connects with Abraham and Lot need only to be mentioned here. The tribes directly related to Lot were those of Moab and Ammon, of which the former established itself east of the Dead Sea, and the latter settled on the eastern side of
the Amorite kingdom which extended between the Arnom and the Jeboc. Of the tribes more immediately related to Abraham, the Israelites and the Madianites seem to have lived in the Peninsula of Sinai. Possession of Mount Seir, the hilly tract of land lying south of the Dead Sea, was in the Arabah; and the Israelites settled in the country west of the Jordan, the districts with which they are more particularly connected in the Book of Genesis being those of Sechem, Bethel, Hebron, and Bersabee.

The history of the Israelites in these early times is closely associated with that of the Canaanites, Abram, Isaac, and Jacob (Israel), all of whom kept a distinct remembrance of their close kinship with the Semitic settlement in Aram (cf. Gen., xxiv.; xxviii.), and the first of whom appears to have reached Chanaan about 2300 B.C., when he came into passing contact with Egypt (Gen., xii) and Elam (Gen., xiv.) (see BABYLONIA).

III. SOJOURN IN EGYPT.—The intercourse of Abraham with Egypt was, as is well known, of the utmost importance in the history of the race, and the narrative has been the subject of much discussion and much controversy. The main points of the story are the migration of the Patriarch to Egypt, the subsequent stay of fourteen years, and the final departure with a large number of persons and possessions. The account is given in Genesis, Chapter xxvii., and the narrative is continued in Chapters xxxiv. and xxxvi. The main incidents are the marriage of Joseph, the slavery of the Hebrews, the capture of Joseph, and the return of the family to Egypt. The story is of great historical importance, as it provides the first recorded instance of a migration from one country to another, and as it illustrates the character of the people who occupied the countries in question.

The history of the Israelites in Egypt is a long and complex one, and the details are not always clear. The Bible gives a number of incident, but the main events are well known. The Israelites were driven out of Egypt by the Egyptians, and the story is told in the book of Exodus. The main events are the exodus from Egypt, the journey through the wilderness, and the conquest of Canaan. The story is also told in the book of Deuteronomy, and the main events are the speech of Moses to the Israelites, the construction of the temple, and the death of Moses.
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called the Gulf of Akabah. Of the various places mentioned as being on their route only two have been identified with some degree of probability. These are Kibroth Hattawnah (graves of lust), regarded as identical with Erweis el-Ebeer, and Haseveth, apparently identical with the modern 'Ain Hudherah (cf. Numb., xi, 34; xxxiii, 16, 17). On entering the Desert of Pharan, the people established themselves at Cades, also Cadesbarne (the holy place), which has been identified with great probability with Ain Kedis, some fifty miles south of Bersabee (Numb., xxxii, 36). Proceeding northward, after the return of the spies whom they had sent to explore Southern Palestine, they made a mad attempt to force their way into Chanaan. They were repulsed by the Chanaanites and the Amalecites at Sephaath, a place subsequently named Horma (cf. Judges, i, 17; now Sebaata) and some thirty-five miles north of Cades. (Cf. Numb., xii, xiv.) Then began a most obscure period in Israel's life. During thirty-eight years they wandered in the Badit et-Tih (Wilderness of the Wanderings) on the southern confines of Chanaan, apparently making Cades the centre around which their movements turned. It is possible that while here, they came, for the first time

in the direction of the sacred mount of Sinai, the next station being at Raphidim (Exod., xvii, 1), which is commonly regarded as identical with Wady Feiran, a long and fertile plain overhung by the granite rocks of Mount Shebal, probably the Horeb of Holy Writ. From Feiran the road winds through the long Wady es-Sheychk and leads to the extensive plain es-Rahab, which is directly in front of Mount Sinai, and which offered more than sufficient standing-ground for all the children of Israel. It is true that none of the foregoing identifications enjoys more than a certain amount of probability, and that, consequently, their aggregate cannot be considered as an unquestionable proof that the traditional road along the Gulf of Sues is the one actually followed by the Hebrews. Yet, as may readily be seen, it is a fact of no small importance in favour of the route just described that its distance of some 150 miles between the place of crossing and Mount Sinai admits of a natural division into stages which on the whole correspond well to the principal marches of the Hebrews; for nothing of the kind can be put forth in support of their position by the contemporary scholars who prefer to the traditional road as eastward one running across the Peninsula of Sinai to the northern point of the Gulf of Akabah.

On leaving Sinai, under the guidance of Moses' brother-in-law, the Israelites proceeded in a northerly direction towards the Wilderness of Pharan, the barren region of et-Tih which lies south of Chanaan and west of Edom. They seem to have approached it by the shore of the eastern arm of the Red Sea, now since the Exodus, into contact with the Egyptians. An inscription of the Pharaoh Memphitah has been found recently at Thebes, in 1886, the close of which relates the conquest by the Egyptians of the land of Chanaan and of Ashkelon, and then adds: 'The Israelites are spoiled so that they have no seed; the land of Khar [perhaps, the land of the Horites, i.e. Edom] is become like the windows of Egypt.' Of the circumstances alluded to nothing positive is known; but the situation of the Israelites implied in the inscription is in or near Southern Palestine, and, as the fuller records of later date show no trace of any relations between Israel and Egypt until the time of Solomon, the sojourn at Cades seems to be the only occasion that will suit the conditions. On the assumption that the Exodus took place in the reign of Memphitah, the only alternative to the view just set forth is to regard the inscription as a boastful account of the Exodus itself, considered as an expulsion of the Israelites'. (Wade, "Old Test. Hist.").

In the beginning of the fortieth year of Israel's wanderings, the march towards Chanaan was resumed from Cades. In approaching Palestine this second time, it was determined to avoid the southern frontier, and to enter the Land of Promise by crossing the Jordan at the northern end of the Dead Sea. The shorter road for this purpose was through the territories of Edom and Moab, and Moses asked permission from the King of Edom to take this route, reminding him of the relationship between his people and Israel. His refusal compelled the Israelites to journey southward towards the Gulf of Akabah, and
there to skirt the southern possessions of Edom, whence they marched northward, skirting the eastern frontier first of Edom and next of Moab, and finally encamping over against the River Arnon (the modern Wady Mobj). Such is the general line of march commonly admitted by scholars between Chorazin and Arnon. Moreover, it is generally agreed that the several lists of Israel’s stations in Numb., xx, 22-xxi, 11; xxxiii; Deut., x, 6, 7, contain differences as to the encampments which they mention, and as to the time which they assign to Aaron’s death, some uncertainty remains as to which side of Edom they crossed. In any case, the Israelites are on their way to the Arnon. With regard to the various stations named in those lists, a still greater uncertainty prevails. In point of fact, only a few of them can be identified, among which may be mentioned the place of Aaron’s death, Mount Hor, which is probably the modern Jebel Madurah on the western border of Edom, some thirty or forty miles north-east of Cades; and next the encampment at Asiongaber, a place which may be identical with Ain el Gudyan which lies about fifteen miles north of the Gulf of Akabah. Resuming their march towards Jordan, the Children of Israel crossed the Arnon, and encountered the hostility of the Amor- rite chief, Schoen, who had taken from Moab the territory between the Arnon and the Jeboc (Wady Zerka). They defeated him at Jasa (not now identified), captured his capital Hesebon (the modern Hisham), and the other cities of his dominion. They were thus brought into contact, and apparently into conflict, with the northemmost kingdom of Basan, which lay between the Jебoc and the foot of Mount Hermon. They gave battle to its king, Og, defeated him at Taanach (now Ed‘a), and took possession of his territory. Their victories and, perhaps still more, their occupation of the land north of Moab by Ruben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh aroused the enmity of the Moabites who, at this juncture, summoned Balaam to curse the Israelites, and who succeeded but too well in their efforts to betray them into idolatry at Sittim (Acaeiis), in the plains of Moab, over against Jericho (Eri‘ka). The crowning events of the Wanderings were the induction of Josue into office as Moses’ successor in command, and the death of Moses on the plains of Moab. One of the chiefs of the Amorrites (Numb., xxvii, 12), which is variously called Nebo (Jebel Neba; Deut., xxxii, 49) or Phshga (Ras Siqiah; Deut., iii, 27), the western projection of Mount Nebo.

V. The Conquest of Chanaan.—Soon after the death of Moses, Josue resolved to attempt the invasion and conquest of Chanaan proper, or the country west of the Jordan, which Israel’s great lawgiver had indeed contemplated, but had not been able to effect. In some respects this was at the time a hard task. The crossing of the Jordan was in itself a difficult undertaking, as the heights of the river were crowned with numerous cities, strongly walled, and therefore able to offer a stout resistance. Even the population in the lowlands was much superior to the Israelites in the art and appliances of war, in touch, as they had long been, with the advanced civilization of Babylonia and Egypt. In some other respects the work of conquest was then comparatively easy. The various peoples (Chanaanites, Hethites, Amorrites, Pherezites, etc.) who made up the population of Western Palestine, constituted a number of mostly independent cities, distracted by those mutual jealousies which have been pointed out in the Amarna tablets, and hence not likely to combine their forces against Israel’s invasion. Moreover, there was no possibility of outside alliances against the intruders. Tyre and Sidon, and other cities of the coast, were going their way, increasing their wealth and commercial connections by peaceful means, and were averse to entangling foreign complications. The Amorrites east of the Jordan were the most formidable remnant of their decaying race, and they had been rendered powerless; while the Philistines, them- selves once a powerful people upon the scattered power” (McCurdy). Circumstances such as these naturally called for Josue’s prompt and vigorous action. With God’s special help he crossed the Jordan at the head of all the tribes encamped at Gogal, identified with the modern Tell el-Jiljulah, four miles from the Wady el-Abel river, and thence proceeded upon Jericho. This city was one of the keys to the trans-Jordanic region, and it soon fell into his power. He next proceeded by the pass of Machmas (the Wady Suweinit) against Hai, a town two miles east of Be’ehel, and captured it by stratagem. After this rapid conquest of Central Chanaan, Josue made alliance with the Gabaonites, who had outwitted him, and won the memorable battle of Bethoron over the five kings of the nearest Amorrite peoples. This victory was followed up by the subjugation of other districts of Southern Palestine, a work which seems to have been accomplished chiefly if not exclusively by Israel crossing the Jordan itself, and overpowered the Cinites and the Calebites. Meantime, the kings of the north had rallied around Jabin, King of Azor in Galilee, and mustered their hosts near the Waters of Merom (Lake Huleh). At the head of the House of Joseph, the Jewish leader took them by surprise, defeated them, and subdued numerous northern towns. Josue’s glorious achievements secured for the tribes of Israel a firm foothold in Chanaan, by means of which they settled in their allotted territories. Great, however, as were these victories, they failed, even in conjunction with the efforts of the individual tribes (as recounted in our text of Judges), to complete the subjugation of Palestine. Many of the larger cities, together with the cultivated valleys and the coast-land, were still, and remained for a long time, in the possession of Chanaan’s earlier inhabitants.

VI. The Period of the Judges.—As long as Josue lived, his personality and his generalship succeeded in keeping up among the Israelites some manner of central authority, despite the tribal rivalries which manifested themselves even during the conquest of Western Palestine. Even Josue, the appointed successor, all central authority actually ceased, and the bonds of union between the different tribes were quickly dissolved. The tribes were dispersed in different districts, and the Semitic love of tribal independence strongly reasserted itself among them. The immediate pressure of the war of con- quest was no longer felt, and in many cases the distinct Hebrew communities were either unwilling or unable to exterminate the older population which survived in the land. The bond of union which naturally arises from close kinship, was likewise considerably attenuated by other side lines of descent among the Chanaanites. Even the bond created by the community of religion was time and again seriously impaired in Israel by the corruption of the ancestral worship of Yahweh with the attractive cult of the Baalim of Chanaan. This deep disunion of the tribes accounts naturally for the fact that, during a long period after the death of Moses’ successor, each section of Israel’s possessions was in its turn harassed and humiliated by a powerful foreign foe, and each time delivered from his oppression by a military leader, a “judge”, as he is called, whose authority never extended beyond the limits of his own district. In the course of time, the drawbacks of such disunion were more strongly felt by the Israelites, and in order to withstand their enemies more effectively by concerted action, they wished for a king. Their first attempts in this direc-
tion were indeed unsuccessful: Gideon refused the crown which they offered him, and Abimelech, his son, who accepted it, proved an unworthy ruler. Yet the spirit of Israel was not to be suppressed; during Israel's fierce conflict with the Philistines, Samuel, the last judge, wielded the universal and absolute power of a monarch without the title and the insignia of royalty; and when to the hostility of Western enemies was joined that of Eastern foes, like the Ammonites, the Israelites strenuously asked for a king and finally obtained one in the person of the Benjamite Saul.

VII. THE UNDIVIDED KINGDOM.—Israel's first monarch resembled in many respects the judges who had preceded him, for the simple reason that, under his rule, a tribal and anocratic spirit did not die out, but was fostered in a nation. He was indeed the King of All Israel; his royal title and authority were to be hereditary, and at his summons all the tribes rallied around him. With their common help, he rescued the men of Jabes Galed from impending destruction at the hands of the Ammonites, fought for a time successfully against the Philistines, and overcame the Amalecites. All the while, however, his kingship was little more than a judgeship. His court and ways of life were simple in the extreme; he had no standing army, no governors over subordinate districts; the war against the Philistines, the great enemies of Israel in his day, he waged like the judges of old, by hasty and temporary levies; and when he died at Gibeon, the profound and inevitable disunion of the tribes, which had been momentarily checked, immediately reappeared; most of them declared themselves in favour of his son, Ishbosheth, but Juda gathered around David and made him king in Hebron. In the civil war which ensued, "David grew always stronger and stronger", with the final result that his sovereignty was formally and voluntarily acknowledged by the elders of all the tribes. The new king was the real founder of the Hebrew monarchy. One of his first cares was to secure for Israel a political and religious capital in Jerusalem, a city of considerable size and of considerable natural strength. His military genius enabled him gradually to overcome the various nations who had cruelly oppressed the chosen people in the days of the judges. On the south-east he fought against the Philistines, and took from them the town of Gath (Tell es-Safi), and a great part of their dominions. On the south-east, he conquered and established garrisons in the territory of Edom. To the east of the Jordan he attacked and well-nigh exterminated the Moabites, while on the north he overthrew the Syrians of Soha as well as those of Damascus who had marched to the defence of their kindred. Finally, he waged a protracted war against the Ammonites, who had entered into a defensive alliance with several of the Syrian princes, and wreaked upon them a frightful vengeance. The possessions secured by these various wars formed a vast empire whose boundaries remained forever after the ideal extent of the Realm of Israel, and whose wise internal organization, on regular monarchical lines, greatly promoted the agricultural and industrial interests of the Hebrew tribes. Under such circumstances one might not unnaturally have supposed that the old tribal jealousies were at an end forever. And yet, on the occasion of the king's domestic broils, a rebellion broke out which for a while threatened to rend the nation asunder. The eldest son of David's father was, however, happily averted, and at his death David left to his son Solomon an undivided kingdom. David's reign had been pre-eminently a period of war and of territorial acquisition; Solomon's rule was, in the main, an era of peace and commercial achievement. Of special value to the new monarch were the friendly relations between Phoenicia and Israel, continued from David's time. Through the help of Tyre he erected the Temple and other beautiful edifices in Jerusalem; the help of Tyre also enabled him to maintain for a time something of a foreign commerce by the Red Sea. His relations with Egypt were likewise peaceful and profitable. He received in marriage the daughter of Pharaoh, the last Pharaoh of the twenty-first dynasty, and kept up with Egypt a brisk overland commerce. He carried on a friendly intercourse and lively trade with the Hittites of Cilicia and of Cappadocia. Unfortunately, his love of splendour and luxury, his unfaithfulness to Yahweh's law and worship, gradually betrayed him into oppressive measures which especially alienated the northern tribes. In vain did he strive to overrule this dissatisfaction by doing away with the ancient terri-
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torial divisions of the tribes, and by appointing the Ephraimite Jeroboam as collector of taxes of the House of Joseph; his tampering with the old tribal principle did but increase the general discontent, and the great authority with which he invested the son of Nabat simply afforded the latter better opportunity to realize the extent of the disaffection of the northern tribes and to avail himself of it to rebel against the king. About this same time, Edom and Moab revolted against Solomon's suzerainty, so that, towards the end of his reign, everything threatened the continuity of the empire of Israel, which had always contained the hidden germs of disruption, and which, to a large extent, owed its very existence to the extreme temporary weakness of the great neighbouring nations of Egypt and Assyria.

VIII. THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL.—Roboam's insulting reply to the northern tribes, when, gathered at Sichem, after Solomon's demise, they asked for some relief from the heavy yoke put upon them by the late monarch, was the immediate occasion of their permanent rupture with the line of David and the southern tribes. Under Jeroboam's headship they formed (c. 937 B.C.) a separate kingdom which is known as the Kingdom of Israel, in contradistinction to that of Juda, and which greatly surpassed the latter in extent and population. The area of the Northern Kingdom is estimated at about 9000
square miles, with a population of about four or five millions. It included eight tribes, viz., on the west of the Jordan, Ephraim, one-half of Manasses, Issachar, Zabalon, Asen, Nephthali with the coast-line between Acre and Joppa; on the east of the Jordan, Ruben, Gad, and one-half of Manasses. Its vassal-states were Moab and so much of Syria as had remained subject to Solomon (III Kings, xii, 24; IV Kings, iii, 4). The Kingdom of Juda included that tribe itself together with that of Benjamin, and—at least eventually—a part, if not the whole, of Simeon and Dan. Its area is estimated at 3400 miles, with a population of about one million and three quarters. Besides this, Edom continued faithful to Juda for a time. But while the Northern Kingdom was larger and more populous than the Southern, it decidedly lacked the unity and the seclusion of its rival, and was therefore the first to succumb, a comparatively easy prey, to the eastern conquerors, when their victorious march brought them to the western lands.

The history of the newly formed kingdom may be conveniently divided into three great periods, during which various dynasties ruled in Israel, while the line of David continued in sole possession of the throne of Juda. The first period extends from Jeroboam to Achab (937-875 B.C.). The kings of this opening period were as follows:—

**ISRAEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam</td>
<td>937-915 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadab</td>
<td>915-913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baasha</td>
<td>913-889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela.</td>
<td>889-887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambri</td>
<td>a few days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amri.</td>
<td>887-875 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JUDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roboam</td>
<td>937-920 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abiam</td>
<td>920-917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa.</td>
<td>917-876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josaphat</td>
<td>876-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the twenty-two years of Jeroboam's reign, few details have come down to us. At first, the founder of the Northern Kingdom took for his capital the city of Shechem, in which Abimelech had once set up his kingdom, and in which the actual outbreak of the revolt against Juda had just occurred; he exchanged it for the beautiful Tiberias, eleven miles to the north-east. To offset the attractiveness of Jerusalem and the influence of its Temple, he extended his royal patronage to two ancient sanctuaries, Dan and Bethel, the one at the northern, and the other at the southern, extremity of his realm. To guard against Judah's invasion of his territory, he built up strong fortresses on both sides of the Jordan. With regard to Jeroboam's early military expeditions, the Biblical narrative imparts no distinct information: it simply represents as practically continual the war which soon broke out between him and Roboam (cf. III Kings, xiv, 30; xv, 6). From the Egyptian inscriptions at Karnak, it appears that the Northern Kingdom suffered much in connexion with the invasion of Judah by Sesac, the first king of the twenty-second dynasty, so that it is not likely that this invasion was the result of Jeroboam's appeal to Egypt for help in his conflict with the King of Judah. The hostilities between the sister kingdoms continued under Abiam, Roboam's son and successor, and in their pursuit, Jeroboam was, according to the chronicles' account, badly worsted (II Paralip., iii). Jeroboam's own line lasted only through his own son Nadab, who, after reigning two years, was slain by a usurper, Baasha of Issachar (913 B.C.), while Israel besieged the Philistine fortress of Gebbethon (probably Kibbah, six or seven miles northeast of Lydda). After his accession, Baasha pushed the war so vigorously against Asa, King of Judah, that, to save Jerusalem from an impending siege, the latter purchased the help of Benadad I, of Damascus, against Israel. In the conflict with Syria which ensued, Baasha lost much of the territory on the west of the Upper Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, with the fateful result that the controlling power in the west was now no longer Hebrew, but Aramean. Baasha was succeeded by his son Ela, whose reign lasted only a part of two years (889-875 B.C.). His murderer, Zambri, got himself proclaimed king, but perished after a few days, giving place to his military competitor, Amri (887-875 B.C.), the skilful head of a new dynasty in Israel. Under Amri, Samaria, admirably and strongly situated in Central Palestine, some twelve miles to the west of Tiberias, became, and remained to the end, the capital of the Northern Kingdom. Under him, too, the policy of hostility which had hitherto prevailed between Juda and Israel was exchanged for one of general friendship based on common interests against Syria. In some directions, indeed, Amri suffered considerable losses, as, east of the Jordan, Ramoth and other cities of Gadad fell into the power of the King of
Damascus, while on the west of the same river, he was forced to grant to that monarch trading privileges (cf. III Kings, xx, 34). But in other directions he succeeded in extending his dominion. The inscription of Mesa proves that he brought Moab under tribute. He cemented Israel's alliance with Tyre by the marriage of his son Achab with Jesabel, the daughter of the Tyrian priest and king, Ethbaal. His territories, now apparently limited to the tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Issachar, with a portion of Zebulon, were consolidated under his firm rule, so much so that the Assyrians, who henceforth carefully watched over the affairs of Palestine, designated Israel under the name of "the House of Amri," even after his dynasty had been overthrown.

Achab's successor, Moab was removed from the throne of Israel by his son, Jeroboam II (785-731 B.C.). These kings were as follows:—

**ISRAEL**

Achab. 875-853 B.C. | Josaphat. 876-851 B.C.
Ochozias. 853-851 | Joram. 851-843
Joram. 851-842 | Ochozias. 843-842
Jehu. 842-851 | Athalia. 842-858
Joachaz. 851-842 | Joas. 836-842
Joas. 797-781 | Amasias. 796-782
Azarias (Ozias). 782—

**JUDA**

It was marked at home by a considerable progress of Israel in the arts of peace (cf. III Kings, xxii, 39); by the public adoption of the Phoenician worship of Baal and Ashtaroth (D. V. Ashhtaroth, Ashtoreth), and also by a strenuous opposition to it on the part of the Prophets in the person of Elias, the leading religious figure of the time. Abroad, Israel's friendly relation with Judah assumed a permanent character by the marriage of Athalia, the daughter of Achab and Jezabel, with Joram, the son of Josaphat and in point of fact, Israel was at peace with Judah throughout the twenty-two years of Achab's reign. Israel's chief neighbour foe was Syria, over whose ruler, Benadad II, Achab won two important victories (875 B.C.). Yet, upon the westward advance of their common enemies, the Assyrians, under Salmanasar II, the kings of Israel and Syria united with other princes of Western Asia against the Assyrian hosts, and checked their onward march at Karkhar on the Orontes, in 854 B.C. Next year, Achab resumed hostilities against Syria, and fell mortally wounded in battle before Hazor (797 B.C.). Achaz (794 B.C.) was the last monarch of Jehu's dynasty. He had scarcely reigned six months when a usurer, Sellum, put him to death. Sellum, in his turn, was even more summarily dispatched by the turbulent Manahem. The last-named ruler had soon to face the Assyrian power directly, and, as he felt unable to withstand it, hastened to proffer tribute to Thlathaphalasar III and thereby save his crown (738 B.C.). His son Phacee reigned about two years (737-35 B.C.) and was slain by his captain, Phacee, who combined with Syria against Achaz of Judah. In his sore distress, Achaz appealed for Assyrian help, with the result that Thlathaphalasar again (734 B.C.) invaded Israel, annexed Galilee and Damascus, and carried many Israelites into captivity. Phacee's murderer, Osee, was Assyria's faithful vassal as long as Thlathaphalasar lived. Shortly afterwards, at the instigation of Egypt, he revolted against Salmanasar IV, Assyria's new ruler, whoupon Assyrian troops overran Israel and laid siege to the capital again. A long resistance, fell near the close of the year 722 B.C., under Sargon II, who had meantime succeeded Salmanasar IV. With this ended the Northern Kingdom, after an existence of a little more than two hundred years. (For the fate of the Israelites left in Palestine or exiled, see Captivities of the Israelites.)
The Kingdom of Judah.—Of the two kingdoms formed upon the disruption of Solomon's empire, the Southern Kingdom, or Kingdom of Judah, was in several respects weaker, and yet was the better fitted to withstand the assaults of foreign enemies. Its general relations with Israel, Egypt, and Assyria, during the existence of the Northern Kingdom, have been briefly mentioned in connexion with the history of that kingdom, and need not be more fully set forth here. Hence the following sketch of the Kingdom of Judah deals exclusively with the period of its existence subsequent to the overthrow of the Kingdom of Israel by the Assyrians. At the time of the fall of Samaria, Ezechias was King of Judah (725–696 b.c.). He long persevered in the allegiance which his father, Amon, had pledged to Assyria; Sargon's death, however, in 705 b.c., appeared to him and other Western princes a favourable opportunity to throw off the Assyrian yoke. He therefore formed with them a powerful league against Sennacherib, Sargon's successor. In due time (701 b.c.), the Assyrian forces invaded Western Asia, captured several Judean cities, and compelled Ezechias to renounce the league and pay an enormous fine. Not long afterwards, Sennacherib ravaged Judah again, and hautiously threatened Jerusalem with destruction. In accordance with Isaiah's prophecy, however, his threats came to naught: "the Angel of the Lord" decimated his army, and disturbances in the East recalled him to Nineveh (IV Kings, xi. 13 seq.). It was under Ezechias that Judah came in contact for the first time with Babylonia (IV Kings, xx). The long reign of his son, Manasses (696–641 b.c.), was, almost throughout, marked by religious degeneracy and faithful vassalage to Assyria. In the latter part of it, Judah rebelled against Assyria, but Sennacherib's son and successor, but the insurrection was speedily crushed, and misfortune brought back Manasses to the worship of the true God. The brief reign of Amon (641–39 b.c.) was an imitation of the first and the worst practices of his father. In 608 b.c. Palestine was traversed by an Egyptian army under Necho II, a prince of the twenty-sixth dynasty, ambitious to restore to his country an Asiatic empire. As a faithful vassal of Assyria, the pious King Josias (639–608 b.c.) marched out to arrest Pharaoh's progress. He was defeated and slain at Mageddo, and his kingdom became an Egyptian dependency. This vassalage was indeed short-lived. The Chaldean Nabuchodonosor, on his victorious march to Egypt, invaded Judah for the first time, and Joakim (A. V. Jehoiakim) (608–597 b.c.), the eldest son and successor of Josias, became a vassal of Babylon in 604 b.c. Despite the advice of the Prophet Jeremias, the Jewish king rebelled in 598. Next year, the Exile King Josiah (A. V. Jehoas chin), was taken, with Jerusalem, and was carried captive to Babylon together with many of his subjects, among whom was the Prophet Ezechiel. In 588 b.c., Judah rebelled again under Zedekias (597–586 b.c.), the third son of Josias. In July, 586 b.c., the Holy City surrendered, and its blinded king and most of his people were deported to Babylon. Thus began the Babylonian exile (see Captivities of the Israelites). After the Babylonian Exile.—Politically and nationally the Babylonian exile was a blessing for ever to the people of Israel. Even when, 350 years later, there was once more a Jewish state, those who formed it were not the people of Israel, not even the Jewish nation, but that portion which remained in the mother country of a great religious organization scattered over all Asia and Egypt (Cyril). The exiles who, in 588 b.c., availed themselves of Cyrus's permission to return to Palestine, were mostly Judeans, whose varied fortunes after their settlement in and around Jerusalem belong in a very particular manner to the history of Judaism and consequently need be set forth only in the briefest manner in the present article. Prompted by the religious impulse which led them to come back to the land of their fathers, their first concern in reaching it was to resume God's holy worship. Their perseverance in rearing the second Temple was finally crowned with success in 516 b.c., despite the bitter and unceasing opposition of the Samaritans. Their great leaders—not only the Prophets of the time (Zachary and Malachi), but also their local secular heads (Nehe mias and Esdras)—were religious reformers, whose one purpose was to preserve the people's fidelity to God's law and worship. They made no attempt to set up a monarchy of their own, and as long as the Persian Empire lasted they and their descendants gloried in their loyalty. Within the Persian period falls the formation of the Jewish military colony at Elephantine, the existence and religious worship of which have been disclosed by Judeo-Aramaean papyri discovered quite recently. The conqueror of Persia, Alexander the Great, seems to have bestowed special privileges upon the Jewish community of Palestine, and to have granted to the Jews who settled in Alexandria—a city which he founded and called after his name—equal civil rights with the Macedonians (331 b.c.). Alexander died before consolidating his empire. During the period of bloodshed which followed his death, Palestine was the bone of contention between the Syrian and Egyptian kings, often changed masters, and suffered oppression and misery at each change. As time went on, the welfare, moral and religious, of the Palestinian Jews was more and more seriously threatened by the influence of Hellenism, which at first chiefly exercised by the Ptolemies from Alexandria as the centre (323–202 b.c.), and later by Antiochus III, the Great, of Syria, and his two successors, Seleucus IV and Antiochus Epiphanes, reigning at Antioch (202–165 b.c.). Under this last-named Syrian prince, Hellenism appeared to menace the point of stamping Judaism out. The high-priests of the time, who were the local rulers of Jerusalem, adopted Greek names, and courted the king's favour by introducing or encouraging Hellenic practices among the inhabitants of the Holy City. At length Antiochus himself resolved to transform Jerusalem into a Greek city, and to destroy Judaean...
from the towns of Palestine and, indeed, from all his dominions. A most cruel and systematic persecution ensued, in the course of which the Machabees rebelled against their oppressors. The final result of the Machabean revolt was the overthrow of the Syrian power, and the barons of the Parthian king, Darius, established in the east.

Under the Asmonean dynasty (135-63 B.C.), the Palestinian Jewish community gradually spread, by conquest and forcible conversion, from its narrow limits in Nehemiah's time, to practically the extent of the territory of ancient Israel. Internally, it was divided between the two rival parties of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, themselves the slow outcome of the twofold movement at work during the Syrian suzerainty, the one against, and the other in favour of, Hellenism. The war which broke out between the last two Asmonean kings, John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, who were supported by the Pharisees and the Sadducees respectively, gave to the Romans the opportunity they had long sought for intervening in Judean affairs. In 63 B.C. Pompey invaded and took Jerusalem, and put an end to the last Jewish dynasty. Up to 37 B.C., the year of the accession of Herod the Great, the history of the Palestinian Jews reflects, for the most part, the vicissitudes of the tangled politics of the Roman emperors.

Herod's despotism reigned (37 B.C. to A.D. 4) was marked by a rapid growth of Hellenism in nearly every city of Palestine, and also by contact of the Pharisees in the celebration of the school of Hillel and Shammai. Upon the death of Herod, the Emperor Augustus divided his kingdom, and placed Judea under procurators as a part of the Roman Province of Syria. The last political struggles to be mentioned are (1) the Jewish revolt against Rome in A.D. 66, which ended in the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70; (2) the rebellion of Bar Cochba in A.D. 132 under the Emperor Adrian, who finally transformed Jerusalem into the Roman colony of Ælia Capitolina from which all Jews were banished. Ever since then, the Jews have been scattered in many countries, often persecuted, yet surviving, always hoping in some manner for a future Messias, and generally influenced by the customs, and morals, and religious beliefs of the nations among whom they live.

Besides the works on Biblical history referred to in the bibliographical note, the following deserve special mention: DUBREVOY, Bible et découvertes modernes (Paris, 1896); SATOH, History of the Great East (London, 1904); McCauley, History, Prophecy and the Monuments (New York, 1885); new ed. announced, 1909); Legrand, Études sur les religions (1903); Fiechter, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia (1903); Wincelius, History of Israel (1905); Barakat, Ancient Records of Egypt (3 vols., 1906-07); Vincent, Chaman d'Apres l'exploration récente (Paris, 1897); Cornwell, History of the People of Israel, tr. (Chicago, 1889); See also the History of And Short Odes of Jerusalem; New York, 1903); Wade, Old Testament History (New York, 1904).

Francis E. Gigot.

Issachar (אִישָׁחָר). The exact derivation and the precise meaning of the name are unknown. First, the name is used as a surname of Jacob and the fifth son of Lia (Gen., xxx, 16-18; xxxv, 23; I Par., ii, 1), on whom it was bestowed account on some particular circumstance connected with his birth (cf. Gen., xxx, 14-18), and of whom nothing is told in Holy Writ besides the fact that, at the descent into Egypt, he had four sons (Gen., xvi, 13; Num., xxvi, 23, 24; I Par., vii, 1). It designates, in the second place, one of the tribes of Israel, which had the ninth son of Jacob for its ancestor. Our knowledge of the tribe of Issachar is rather meagre. During the journey through the wilderness, that is to say, along the entire Jewish route, the Issacharites marched on the east of the tabernacle (Num., ii, 5). It contained 54,400 warriors when the first census was taken at Mount Sinai (Num., i, 25 sq.), and 64,300 at the time of the second census (Num., xxvi, 25). After the entrance into Western Palestine, this tribe was one of the six which stood on Mount Garizim during the ceremony of the cursing and the blessing (Deut., xxvii, 12). The precise limits of its territory are not given in Holy Writ. Its general boundaries were Zebulun on the north, Dan on the north-east, Manasses to the south and to the west, the Jordan to the east. Its lot, according to Jos., xix, 17-23, comprised sixteen cities and their villages, prominent among which were the cities of Jeresh, Sunem, Engannim, and Anaharz. Within its territory lay the great plain of Eschel, the name of which enabled the Hebrew poet (Gen., xlix, 14) to describe Issachar as "a large limbed as stretching himself between the sheepfolds", and the fertility of which is praised by travellers down to the present day. The tribe played an important part during the period of the Judges (Judges, v, 15; x, 1, 2); and in the time of David it counted 145,600 warriors (I Par., vii, 1-5). Its history during the royal period was likewise important, and the third king of Northern Israel belonged to that tribe (III Kings, xx, 27). The Prophet Esaias places Issachar between the tribe of Manasses and Zebulun (Ezech., xlviii, 25, 26), and St. John names it between Levi and Zebulun (Apoc., vii, 7).

See Comm. on Genesis and Biblical Histories in bibliography to 1 Esdr., to which may be added Wallenius' Researches in Palestine, III (Boston, 1841); Stanley, Sinai and Palestine (New York, 1859); Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land (New York, 1897).

Francis E. Gigot.

Issachar, a titular see of Cilicia Prima, suffragan of Tarsus. The city is famous for a whole series of battles fought there at different periods. The first was the victory of Alexander over Darius in 333 B.C., next that of Septimius Severus over Pescennius Niger, in A.D. 194, that of Heraclius over Chosroes in A.D. 622, finally that of the Sultan of Egypt, Biharran, against the Armenian King Hetoum in August, 1266. So many combats were fought at Issus because in its vicinity was the famous defile leading along the seashore from Cilicia to Syria, the "Gates of Syria", or highway from Asia Minor into the Syrian Orient. Issus is not mentioned in the "Notitiae Episcopatum" of the Patriarchate of Antioch, to which Cilicia belonged (Echos d'Orient, X, 94, 145), and it is not known in what manner it became a titular see of the Latin Church. Its ruins are situated near Ayas.

S. Vaille.

Ita, Saint, called the "Brigid of Munster", b. in the present County of Waterford, about 475; d. 15 January, 570. She became a nun, settling down at Cluan Credhail, a place-name that has ever since been known as Killeedy,—that is, "the Church of St. Ita"—in County Limerick. Her austerities are told by St. Cuimin of Down, and numerous miracles are recorded of her. She was also endowed with the gift of prophecy and was held in great veneration by a large number of contemporary saints, men as well as women. When she felt her end approaching she went for her community of nuns, and implored the blessing of heaven on the clergy and laity of the district around Killeedy. Not alone was St. Ita a great saint, but she was the foster-mother of many saints, including St. Brendan the Voyager, St. Pulecherius (Mochoemoeg), and St. Cumnian Fada. At the request of Bishop Butler of Limerick, Pope Pius IX granted a special indulgence for the feast of St. Ita, which is kept on 15 January.

Colgan, Acta SS. Hl. (Louvain, 1845); O'Hanlon, Lives of the Irish Saints (Dublin, 1867); Lives of the Saints (London, 1888); O'Donnoghue, Brendaniana (2nd ed., Dublin, 1885); Bagley, The Diocese of Limerick (Dublin, 1906).

W. H. Grattan-Flood.

Itala Version. See Versions of the Bible.
ITALIANS in the United States.—Christopher Columbus, an Italian, was the leader of those who in succeeding centuries were led by the Providence of God, through economic necessities, to propagate the Faith in the New World. The immediate Italian followers of the Christian civilization that led to the discovery of the coast of North America, his son Sebastian, who reached Labrador, Amerigo Vespucci, who gave his name to the continent, and Verrazzano, the discoverer of New York Bay and of the Hudson River. Previous legendary discoveries did not open the continent to Christian civilization, and the discovery of Columbus and the explorations of those Italians who followed him. It is true, however, that the expeditions of Columbus and his successors were not made in the service of Italian States, and therefore the first settlers were not Italian. It is a curious fact that the history of Massachusetts supplies a number of family names which have led some investigators to claim that Italians or persons of Italian origin fixed their homes there at a very early date. The supporters of this view hold that the Cabots of Massachusetts are descendants of the explorer Sebastian Cabot. They also point to the spelling of the name Cabot in the diary of Samuel Sewall (1674-1729), as the oldest form of the well-known New England name of Bigelow, and to such other names as Mico, Briscoe, Cotta, Tenno, and Bisto, which are of a more or less marked Italian type. Even if these speculations be well founded, it is quite possible that the bearer of these names soon lost their national identity among their far more numerous Puritan neighbours. Still, although the stream of Italian immigration did not set in until much later, completeness demands some mention of the few distinguished Italians who came to the American colonies, or United States, as scattered preludes to the great latter-day tide. Among those who found their way to America in the eighteenth century was Lorenzo da Ponte (q.v.), the librettist of Mozart's "Le Nozze di Figaro" and "Don Giovanni." Another name worthy of note is that of Constantino Brumidi (q.v.), who produced many noteworthy paintings, among them those in the Capitol at Washington, where he died in 1880. Father Joseph M. Finotti (q.v.), the author of "Bibliographia Catholica Americana" and several other widely known works, came to this country from Italy in 1845. There have been several other individuals worthy of note. At the time of the Revolution of '48 many well-known Italians came to the United States and lived there for some time. The best known of these was Garibaldi, who resided two years on Staten Island working in a candle factory.

Since the year 1850, when Italian immigration to America began to assume its present enormous proportions, the problems arising out of it have become extremely grave for both the Italian and the United States Governments. At first, owing to the great density of the population of Italy—257 to the square mile in 1881, and 294 in 1910—this movement of the surplusage was regarded in the mother country as a great relief. Now, however, both agricultural labourers and those available for building and manufactures having become scarce, in proportion to the larger demands of a growing industrial and commercial activity, the Italian Government has become seriously alarmed at this continued drain upon the population. Laws have been enacted, or are being prepared, ostensibly for the protection of the emigrants, but in reality to preserve for Italy the fruit of the labour of her children. It is true that many millions went to Italy from the United States, but this sum, which is placed by some authorities at as high a figure as sixty million, hardly repays Italy for the loss she sustains, first in having nurtured and partly educated hundreds of thousands of men who have afterwards given their labour to a nation to which they cost nothing; second, in losing a great part of the industrial production which she might have had, and which, considering the difference in the standards of living and of wages, would have amounted to an immense sum. For Italy, the first navigators of the coast of North America, her son Sebastian, who reached Labrador, Amerigo Vespucci, who gave his name to the continent, and Verrazzano, the discoverer of New York Bay and of the Hudson River. It is true, however, that the expeditions of Columbus and his successors were not made in the service of Italian States, and therefore the first settlers were not Italian. It is a curious fact that the history of Massachusetts supplies a number of family names which have led some investigators to claim that Italians or persons of Italian origin fixed their homes there at a very early date. The supporters of this view hold that the Cabots of Massachusetts are descendants of the explorer Sebastian Cabot. They also point to the spelling of the name Cabot in the diary of Samuel Sewall (1674-1729), as the oldest form of the well-known New England name of Bigelow, and to such other names as Mico, Briscoe, Cotta, Tenno, and Bisto, which are of a more or less marked Italian type. Even if these speculations be well founded, it is quite possible that the bearer of these names soon lost their national identity among their far more numerous Puritan neighbours. Still, although the stream of Italian immigration did not set in until much later, completeness demands some mention of the few distinguished Italians who came to the American colonies, or United States, as scattered preludes to the great latter-day tide. Among those who found their way to America in the eighteenth century was Lorenzo da Ponte (q.v.), the librettist of Mozart's "Le Nozze di Figaro" and "Don Giovanni." Another name worthy of note is that of Constantino Brumidi (q.v.), who produced many noteworthy paintings, among them those in the Capitol at Washington, where he died in 1880. Father Joseph M. Finotti (q.v.), the author of "Bibliographia Catholica Americana" and several other widely known works, came to this country from Italy in 1845. There have been several other individuals worthy of note. At the time of the Revolution of '48 many well-known Italians came to the United States and lived there for some time. The best known of these was Garibaldi, who resided two years on Staten Island working in a candle factory.

Since the year 1850, when Italian immigration to America began to assume its present enormous proportions, the problems arising out of it have become extremely grave for both the Italian and the United States Governments. At first, owing to the great density of the population of Italy—257 to the square mile in 1881, and 294 in 1910—this movement of the surplusage was regarded in the mother country as a great relief. Now, however, both agricultural labourers and those available for building and manufactures having become scarce, in proportion to the larger demands of a growing industrial and commercial activity, the Italian Government has become seriously alarmed at this continued drain upon the population. Laws have been enacted, or are being prepared, ostensibly for the protection of the emigrants, but in reality to preserve for Italy the fruit of the labour of her children. It is true that many millions went to Italy from the United States, but this sum, which is placed by some authorities at as high a figure as sixty million, hardly repays Italy for the loss she sustains, first in having nurtured and partly educated hundreds of thousands of men who have afterwards given their
The rise of the civil employees, the pensions, and the expenses of worship, only a small part of the national budget remained available for national expenditures such as the army, navy, public instruction, railways, police, the maintenance of prisons, etc. Under these conditions depressed labour had to find another field and a better market. Agriculture was no longer profitable, in many places. Unimproved lands, with primitive methods, did not yield great profits, and a large part of these were absorbed by taxation.

The letters of the first emigrants announced to their friends the favourable conditions of the labour market abroad, and especially in the United States. A rush of emigration followed immediately. One good news was confirmed by returning emigrants, with “fortunes” of a few hundred dollars. Since then the stream of immigration has continued with two interruptions caused by the two great industrial crises of 1893 and 1907. The official statistics of Italian immigration into the United States, from 1831 to 1908, are given below. It should be remembered, however, that the figures previous to 1890 are not so accurate as those for the succeeding years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 1831 to 1870</td>
<td>25,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 1870 &quot; 1880</td>
<td>65,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 1880 &quot; 1890</td>
<td>307,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>52,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>76,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>62,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>72,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>43,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>36,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>68,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>59,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>58,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>77,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>100,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>135,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>178,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>230,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>193,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>221,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>272,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>285,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>128,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,743,059</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1821 and 1850 the Italian immigration into the United States amounted to 4531. Since then the figures by decades are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851-1860</td>
<td>9,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1870</td>
<td>11,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1880</td>
<td>55,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1890</td>
<td>307,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1900</td>
<td>51,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1908</td>
<td>1,647,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be borne in mind, however, that a large number of immigrants returned to Italy, and therefore, in the official statistics, some immigrants are necessarily counted twice and even three times. Statistics have not been compiled of the number of immigrants returning to Italy, but from what has been observed during the last few years when more attention has been given to this important phenomenon, it is safe to say that almost one million of the Italians counted in the general total of immigrants into the United States have returned to Italy. Their number, however, is perhaps more than made up by the children of Italian parentage born in the United States. On account of the fact that the period of the influx of immigrants from the great cities, many of these American-born Italians may be considered as Italian rather than American. The number of the Italians in the United States at the beginning of the year 1910 can therefore be roughly estimated at about 2,250,000.

**General Characteristics and Distribution.**

In the statistics taken by the Federal Government at the immigration station, the Northern Italians are separated from the Southern Italians and Sicilians. From these statistics it appears that, of the total Italian immigration into the United States, 80 per cent is composed of Southern Italians and Sicilians. This means that the Latin type is ethnically predominant among them, since the Northern Italians, as is well known, have a considerable Teutonic element in their composition. One outstanding fact is that those Italians who emigrate to the United States with the intention of returning to Italy include only a very small proportion of women. On the whole the women constitute not more than 30 per cent of the Italians in the United States—according to some estimates considerably less. But the percentage of Italian women passing through the immigrant station at Ellis Island, which was almost negligible ten years ago, is now rapidly increasing.

Economically, the Italian element has not contributed as largely to the progress of the United States as have other races. They have, however, enjoyed their share of American prosperity. Italians pay taxes to the City of New York on more than 100,000,000 dollars value of real estate. They have, besides, large sums in the banks. The silk industry is to a large extent in their hands, and so is the fruit and grape industry in California. They carry on an extensive manufacture of macaroni in many cities, while their unwillingness to give up their national dishes is partly responsible for the rapid increase of Italian-American commerce which, in 1909, exceeded 100,000,000 dollars. Eighty per cent of the Italian immigrants are unskilled workers. The number of skilled workers among them was very small, nearly all the immigrants being rustics up to a few years ago, but the proportion is rapidly increasing, while the immigrants from the cities are beginning to come in larger numbers.

Statistics of Italian marriages are lacking, but it is a fact that the Italian prefers to marry an Italian, and many Italian girls cross the ocean by every steamer and are married to the men who have sent for them at the immigration station. Statistics are also lacking as to the birth rate among the Italians in America. In the State of Massachusetts the average number of children in families in which both parents are American, that is, are children of natives, is less than two, while the number in families in which the husband and wife are foreign born is over four. This, perhaps, may be taken to be a fair average for the Italian families in the United States. The Italians can be considered one of the strongest races among the immigrants, and it is safe to note that, on account of the crowding in the cities, of the lack of air in the tenements, and perhaps also because of ignorance of practical hygiene, mortality among them in this country is 3-6 per cent, that is, higher than that of any other nationality. In deaths from measles, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and broncho-pneumonia, Italians reach a higher percentage than any other nationality.

The Italian working population of the United States is approximately 1,200,000. Of these 500,000 were engaged in agriculture, and 400,000 in trades, mining, etc., before, it is safe to say that almost one million of the Italians counted in the general total of immigrants into the United States have returned to Italy. Their number, however, is perhaps more than made up by the children of Italian parentage born in the United States. On account of the fact that the period of the influx of immigrants from the great cities, many of these American-born Italians may be considered as Italian rather than
of Italian immigrants were occupied in agriculture at home and do not engage in agricultural pursuits in the United States. Only a small part of the Italians coming to the United States devote themselves to agriculture. It is worth noting that 60 per cent of the Italians engaged in agriculture in the United States come from Northern Italy, although Northern Italian towns are few in the city. In the East, where truck-farming and chicken-raising can be made very remunerative, Italians have established themselves on the small farms abandoned by the children of Americans who go to the city. Thus the northern coast of Boston, all but the Connecticut Valley, and the western part of the State of New York have several hundred farms occupied by Italians. In the southern part of New Jersey, also, the Italians have devoted themselves to agriculture and especially to grape-growing. It is in California, however, that Italians have achieved most success as cultivators.

Throughout the South, and especially in Louisiana and Texas, the Italians work as farmers with remarkably good results. In West Virginia their success is not so marked, and some promising colonies have failed miserably. The states which have the largest proportion of immigrants are the New England States: with 200,000, of whom 50,000 live at Boston; New Jersey 250,000, of whom 60,000 live at Newark; New York, 700,000, of whom 500,000 live in the City of New York; Pennsylvania, 300,000, of whom 100,000 live at Philadelphia; Illinois, 100,000, of whom 50,000 live at Chicago; Louisiana, 60,000, of whom 30,000 live at New Orleans; California, 50,000, of whom 25,000 live at San Francisco. Of the Northern Italians, four-fifths are found in the States of Illinois, Ohio, New Jersey, Colorado, California. Of the Southern Italians and Sicilians, four-fifths are found in the States of Florida, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

As to occupation, the Italians of the New England States, of New York, and New Jersey are chiefly occupied in mills or on railroads; in Pennsylvania a large number are working in the mines, where, however, the Slavic element is growing stronger every day. The steel and coke industries in Pennsylvania also employ a considerable number of Italians.

From what precedes it appears at once that 87 per cent of the Italians of the United States are settled in the New England and North Atlantic divisions, and that only 13 per cent crowd into the large cities. This congestion presents a problem. The phenomenon, however, is not peculiar to the Italians; it is also to be observed in the case of other nationalities which are in the same economic condition as the Italians. The city offers a large number of various resources; it furnishes work to the newcomers, and it needs the work for a variety of occupations which he alone can fill. The Italian immigrant is perhaps the most adaptable of all in this respect; he is intelligent, in most cases sober, faithful in his work, always looking for an opportunity to increase his salary. He goes from one shop to another, from the railroad tracks to the mill. The country offers the Italian immigrant a kind of occupation which he looks upon with disgust, an occupation which reminds him of centuries of oppression and slavery. There was a time in Italy when agriculture was productive, when the owners of the land gave their energetic tenants their wards; but landowners began to live in the city and neglect the country, and the country which had produced enough for lord and peasant, now produced enough for neither. Yet these poor serfs of the soil, in whom the love of the fields is inborn, bring that love with them to the city. The small Italian is unable to accumulate enough to buy the piece of land they long for in their native village. Those who have studied the problem of the distribution of Italian immigrants in the United States have forgotten two most important facts: (1) the disgust of the immigrants for agricultural work, which they associate with sufferings and poverty; (2) the desire—almost general—among the immigrants to return to their native land. The first of these two facts is only temporary and disappears with the passage of time.

Italians do not come to the United States with the idea of settling there, as did the immigrants from North-Western Europe a generation or two ago. It is true, however, that almost all Italian immigrants ultimately adopt the United States as their permanent home, based on the idea that it is their only country. So many have asked: If it be true that the vast majority of the Italian immigrants settle permanently, with their families, in the United States, why not try to distribute them better in the West and South, instead of letting them crowd into the cities of the East? Such reasoning as this has led to efforts on the part of the Federal Government to distribute the Italian immigrants more advantageously—such, for example, as the establishment of the information bureau at Ellis Island. This is like applying a social and economic cure to what is essentially a psychologic phenomenon. The Italian is the most idealistic of all immigrants. The money which he wants to accumulate, which he has reason to believe he will sooner accumulate in the city than in the country, he does not want for its own sake. The feelings of the Italian who leaves his country have been beautifully described by Manzoni in his masterly novel: "To the mind of him who voluntarily departs in the hope of making a fortune in a strange country, the dreams of wealth vanish... He is astonished at his own courage in having gone so far, and would return home at once if he did not think that at some future day he will be able to return rich. Sad and moving is the country where rows of houses, and the streets upon streets, take away his breath; in presence of the magnificent monuments which tourists admire, he can only think with painful yearning of the little farm, of the village, of the little house which he has long desired to possess, and which he will buy when he returns rich to his native mountains." It is this mental attitude that defeats every attempt to properly distribute the Italian immigration: anxious, above all, to return to Italy with a certain sum of money, the immigrant knows that he can earn that sum more quickly in the city than in the country, and for that reason he prefers the city. Here is the key to the present unsolved problem; for this point of view is common to all immigrants except those—obviously unsurisable as settlers in the United States—whose criminal past debars them from all hope of a return to Italy.

How can the newly arrived immigrant be persuaded that, whatever he may think now, he will eventually be glad to make his and his family's home in the United States? Even if it were possible to persuade him of this, there would still remain the financial difficulty. To go West, he needs money—to buy land, to live during the first years, to take care of the family in Italy—and the average Italian immigrant comes here with just enough money to pass through the immigration station. In most cases the money spent for the journey represents a loan, which must be repaid out of the immigrant's first earnings. This explains in part the large sums of money sent back to Italy by immigrants. (For the average immigrant to the United States, some 30 per cent of the money spent in Italy goes back to Italy; the very fact that they can go, and who, in most cases, have already found employment for them. In many cases the newcomer
is placed in the hands of some Italian "banker," who sells passages, acts as notary public, sells real estate, and furnishes contractors with Italian labour. The immigrants are at first glad to accept whatever employment may be offered them; when the initial difficulties have been overcome by their persistence and sagacity, to be made to understand that they cannot be as quickly made in America as they had imagined, they next discover the economical advantage of maintaining the whole family in America rather than dividing earnings between board in America and remittances to Italy. The wife, or the betrothed one, is then thought over with the idea of working hard, side by side, so as to be able the sooner to return to Italy together. They buy furniture on the installment plan and spend their savings; the children grow up in America without any knowledge of Italy or the Italian language. Then one of the old people at home dies, and the crisis comes. The immigrant goes back to Italy and finds that, accustomed as he now is to a different environment, he no longer feels at home in his native country. He regulates his family affairs and brings with him to America his surviving parent. Thus the home is transplanted to the United States, and the Italian becomes an American in reality and appearance.

How long does it take for the average immigrant to go through this process? Sometimes two or three years, sometimes fifteen or even twenty. It is certain, however, that when this evolution is completed the immigrant is a city dweller, and cannot be induced to give up city life.

The only hope of solving the problem would seem to be in giving good advice to intending emigrants before they leave Italy. An Italian peasant will always sooner believe a fellow-townsmen, however ignorant, than an agent of the Government. Experience in other countries shows that a successful agricultural colony of Italians grows very rapidly, while an unsuccessful one just as rapidly disappears. Every effort should therefore be made to reach the Italian in his own country through his friends in America, in such a way as to convince him that it will be to his advantage to go to some agricultural settlement where others of his countrymen are successful and prosperous. As the Italian immigrant can, unquestionably, be of more service, both to himself and to his new country, as a farmer than as a sweat-shop worker or a miner, any expenditure with a view to the attainment of this desirable result would be well repaid.

Religious Organization.—Since the discovery of the new continent the sons of Saint Francis have been indefatigable in their work in the new vineyard of the Lord. When the immigrants began to come in large numbers the Franciscans were already at work among them, following them, instructing them, and comforting them in the trials of their new life. St. Anthony's Church, founded in 1866, was the first Italian parish to be organized in the Archdiocese of New York, and its pastors, the Franciscan Fathers, have exerted a powerful influence over the country, faithfully imitating their seraphic founder by their zeal. Notable among the pioneer Franciscans were Father Pamphilo da Magliano, founder of St. Bonaventure's College at Allegany, New York; Leo Pacelli, first pastor of St. Anthony's church and parish, New York; Anacleto de Angeli, who raised a monument to his order by building the church and convents of St. Anthony. The Franciscans were followed by the Jesuits, the Scalabrinis, Fathers, the Salesians, the Passionists, and the Augustinians. The American episcopate has at all times endeavored to provide the Italian immigrants with priests and Churches. In many cases these efforts did not prove very successful on account of the difficulty of persuading Italians to support their church, a difficulty which can easily be explained when it is borne in mind that the Church in Italy is supported by what might be called indirect taxation. Whenever possible, parochial schools have been established, and in most of them both English and Italian are taught. These schools are looked upon very favourably by the Italians, and an effort ought to be made to increase their influence, so that when the parents are brought to the Church through the influence of the pupils of the parochial schools.

In New York City, where the problem of Italian immigration is more acute than anywhere else in the country, Archbishop Farley has done his utmost, helped by Dr. sec., the bishop of the diocese. Archbishop Quigley of Chicago, Bishop Fitzmaurice of Erie, and Bishop Canevin of Pittsburgh have done much to give Italian churches and schools. In some cases priests of other nationalities have even learned the Italian language in order to be able to minister to the needs of the Italians, and a most notable instance of this kind is that of Father C. Winkel, of the Diocese of Erie, who for many years has faithfully worked among the Italians of the bituminous mines of western Pennsylvania. Among the laymen who have contributed of their wealth to promote the religious welfare of the Italians must be mentioned the members of the Iesin family who built the Iesin Church, South against Methodist Church, N. Y., and several churches and schools in the mining towns of western Pennsylvania. The Church does not neglect the immigrants at their first landing. It is then that they need most assistance. The San Raffaele Society was organized in New York in the year 1893 for the protection of Italian immigrants. Archbishop Farley is the president, the Rev. Gerardo Ferrante is the superintendent, and the Rev. G. Moretto is the managing director. There are in the United States two Italian Catholic weeklies: the "Italiano in America," published by the Salesians, and the "Verita," published partly in English at Philadelphia. One of the strongest evidences of the religious disposition of the Italians in the United States is the fact that over one-half of the eight hundred benevolent societies existing among them bear the names of patron saints of various Italian towns, and in most cases a yearly festival is celebrated in honour of the patron. These festivals, and the parades of all kinds for which they are the occasions, are somewhat apt to give outsiders an unfortunate impression of popular Italian religion. It is true that among the lower classes the cult of the saints is misunderstood and overemphasized, but at the same time these celebrations are proof of a strong attachment to their native homes and of the religious feeling with which it is associated. It is to be regretted that unscrupulous liquor dealers make of these festivals the occasion for a sale of intoxicants which indirectly leads to disorders and even murders.

The following religious statistics are taken from the "Official Catholic Directory":—

Archdiocese of Baltimore: 3 Italian churches; 3 priests.

Archdiocese of Boston: 8 Italian churches; 15 priests; 2 parochial schools (8 Franciscan Sisters; 4 Sisters of the Sacred Heart), attended by 724 pupils.

Archdiocese of Chicago: 10 Italian churches; 6 Fathers, O.S.M.; 13 secular priests; 1 parochial school (10 Sisters of the Sacred Heart), attended by 850 pupils.

Archdiocese of Cincinnati: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Archdiocese of Milwaukee: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Archdiocese of New Orleans: 1 Italian church; 5 priests.

Archdiocese of New York: 26 Italian churches; 55 priests; 6 parochial schools (20 Sisters of the Third Order of Saint Francis, 3 Sisters of Jesus and Mary, 10 Sisters of Charity, 7 Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 31 lay teachers), attended by 3397 pupils; 1 industrial
school for boys and girls; 15 chapels; 1 college; 1 seminary; 1 Catholic hospital, with 27 Sisters of the Sacred Heart; 1 home for immigrants, with 2 Sisters of the Sacred Heart; 1 orphan asylum, with 13 Sisters of the Sacred Heart and 202 inmates; 1 day nursery, with 8 Palatine Sisters, 56 boys and 52 girls.

Archdiocese of Oregon City: 1 Italian church; 2 priests.

Archdiocese of Philadelphia: 13 Italian churches; 21 priests; 3 parochial schools (25 Sisters of St. Francis), attended by 1615 pupils; 1 orphan asylum, with 10 Sisters of St. Francis; 1 industrial school, kindergarten, and day nursery, with 22 missionary Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 164 boys, and 162 girls.

Archdiocese of St. Louis: 3 Italian churches; 5 priests; 1 parochial school (2 lay teachers), attended by 117 pupils.

Archdiocese of St. Paul: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Archdiocese of San Francisco: 3 Italian churches; 5 priests.

Diocese of Albany: 4 Italian churches; 4 priests; 1 seminary with 8 professors and 90 students.

Diocese of Altoona: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests; 1 parochial school with 56 pupils.

Diocese of Brooklyn: 11 Italian churches; 16 priests; 2 parochial schools, with 3 Sisters of St. Francis of the Immaculate Conception, 13 Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 3 lay teachers, 815 pupils; 1 kindergarten, with 3 teachers, 52 boys, 85 girls.

Diocese of Buffalo: 8 Italian churches; 12 priests; 4 parochial schools, with 2 Sisters of St. Joseph, 10 Sisters of St. Mary, 8 Sisters of St. Francis, 983 pupils.

Diocese of Burlington: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Diocese of Cleveland: 7 Italian churches; 7 priests.

Diocese of Columbus: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Diocese of Davenport: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Denver: 3 Italian churches; 5 priests; 2 parochial schools, with 8 Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 10 Sisters of Charity, and 620 pupils.

Diocese of Detroit: 1 Italian church; 1 priest; 1 parochial school with 78 pupils.

Diocese of Duluth: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Diocese of Erie: 6 Italian churches; 7 priests; 1 parochial school, with 2 Sisters of Mercy and 170 pupils.

Diocese of Fall River: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Harrisburg: 3 Italian churches; 3 priests.

Diocese of Hartford: 6 Italian churches; 9 priests; 3 parochial schools, with 2 Sisters of the Precious Blood, 10 Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 5 Sisters of Our Lady of Compassion, and 320 pupils.

Diocese of Helena: 1 Italian church; 1 priest; 1 parochial school, with 5 Sisters of Charity, 1 lay teacher, and 270 pupils.

Diocese of Indianapolis: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Little Rock: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Marquette: 4 Italian churches; 4 priests.

Diocese of Mobile: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles: 2 Italian churches; 2 priests.

Diocese of Nashville: 1 Italian church; 2 priests; 1 parochial school, with 4 Sisters of Charity of Nazareth and 140 pupils.

Diocese of Natchez: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Newark: 19 Italian churches; 20 priests; 6 parochial schools, with 4 Baptistine Sisters, 4 Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 2 Sisters of Charity, 5 Sisters of St. Francis, 4 Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, 1 Lay sister, and 1289 pupils; 1 orphan asylum with 12 sisters and 92 orphans.

Diocese of Peoria: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Pittsburgh: 13 Italian churches; 20 priests; 2 parochial schools, with 4 Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 1 lay teacher, and 307 pupils.

Diocese of Providence: 2 Italian churches; 5 priests.

Diocese of Rochester: 3 Italian churches; 3 priests, 1 parochial school, with 5 Sisters of St. Joseph and 271 pupils.

Diocese of Sacramento: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of St. Augustine: 1 Italian church; 1 priest.

Diocese of Scranton: 12 Italian churches; 15 priests; 1 parochial school, 6 Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, and 200 pupils.

Diocese of Seattle: 1 Italian church; 1 priest; 1 parochial school, with 1 Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart and 110 pupils.

Diocese of Springfield: 4 Italian churches; 4 priests.

Diocese of Superior: 3 Italian churches; 3 priests; 1 parochial school, with 4 Franciscan Sisters and 200 pupils.

Diocese of Syracuse: 1 Italian church; 2 priests.

Diocese of Trenton: 12 Italian churches; 14 priests.

Diocese of Wheeling: 5 Italian churches; 6 priests.

Summary: 219 Italian churches; 315 priests; 41 parochial schools; 254 teachers, including 70 Sisters of the Sacred Heart, 27 Sisters of Charity, 12 Franciscan Sisters, 4 Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, 24 Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, 4 Baptistine Sisters, 3 Sisters of St. Dominic, 7 Sisters of St. Joseph, 38 Sisters of St. Francis, 2 Sisters of the Precious Blood, 4 Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, 5 Sisters of Our Lady of Compassion, 4 Sisters of Jesus and Mary, 2 Sisters of Mercy, 2 Sisters of St. Mary, 30 lay teachers, and 1260 pupils; 1 orphan asylum; 1 kindergarten; 1 day nursery with 8 Palatine Sisters, 230 boys and 224 girls; 2 seminaries; 1 Catholic hospital; 1 home for Italian immigrants; 3 orphan asylums with 317 orphans.

For statistics of the immigration movement, see the Reports of the Commissioner General of Immigration (Department of Commerce and Labor, Washington, D.C.) and the Bulletin of the Italian Emigration (published at Rome by the Ministry of Emigration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs). For a general survey of Italian Immigration, see Fasciari, Il Popolo Italiano nell'Italia Moderna (Milan, 1909), xxiv. For social, moral, and economic condition of the Italians in the United States and for statistical statistics, see Litt, Gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse der Italiener in Amerika (New York, 1905). For conditions among Italians occupied in agriculture in the United States, see Pedocini, Il Popolo Italiano (New York, 1897). For an exhaustive study of Italian immigration from the Italian point of view, see Fresi, Gli Italiani negli Stati Uniti del Nord (Milan, 1909).

JOHN DE VILLE.

Italo-Greeks, the name applied to the Greeks in Italy who observe the Byzantine Rite. They embrace three classes: (1) the ecclesiastical communities which have followed the Greek Rite since the Byzantine period; (2) the Greek colonies in the various Italian cities, and at Rome, which are not in the Gregorian manner, but on the contrary, are of the same religious rite as the Byzantine; (3) the descendants of the Greeks and Albanians who emigrated in masse into Southern Italy after the Turkish occupation of the Balkans, and established towns, or at least formed powerful groups by themselves; they long maintained their native language and customs, and even now observe the Greek Rite, though in other respects they have been absorbed in the Italian population.

(1) As to the first class, it is difficult to say whether the Greek Rite was followed in any diocese of Southern Italy or Sicily before the eighth century. But the gradual hellenization of the Greek Church as well as the founding of numerous Greek monasteries, must have affected liturgical life. The spread of Greek monasticism in Italy received a strong impulse from the Saracen invasion of Palestine and Egypt, and later from the iconoclastic persecutions. The monks, in their monastic regulations, were not infrequently chosen from their number, the diocesan liturgy, under favourable conditions, could easily be changed, especially since the Lombard occupation of the inland regions of Southern Italy cut off the Greeks in the South from communication with the Latin Church, whose intellectual culture, moreover, was far inferior to that of Byzantium.
When, in 726, Leo the Isaurian, by a stroke of his pen, withdrew Southern Italy from the patriarchal jurisdiction of Rome and gave it to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the process of hellenization became more rapid; it received a further impetus when, on account of the Saracen occupation of Sicily, many Greeks and hellenized Sicilians repaired to Calabria and Apulia. Still it was not rapid enough to suit the Byzantine emperors, who desired lest those regions should again fall under the influence of the Western Empire, like the Duchy of Rome and the Exarchate of Ravenna. Finally, after the Saxon emperors had made a formidable attempt to drive the Greeks from the peninsula, Emperor Nicephorus Phocas and the Patriarch Photius legalized the re-establishment in 968, to adopt the Greek Rite. This order aroused lively opposition in some quarters, as at Bari, under Bishop Giovanni. Nor was it executed in other places immediately and universally. Cassano and Taranto, for instance, are said to have always maintained the Latin Rite. At Trani, in 983, Bishop Rodostomo was allowed to retain the Latin Rite, as a reward for aiding in the surrender of the city to the Greeks. About the middle of the eleventh century, however, Bishop Giovanni II joined the schism of Michael Cerularius. In every diocese there were always some churches which remained Greek in Rite; but after the restoration of that rite, there remained Greek churches with native Greek clergy.

The restoration of the Latin Rite began with the Norman conquest in the eleventh century, especially in the first period of the conquest, when Norman ecclesiastics were appointed bishops. Another potent factor was the reform of Gregory VII, who in his efforts to repress marriage among the Latin clergy found no small obstacle in the example of the Greek priests. However, he and his successors recognized the Greek Rite and discipline wherever it was in legitimate possession. Moreover, the Latin bishops ordained the Greek as well as the Latin clergy. In the course of time the Norman princes gained the affection of their Greek subjects by respecting their rite, which had a strong support in the numerous Basilian monasteries (in the fifteenth century there were still 52 monasteries of the Order of St. Basil alone). The latinization of the dioceses was complete in the sixteenth century. Among those which held out longest for the Greek Rite were Acerno (and perhaps Gravina, 1302; Gerace, 1467; Oppido, 1472 (when it was temporarily united to Cerignola); Bisignano, 1565; Bova, to the time of Gregory XIII, etc.). But even after that time many Greek priests remained in some dioceses. In that of Otranto, in 1583, there were still two hundred Greek priests, nearly all native. At Reggio, Calabria, Count Ruggero in 1092 had given the Greeks the church of S. Maria della Cattolica, whose clergy had a protopapa, exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop; this was the case until 1611. In 1695 there were in the same dioceses fifty-nine Greek priests; after thirty years there was only one. Rosano still had a Greek clergy in the seventeenth century. The few native Greek priests were afterwards absorbed in the tide of immigration (see below). Of the Basilian monasteries the only one left is that of Grottaferrata, near Rome. In Sicily the latinization was, for two reasons, accomplished more easily and radically. First, during the rule of the Saracens most of the Greeks lived among the Arabs, and so it came about that the installation of Latin bishops encountered no difficulty; secondly, the Normans had come as liberators, and not as conquerors.

(2) Important Greek colonies, founded chiefly for commercial reasons, were located at Venice, Acona (where they obtained from Clement VII and Paul III the church of S. Anna, which they lost in 1833, having been declared schismatistical in 1797). Bari, Locoe (where, even in the nineteenth century, in the church of S. Nicola, Dido was buried, though in the Greek tongue, in the Latin Rite), Naples (where they have the church of SS. Pietro e Paolo, erected in 1526 by Tommaso Paleologo Assagni), Leghorn (where they have the church of the Annunciation, 1607).

In Rome, where Greek was the official language of the Church until the third century, there was always a large colony observing the Greek Rite. From the end of the sixth century until the ninth and tenth there were several Greek monasteries, among which were Cella Nova, near S. Sabas; S. Erasmo; S. Silvestro in Capo to which the monastery next to S. Maria Antiqua was at the foot of the Aventine. Like other nations, the Greeks before the year 1000 had their own schola at Rome. It was near the church of S. Maria in Cosmedin. Even in the pontifical liturgy—at least on some occasions—a few of the chanted passages were in Greek; the custom of singing the Epistle and Gospel in both Latin and Greek dates from that period (Gaisser, "Brani greci nella liturgia latina" in "Rassegna Gregoriana", 1902, nos. 7, 8, 9). At present (1909) there are in Rome two Greek Catholic churches: S. Atanasio, belonging to the Greek College, and S. Maria in Acquapendente, the church of the Basilian monks of the Congregation of Choueire.

(3) Besides the first large emigration of Albanians, which took place between 1467 and 1470, after the death of the celebrated Scanderbeg (when his daughter, who had become the Princess of Bisignano, invited her countrymen to the Kingdom of Naples), there were two others, one under Sultan Selim II (1566-1574), directed to the ports along the Adriatic and to Leghorn; the other about 1740. In the course of time, owing to assimilation with the surrounding population, the number of these Italo-Greeks diminished, and not a few of their villages became entirely Latin. The following is a list of towns with an Albanian population. In Calabria and Basilicata: Castrogiove, Farneto, S. Paolo, S. Costantino, Plataia, Civita Perelle, Frassineto, S. Basilo, Fermo, Lungro, Acquaformosa (Calabria), Marri, S. Beato di Ercolano (Diocese of S. Marco and Bisignano), Macchia, S. Demetrio Corone, S. Cosmo, S. Giorgio Albanese, Vaccarisi Albanese (Diocese of Rossano); a total of 37,000 souls and about fifty priests. Five other districts in the same region are completely latinized. In Sicily, Italo-Greeks still abound at Villafranca di Bari, Palermo, Palazzolo, Contessa Entellina (Diocese of Monreale), Mezzofuso, Palermo (Diocese of Palermo), and Messina, where in the church of S. Maria del Graffeo the Latin Rite is observed in the Greek tongue; a total of about 22,000 souls and forty priests. Other Italo-Greek colonies were at Villa- badessa (Diocese of Atri and Penne); Pianezza, near Acquapendente; and Cargese, in Corsica.

To educate the clergy of these Greeks Gregory XIII founded in 1577 at Rome the Greek College of S. Atanasio, which served also for the Greek Catholics of the East and for the Ruthenians, until a special college was instituted for the latter purpose by Leo XIII. Among the alunni of S. Atanasio was the celebrated Leo Allatius. Another Greek ecclesiastical college was founded at Palermo in 1715 by P. Giorgio Gazzetta, founder of an oratory of St. Philip Neri among the Greeks. The latter college was established by the monastery of SS. Pietro e Paolo existed from 1603, erected by the Propaganda to supply priests for Albania. It was suppressed in 1746. Finally Clement XII, in 1736, founded the Corsini College in the ancient Abbey of S. Benedetto d'Alcamo, whence it was transferred in 1794 to S. Demetrio Corone, in the ancient Basilian monastery of S. Adriano. Since 1849, however, and...
especially since 1800, this college has lost its ecclesiastical character and is now secularized.

Ecclesiastical Status.—The Italo-Greeks are subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome; several times, but in vain, they have sought exemption. However, the popes have long wished them to have a titular archbishop, resident in Rome, for the ordination of their priests, and to lend splendour to Divine service. The first of these was Gabriele, titular Archbishop of Myra, and successor (1698). When he established the Corsoini College, he placed it in charge of a resident bishop or archbishop of the Greek Rite. At present this episcopus ordinariis for the Greeks of Calabria resides at Naples. In 1784 the Greeks of Sicily obtained from Pius VI an episcopus ordinarius, resident at Piana dei Greci border; naturally, the position of a people whose rite and discipline differed in many points from those of the surrounding population, required special legislation. Benedict XIV, in the Bull "Etsi pastoralis" (1742), collected, co-ordinated, and completed the various enactments of his predecessors; to this date the southernmost portions of the kingdom has always endeavoured to respect the rite of the Italo-Greeks; on the other hand, it was only proper to maintain the position of the Latin Rite. No member of the clergy may pass from the Greek to the Latin Rite without the consent of the pope; and no layman was allowed to participate in the formation of the bishop. The other forms of mixed marriages belong to the Latin Rite. A Greek wife may pass to the Latin Rite, but not a Latin husband to the Greek Rite. Much less would a Latin be allowed to become a priest of the Greek Rite, thus evading the law of celibacy. As regards the Exarchate, any promise of Greeks and Latins is forbidden, except in case of grave necessity, e.g. if in a given locality there should be no Greek church. Where custom has abolished communism under both kings, a contrary usage must not be introduced. 

U. BENIGNI.

Italy.—In ancient times Italy had several other names; it was called Saturnia, in honour of Saturn; Oceania, introducing land of the Taurians; Ausonia; Hesperia, land to the west (of Greece). Trrhynnea, etc. The name Italy (Istria), which seems to have been taken from vitulus, to signify a land abounding in cattle, was applied at first to a very limited territory. According to Nissen and to others, it is to be identified with the southernmost portion of the peninsula of Calabria; but some authorities, as Cochin and Gentile, hold that the name was given originally to that country between the Sele and the Lao which later was called Lucania. We find the name Italy in use, however, among Greek writers of the fifth and the fourth centuries b. c. (Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristotle, Plato); and in 241 b. c., in the treaty of peace that ended the First Punic War, it served to designate peninsular Italy; while in 202 b. c., at the close of the Second Punic War, the name of Italy was extended as far as the Alps.

CHARACTERISTICS.—Italy has an area of 110,648 square miles, of which 91,393 are on the Continent of Europe, and 19,253 on the islands. The area of Italy, therefore, is little more than half that of France.

Under the Romans and in the Middle Ages, under the powerful republics of Amalfi and of Pisa, of Genoa and of Venice, Italy ruled the Mediterranean Sea, which, however, after the discovery of America, ceased to be the centre of European maritime activity. The centre of European interests was carried towards the east; the bishops of Rome; several times, but in vain, they have sought exemption. However, the popes have long wished them to have a titular archbishop, resident in Rome, for the ordination of their priests, and to lend splendour to Divine service. The first of these was Gabriele, titular Archbishop of Myra, and successor (1698). When he established the Corsoini College, he placed it in charge of a resident bishop or archbishop of the Greek Rite. At present this episcopus ordinariis for the Greeks of Calabria resides at Naples. In 1784 the Greeks of Sicily obtained from Pius VI an episcopus ordinarius, resident at Piana dei Greci border; naturally, the position of a people whose rite and discipline differed in many points from those of the surrounding population, required special legislation. Benedict XIV, in the Bull "Etsi pastoralis" (1742), collected, co-ordinated, and completed the various enactments of his predecessors; to this date the southernmost portions of the kingdom has always endeavoured to respect the rite of the Italo-Greeks; on the other hand, it was only proper to maintain the position of the Latin Rite. No member of the clergy may pass from the Greek to the Latin Rite without the consent of the pope; and no layman was allowed to participate in the formation of the bishop. The other forms of mixed marriages belong to the Latin Rite. A Greek wife may pass to the Latin Rite, but not a Latin husband to the Greek Rite. Much less would a Latin be allowed to become a priest of the Greek Rite, thus evading the law of celibacy. As regards the Exarchate, any promise of Greeks and Latins is forbidden, except in case of grave necessity, e.g. if in a given locality there should be no Greek church. Where custom has abolished communism under both kings, a contrary usage must not be introduced.
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seizure of Rome in 1870 see the articles TEMPORAL POWER and PAPAL STATES.

Coast-line and Sea.—The coast-line of the Italian Peninsula measures 2100 miles. Its principal harbours are the Gulf of Genoa, the first commercial port in Italy, the Gulf of Spezia, an important naval station; Civitavecchia, an ancient harbour; the harbours of Gaeta, Naples, and the Gulf of Taranto; Brindisi, a natural port; the Gulf of Manfredonia, and the lagoons of Venice. The principal seas are: (1) the Sea of Italy, or Tyrrenian Sea, which lies between the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica and the mainland. It slopes from its shores to its centre, where it attains a depth of more than two and one-quarter miles, and scattered over it are the Tuscan Archipelago, the Ponza and Panathenian Island groups, the Egadi Islands, the volcanic Island Ustica, and the Lipari or Eolian Islands, the latter being all extinct volcanoes with the exception of Stromboli. The tides of this sea vary by only eight or twelve inches; it abounds in coral banks, and anchovy, sardine, and tuna fishing is remunerative along the coasts of Sicily and Sardinia.

(2) Ligurian Sea.—The Gulf of Genoa is the most inland and also the most northerly part of this open sea, which extends to the south as far as the Channels of Corsica and of Piombino, through which it communicates with the Tyrrenian Sea. It is open towards the Mediterranean, while its south-western limit is a line drawn from Cape Lardier, in Provence, to Cape Revellata in Corsica. The tides of this sea vary from six to eight inches. On account of its depth and of the absence of tributary rivers, it contains few fish.

(3) Sea of Sicily; Sea of Malta.—That branch of the Mediterranean that lies between Tunis and Sicily is called the Channel of Tunis or of Sicily, and has a minimum breadth of 90 miles. The branch that separates the Maltese Islands from Sicily is called the Malta Channel and has a minimum breadth of 51 miles. In the former, at an average depth of 100 fathoms, there is a submarine bank that unites Africa and Sicily; it has extensive shoals, known for their volcanic phenomena. Sponge and coral fisheries in this sea are lucrative. The tides are higher than those of other Italian waters, and a singular phenomenon, called marrobbio, is observed here, being a violent and dangerous boiling of the sea, having, possibly, a volcanic origin.

(4) Ionian Sea.—This is an open sea between Sicily and the Calabrian and the Salentine peninsulas, and the western coasts of the Balkan Peninsula; it communicates with the Tyrrenian Sea by the Strait of Messina, a passage formed by the catastrophes that violently detached Sicily from the Continent. This strait, which is one of the most frequented waterways of Europe, is funnel-shaped, having a breadth of 20 miles at its southern, and of 2 miles at its northern, opening. On the line between the islands of Sicily and Crete, the longest sea travel a distance of 24 miles, the shortest that has been found so far in the Mediterranean Sea. While the tides on the African coast rise over six feet, those on the coast of Italy are very slight; they are all the stronger, however, in the Strait of Messina, where the currents that pass between the Tyrrenian and the Ionian Seas, especially when the wind blows, form vortices and surges that beat violently against the coast of Calabria. The fantasy of the ancients personified these two phenomena, in the story of the Calabrian coast, and Charybdis on the Sicilian side (Homer, "Odyssey," I, xii, Virgil, "Aeneid," III, 420-425).

(5) Adriatic Sea.—This sea lies between the Italian and the Balkan Peninsulas, with an area of 51,000 sq. miles. It abounds in fish of exceptionally good quality.

Orography.—Italy is a country of mountains and hills, with few high table-lands; while, of the latter, the two most important, those of Tuscany and of the Murge, are broken and surmounted by hills and mountainous groups. Lowland plains are, on the contrary, the dominant characteristic of Northern Italy; plains, in fact, occupy about one-third of the surface of the country. The principal mountains of Italy are: (1) The Alps, a system of parallel ranges, at the north of Italy, forming an arc that presents its convex side to the west; they extend from the pass of Cadibona to the masses of Mt. Blanc, which is the highest point of the Alpine range (15,780 feet), and from that point, following a north-easterly direction, they extend to Vienno on the Danube. One of the greater eastern branches of this system, the Carnic and the Julian Alps, diverges in a south-easterly direction and terminates in the Fianona Point on the Gulf of Quarnero. Their length, from the pass of Cadibona to Cape Fiano, is nearly 755 miles. Their mean height is 6500 feet. The Italian watershed is steep, with short spurs and deep valleys, while the opposite side is a gentle slope. Hence the facility of crossing over the Alps from without (France, Germany), and the corresponding difficulty of the passage from the Italian side, as history has shown by foreign invasions. The Alps are of climatic benefit to Italy, for they are a screen against the cold winds from the north, while the vapours of warm winds from the Mediterranean and the Adriatic Seas are condensed on the Alpine heights, producing the copious rains and snows that result in those numerous glaciers which are reservoirs for the rivers. The inhabitants of the Alps are a strong and robust people, sober, and attached to their native valleys. Temporary emigration, due to the nature of the land, is very great, but permanent emigration is rare. With the Alps is connected the typical Italian figure of the chimney-sweep evoked by the fancy of artists and of poets.

(2) The Apennines form parallel trunk chains, arranged in echelon, like the tiers of a theatre; they extend from the Pass of Cadibona to the Strait of Messina and are continued in the northern mountains of Sicily as far as Cape Boso. The range is of much less elevation than the Alps, its mean height being 3900 feet; nor has it the imposing, wild, and varied aspect of the Alps. Its summits are bare and rounded, the valleys deep, and cultivation goes on well up the heights. The sides were once covered with forests,
but that wealth of vegetation has been improvidently destroyed everywhere along this range, and, consequently, iron grey, the ash colour of calcareous rocks, and the red brown of clay and sand-beds are the predominant tints of the country. The highest summit is that of Mt. Corno (5855 feet) in the group of the Gran Sasso. On account of their latitude and of their proximity to Italy, the Apennines at its extremities, but it becomes complex towards the centre, where it consists of a group of parallel chains, arranged in steps, those curving towards the east constituting the Sub-Apennine range; while those groups that extend along the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic coasts constitute the Anti-Apennine system. Geographers do not agree on the determining lines of these three divisions. We will adopt the line from Cadibona Pass (1620 feet) to Bocca Serriola (2400 feet) between the Tiber and the Metauro Rivers, for the northern division; from Bocca Serriola to the Pass of Rionero between the rivers Sangro and Volturno, for the Central Apennines, and from this point to Cape Armi, for the southern division. The Northern Apennines encircle the southern basin of the Po, in a north-west to south-east direction, and the Pass of Cisa (3410 feet) divides them into two sections, the Ligurian and the Emilic-Tuscan. (a) The Ligurian Apennines form an arc around the Gulf of Genoa and have their crest near and parallel to the coast; but, to the north of Genoa, they deviate towards the east. Their southern spurs are short and steep; those towards the Po are longer and more ramified, the two principal ones being those of Mt. Antola and Mt. Penna, the former of which fans out between the Scrivia and Trebbia Rivers and contains Mt. Ebro (5570 feet) and Mt. Lesima (5760 feet), and it terminates near the Po, forming the Pass of Stradella; that of Mt. Penna, with numerous branches between the Trebbia and the Taro Rivers, contains Mt. Misuraca, or Bue (5930 feet), which is the highest point of this section. The Langhe and the hills of Monferrato, which last are called also Hills of the Po, famous for their sparkling wines, form a species of promontory of the Ligurian Apennines, enclosed between the Po, the Taro and the Scrivia. All this region consists, superficially, of greenish and of yellowish sands, and below the surface, of clay and of bluish marl, alternating with veins of gypsum, of gravel, and at times of lignite. During the Miocene period, this region was a continuation of the Gulf of the Po and communicated with the Mediterranean Sea by the channel, or possibly the archipelago of Cadibona. Four railroads cross this section: (i) the Savona-Torino, with a branch to Alessandria through the Cadibona Pass; (ii) the Genova-Ovada-Asti near the summit of the Turchino; (iii) the Genova-Novig-- with the summit of the Casimera Pass; (iv) the Spezia-Parma, with the Borgallo tunnel. (b) The Emilio-Tuscan Apennines. There are characteristic differences between the two slopes of this section of the Apennines. The branches towards the north-east, that is towards the Adriatic Sea, are parallel, and perpendicular to the crest that separates the waters of the Metauro and the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way. The most important branch, on account of its length and ramifications, and also because it separates Northern Italy from Central Italy, is the one which is called Alps of Luna, beginning in the dorsal spur of Mt. Magni (4400 feet), between the Mt. Sibillini and the Metauro Rivers, and in the Apennines have no connection with the Emilian Way.
Fucino, to the west. The eastern range extends from the defile of Arquata to the Sangro River and is divided into three stretches, namely, the group of Pizzo di Sevo (7850 feet), from the Tronto River to the Volano; the Gran Sasso d’Italia, between the Vomano and the Murrone, the highest group of the peninsula, its greatest elevation being that of Mt. Corno (9050 feet); and third, the group of the Majoletta, which is preceded by the Morone chain and the highest point of which is Mt. Amaro (9170 feet). Bears are still to be found in these mountains. The middle range of the Abruzzi (Apennines) parts from the Velino River near Mt. Terminillo and divides into the groups of Mt. Velino and of Mt. Sirente, from which the range is continued to the south-east, by the Sannio Mountains, which are separated from those of Majella by the plains of Solinoma and of Cinque- miglia. (f) The Roman Sub-Apennines.—The Saline Mountains rise between the Aniene, the Tiber, the Apennines, of which they preserve both the nature and the direction; the Apennines of Calabria, which are different in direction, aspect, and nature from the Apennines, having an Alpine character; the Murgia range, also differing in origin and characteristics from the Apennines. (h) The Neapolitan Sub-Apennines. This range extends from the Pass of Rionero to the saddle of Conza. Beginning at the north, there is first the highland plain of Carovilli, and then the mountains of Freni or of Campobasso. These are followed by the vast highland plain of the Sannio and by that of Irpinia which forms the eastern border of the Beneventana basin and terminates at the saddle of Conza. This series of elevations, although of medium height, marks the principal axis of the Apennine range. (i) The Neapolitan Tyrrhenian Sub-Apennines are formed of the groups of the Mateese and of the Terminio, and of the Avellino Mountains. The Mateese group, which is totally isolated, has its highest elevation in Mt. Miletto (6700 feet) and consists of two parallel trunks that are very close together, dividing between them a narrow height that contains a small lake. The group of the Terminio (about 6000 feet), which contains Mt. Accettica and Mt. Cervialto, constitutes one of the most important oro-hydrographic points of Southern Italy. They abound in springs, and from them come the fresh waters of the Serino with which Naples is supplied through an aqueduct. Between the two above groups rise the Avellino Mountains that close the Beneventana basin. These are groups that are isolated by deep clefts, chief among them being Mt. Vergine (4800 feet) which has a celebrated sanctuary. (j) The Neapolitan Tyrrhenian Apennines.—This Anti-Apennine range extends in the direction of the Roman Anti-Apennines, through the volcanic group of Roccamonfina and of Mt. Maggiori, to the Volturno River. On the coast is the region of Campi Flegrei, formed of small, extinct volcanoes, then the active volcano Mt. Vesuvius (4070 feet), and after that the Lattari or Sorrento chain which forms the peninsula of Sorrento and terminates at Campiella Point. (k) The Neapolitan Adriatic Anti-Apennines consist of the Gargano group which is entirely isolated and which differs from the Apennines in style and in nature. It projects into the Adriatic Sea (the Gargano Head) for 30 miles and the River Candelaro now takes the place of the branch of the sea that formerly separated this group from the peninsula. The elevation rises steep above that river and the Gulf of Manfredonia, forming a series of forest-covered terraces upon which stand dome-shaped summits, as Mt. Calvo (3460 feet), and sloping down towards the north upon Lake Varano. From this side of Mt. Cornacchia (3800 feet) the Capitanata Mountains branch towards the north and pass across the plain of Apulia on the west. (l) The Apennine Apennines. This Apennine range extends from the Sella di Conza to the Scalone Pass and is bounded by the Sele River, the Opanto with its affluent the Loeche, the Bradano and its affluent the Basentiello, the coast of the Gulf of Taranto, the 19th...
and of the Apennines that are directed towards the valley of the Po never reach the shores of that river; on the contrary, there stretches between the base lines of those two mountain systems the vast plain of the Po. (17,500 square miles), which is compared to a great amphitheatre, open towards the east, and the Apennine watersheds forming its tiers, and the plain its arena. Its uniformity is broken by the hills of Monferrato and by those of the Langhe, by the Euganean hills, and by the Berici Mountains. If the sea should rise 300 feet, it would reach the base of the Monferrato hills and would enter the Apennine valleys; and if it should rise 1300 feet more it would enter the valleys of Piedmont. This plain of the Po, which is divided into plains of Piedmont, Lombardy, and Venice, on the left of the river, and into plains of Transpadane Etruria on its right, was formerly a gulf of the Adriatic Sea that was filled in by the alluvial deposits of the rivers and was levelled by inundations. This process of filling in the Adriatic Sea is continuous, as is shown by the fact that the delta of the Po is carried forward by nearly twenty-six feet each year, while Ravenna, which in the time of the Romans was the mouth of the Adriatic Sea, is now nearly 2000 feet from the mouth of that river; one of them descends gradually from west to east (Cunco, 1700 feet). While this plain covers only a third of the surface of the valley of the Po, it is nevertheless the historical and political centre of that valley.

(2) Plains of Central Italy.—Between the south of the Po River and the Adriatic Sea the plains of Central Italy extend for a lengthy extent of low plains that vary considerably in breadth. These plains are monotonous and sad, in contrast with those of the river valleys, as that of the Ombrone, those of the Arno and of other rivers, which are fertile and beautiful. First there is the plain of Tuscany, divided into the low plains of the basin of the Arno and the Maremma, of which the former were once marshy and unhealthy, especially that of the valley of Chiana; but, through the great hydraulic works of the Medicis of the sixteenth century, they are now most fertile and are model expositions of agriculture. (3) The Tuscan low-lands and lagoons are situated along the line of the river, where the rain-waters become stagnant and where the streams are sluggish on account of the too gentle slope of the land, and therefore they accumulate their refuse; this disadvantage, however, is now turned to profit in the fertilization of the ground by what is known as the filling-in-system. (4) The Roman Campagna.—The lightly undulating Roman Campagna lies on the eastern side of the lower Tiber, and, although it has the monotony and sadness of all plains, it has a grandeur in itself, its beautiful sunsets and in the gigantic and glorious ruins that witness how great a life there was in those now deserted plains and accompanied by herds of cattle and wild boars. The remains of the consular roads that traverse this plain in every direction, reminding one of the victorious armies that marched over them, are now scarcely to be discerned under the brush; the waters, no longer checked, have left their channels and formed extensive marshes, where malaria reigns, and houses and tillage are not to be found on the Campagna at many miles from Rome. (5) The Pontine Marshes.—From Cisterna to Terracina and from Porto d’Anzio to Mt. Circeo lies a swampy expanse, 25 miles in length and from 10 to 11 miles in breadth, called in ancient times Agro Fomenzio, and now Pontine Marshes. It is a land of salt marshes, where cattle are reared and healthy, only a little swamp existing near Terracina; and in the fifth century of the Roman Era the Censor Appius constructed over it the magnificent way that bears his name. But the provinces having been de-
populated by wars, and the cultivation of the soil having been interrupted, the stagnant waters overlaid all. The Consul Cethegus, however, by new drainage, made these lands healthy again, but the civil wars reduced them to a worse condition than the one before, which they were redeemed; and in the time of Augustus, as Horace tells us, the Appian Way ran solitary through that vast swamp. Augustus and his successors attempted to drain the tract once more; but the barbarians destroyed every vestige of their work. Pope Leo I, Sixtus II, Clemens X, and especially Pius VI, resumed the undertaking, and by means of large canals restored it to agriculture; but once more the region is unhealthy, and almost without inhabitants. (6) Plains of Southern Italy.—The plains of Southern Italy cover nearly four-tenths of its surface, the regions which contain more of them being Campania and Apulia. There are none in the Basilicata, and few in Calabria. On the Tyrrhenian Sea, there are (a) the Campania Plain which extends along the coast between the Garigliano and the Sarno Rivers. Over it rise the volcanoes of the Campi Flegrei and that of Vesuvius. This is the Campania Felix of antiquity, a region of extraordinary beauty and of exceptional fertility due to the volcanic soil and to the maritime climate. (b) The Plain of Pesto, or of the Sele, which is much smaller than the first. It is situated at the mouth of the Sele River, not far from where stood Poseidonia, or Paestum, the city of roses, famous for its life of delights and delicacy, but already in ruins at the beginning of the Roman Empire. Now these places are marshy and unhealthy. (c) The Plain of Santa Eufemia, situated at the end of the gulf of the same name and traversed by the Amato River, and the Plain of Gioia, traversed by the River Mesima. They are small, marshy, and unhealthy plains in the shape of amphitheatres, formed by the alluvial deposits of those two rivers. Looking towards the Ionian Sea is the plain of Sibari, where once stood, at the mouth of the Crati River, the Greek city for which the plain is named. It is of alluvial origin and nature, as are the plains of Campania. The plains of the coast of Apulia have their northern terminus in the famous Tavolieri della Puglie which is almost a steppe, treeless, monotonous, and sad, exposed to the winds and traversed by a few streams that change their channels. Formerly this plain was used for winter pasturage, but the soil being fertile, corn is now grown. It is bounded by the Candellarro River, the Apennines, the Oanto River, and the Gulf of Manfredonia. On the Salentine peninsula there is a species of Tavolieri, contained between the Brindisi-Oria railroad and a line drawn from Torre dell' Orso, on the Adriatic Sea, to Nardò on the Ionian.

Vesuvius and Earthquakes.—As Italy in one of the most recently developed parts of the mainland and of the crust that has risen above the waters, it is subject to the phenomena that are due to that internal energy of the earth called volcanism, which is manifested in the various forms of volcanic activity, in earthquakes and in geysers. The valley contains an active volcano, but the Berici Mountains and the Euganean Hills that are rich in thermal springs (as at Abano) were, in remote times, two very active centres, as is shown by the great quantity of volcanic matter around them. In the peninsula of Italy and on the islands, volcanic activity is still very great, especially towards the Tyrrhenian coast. The Apennine zone that extends from the group of Mt. Amiata to Mt. Roccamonfina is almost entirely covered by extinct volcanoes: the San Vincenzo hills, to the north of Campiglia, and the Sassofondino hills, to the west of Roccastrada, and their volcanic nature, as is also the great cone of Mt. Amiata, which is the highest volcanic elevation of the peninsula; to the east of the Amiata rises the picturesque basaltic mass of Radicofani, and the Lakes of Boliena (Vulsinio), Vico (Cimino), Bracciano (Sabatino), and Albano (Latino) are merely the principal craters of the many volcanoes that form the Roman group. A great number of these volcanoes began their activity under the sea which they filled in with their products, creating in this way the broken Campania that consists chiefly of volcanic materials. In the valley of the Tolsoro or Sacco, near Frosinone, rise the Ercinici volcanoes, of which the chief summits are those of Posi, Ticchiena, Caliano, and of San Giuliano; and to the south of the plain through which the Volturino River flows stands the group of extinct craters that constitute Mt. Roccamonfina. The volcanic group of Naples is the most important of one them all, and the most famous, because it contains the oldest active volcano in Europe, namely Mt. Vesuvius (4000 feet). That ancient volcano rises between the destroyed cities of Pompeii and Herculanenum, at about six miles from Naples. Dio- dorus Siculus, Vitruvius, Plutarch, and Strabo speak of it as a volcano that had been extinct for centuries in their day. In the year 79 of the Christian Era it suddenly became active again, burying in molten stone, sand, and ashes the cities of Stabia, Herculanenum, and Pompeii, and by its noxious vapours terminating the life of Piny the Elder. Between the years 79 and 1631 Vesuvius had a few eruptions: those of 203, 472, 512, 689, 913, 1036, 1139, 1500; but, on 16 December, 1631, the diameter of the crater was increased nearly two miles, and nearly 72,000,000 cubic metres of lava were ejected from it in a few hours, while there descended from the summit devastating torrents of boiling mud. Thereafter eruptions became more frequent, the principal ones having occurred in 1737, 1794, 1822, 1858, 1861, 1862, 1868, 1872, and the last in 1906; but flickering flames and smoke are almost always emerging from the crater. The Campi Flegrei to the west of Naples occupy a surface of nearly 80 sq. miles and consist of low craters that have been partly filled in by the waters. Notable among these are Mt. Montenuovo, which was developed in a single night in September, 1530; and Mt. Solfatarum, from the
fissures of which, called chimneys, there constantly emanate smoke and vapours of sulphuretted hydrogen. The Vulture volcanic region to the east of the Apennines is not allied to the Tyrrhenian volcanic region. The Vulture consists of two concentric craters of which the outer one is montane: this contains the two small lakes of Monticchio (2050 feet).

Thermal springs are very abundant in Italy, especially those containing sulphur and carbonic acid. Of gaseous springs, there are in Italy the so-called fumarole that emit aqueous vapour with carbonic acid, the borboni, or fumaroles of Tuscany, and the sulphur-producing spring of Pozzuoli which burst into an eruption in 1198. Near Rome there are the Albula Springs. Lastly there are the mephitic springs that produce carbonic acid, the most famous of them being the so-called Grotta del Cane, near the Lake of Aquno, which is an ancient, extinct crater, near Naples.

Besides her volcanic characteristics, Italy, like Japan, is the classic land of earthquakes. The regions that are most subject to them are (a) the southern parts of the Alps, (b) the coast region of the basin of the Po, from Venice to Pesaro, (c) the Apennines of the Marches, (d) the Abruzzi, (e) Mt. Vesuvius, that of Mt. Vulture, and that of Mt. Etna, (e) the Lucan-Calabrian district, (f) the islands of volcanic origin. Of the famous catastrophes due to earthquakes, the best known are those of 1783, in Calabria, when there were destroyed 100 cities and villages, under the ruins of which 22,000 people were buried; the one of 1857 in the Basilicata that cost 10,000 victims to Potenza and its neighbourhood. The earthquake that shook the western Ligurian Riviera in 1887, although the most terrifying catastrophe of its kind that has befallen continental Italy; was, withal, much less severe than those that have visited the southern portion of the peninsula. Calabria may be said to have been for ten years on the brink of the earthquake that culminated fatally on the morning of 28 December, 1908, when, in a few moments, the city of Messina, with 150,000 inhabitants, the city of Reggio, with 45,000 inhabitants, the town of Sila, and other smaller ones, were razed to the ground, burying more than 100,000 people under their ruins. Italy was comforted by all the civilized nations, and especially the United States, which built a town in the beautiful district of Santa Cecilia, in the neighbourhood of Messina, with nearly 1500 Frenchmen, after the fact, the house is perfectly finished, and painted in white. The United States Avenue, parallel with the sea, and Theodore Roosevelt Avenue, parallel with the torrent of Zaera, divide the town into four quarters that are intersected by streets having the names of those generous Americans who helped in the work: Commodore of the Navy, who was the head of the relief Commission; Lieutenants Buchanan and Spofford; Engineer Elliot, director of construction; Dr. Donelson, and others.

Hydrography. (1) Rivers.—The rivers of Continental Italy empty into the Adriatic and the Ligurian Seas, as, for example, the Po, with its numerous affluents flowing into the Adriatic Sea, after a course of 248 miles, having an average breadth of 330 feet between Trent and Verona, and of 220 feet between Verona and the sea. The Venetian rivers enter the plain charged with alluvial materials that would make them overflow, if they were not held in their beds by artificial embankments. Although the sources of some of these rivers are known, it is difficult to say where and how they empty into the sea; the Bacchiglione is a type of them. (e) The Rivers of Romagna.—The Po di Volano, once a branch of the Po, with which river, however, it has the drainage of the plain near Cento; at Ferrara it divides into two branches, one of which is navigable and, flowing towards the east, empties into the sea at Porto Volano; the other branch, which is not available for navigation,
turns towards the south-east, terminating against the embankment of the Reno, a river that rises near Prunetta, passes to the east of Bologna, flows by Pieve di Cento, and, turning towards the east, enters the old channel of the Po di Primaro and empties into the sea at Porto Primaro, after a course of 124 miles. The Idice, Santerno, and the Senio are its affluents. (d) The rivers of Istria are very short, with little water, and flow in channels from which they disappear into the ground, to appear again in other channels or near the sea. The Recca-Timavo is the most important one of them; after a course of 28 miles in a narrow channel, it disappears into a cave, and it is probable that its waters go through the Carso and that they are the same that emerge from great springs, near Monfalcone, and empty into the Montefalcone Gulf under the name of Timavo. The other rivers, the Dragogna, the Quieto, the Leme, which rises under the name of Fossa, all develop fords at their mouths, and the Fossa disappears and reappears several times; the Arsa empties into the Gulf of Quarnaro.

On account of the bow shape of the Central Apennines the rivers that empty into the Adriatic Sea are very short and almost straight, while those that empty into the Tyrhenian Sea are longer, and have a sinuous course in the longitudinal valleys through which they flow. They cut narrow channels through the mountain ranges or at times form cataracts like those of Marmore, near Terni (530 feet), those of Tivoli, and those of the Fabro. Many of the long valleys between the Asi-Apennine and the Sub-Apennine ranges were occupied by lakes that were either filled in naturally by the alluvial deposits of the rivers or were artificially drained, as were the valley of Chiana, the valley of the Tiber, the plain of Foligno, the lands of Reati, of Fucino, and others. The Arno River, which has an average breadth of from 530 to 500 feet, rises on Mt. Falterona (3400 feet) and flows towards the southeast between the Apennines and the Pratomagno, through a beautiful spacious valley that is the continuation of the Val di Chiana and is called Casentino. It appears that formerly the Arno flowed into the lake that occupied the valley of Chiana and was a tributary of the Tiber through the Paglia. Now the Arno, abreast of Arezzo, arches round the Pratomagno and flows through a series of narrow passes between that chain and the mountains of Chianti. At Pontassieve it receives the Sieve which flows through the valley of Mugello, and then, turning directly to the west, it enters upon the second straight course; it flows through Florence, receives the Bisenzio and the Ombrone of Pistoia and flows through the plain of Prato which was once the bottom of a lake; it enters the Passo di Golfona, 71 miles in length, between Mt. Albano and the mountains of Chianti; thereafter it receives the Pesa, the Elsa, and the Era, on the left, and the Pescia on the right—and in all this second course it flows over a low plain, between powerful artificial embankments. It empties into the sea at 6 miles from Pisa through a delta that is carried forward 10 feet each year. The Tiber (Tiberis).—This is the most famous of all rivers, because there stands on its banks the city which of all has exercised the greatest influence upon the world, in ancient, as well as in modern, times. Geographically, the Tiber is the second river of Italy, in relation to its basin, and the third, in relation to its length, the first and the second being the Po and the Adige respectively. It flows from north to south, winding along the tenth meridian East of Greenwich, with an average breadth of about 500 feet, while the volume of its flood is 9500 cubic feet per second. It has a very sinuous course which is divided into four parts; the first of them is through a longitudinal valley, between the Apennines and the Sub-Apennines, called the Valley of the Tiber, the river passing by the town of Santo Sepolcro and the Città di Castello. It leaves Perugia on the right and receives the Chiascio, a river that has for affluent the Topino, which comes from the plain of Gubbio, and the Marogna which itself receives the abundant waters of the Clitunno. At its juncture with the Chiascio, the Tiber begins its second tract: flowing in a south-easterly direction through a narrow valley of the Sub-Apennines of Umbria, it leaves Todi on its
right and flows through the pass of the Forello, to receive the Paglia near Orvieto. The third division is in a south-easterly direction from the junction of the Paglia to Passo Corese, where the Tiber receives the Nera, its largest tributary. The Nera, near Terrini, receives the waters of the Velino through the falls of Marmore which are 530 feet high, the second waterfall of Italy, and being the fourth division of the Tiber is through the Roman Agro, from Passo Corese to its mouth. The river divides Rome into two parts, and a little beyond the city it receives the Aniene, or Teverone, which forms the waterfall of Tivoli (347 feet) at the town of that name. The Tiber always carries a great load of alluvial material, and consequently its mouth has always made encroach- ment upon the sea, and does now so by about 13 feet each year. The Isola Sacra divides the river into two branches; the southern one which washes Ostia is not navigable; the other, to the north, known as the Flumineo Channel, is navigable and is formed by the so-called Trajan ditch. The Garigliano River in the first part of its course is called the Liri (Litora), but, after receiving the Rapido, it takes the name of Garigliao, because the Rapido in its lower part preserves its ancient name of Gari. Changing its direction into the River flowing into the Mountains into the Gulf of Gaeta. In its higher course the river Liri, near Capistrello, receives the waters of the basin of Fucino through a subterranean passage nearly four miles long, the volume of the waters of the Liri being increased by 10,600 cubic feet per second.

The rivers of Southern Italy empty into three different seas, the Tyrrenanian, the Ionian, and the Adriatic. With the exception of the Volturino, the Sele, the Bradano, the Basento, and the Sinni, none of the streams of Southern Italy deserve the name of river; they have the nature rather of torrents, especially those of Calabria, which, when running full, are very destructive. They flow perpendicularly to the coasts, with the exception of the Candellarino, which flows in a south-easterly direction; those on the Tyrrhenian in their upper courses form longitudinal valleys. The alluvial plain of Sibari, which is the largest plain of Calabria, was developed by the Crati and its affluents.

The principal rivers of Southern Italy are: the Volturno (115 miles) which rises at Capo d’Aapia, on Mt. Rocchetta, with a considerable volume of water, receives the Vandra that flows from the plain of Caro- villi, increased by the waters of the Cavaliere, on the banks of which stands Isenior, and after flows through a broad valley, the bottom of which consists of the alluvial deposits of that river which, at the height of Presenzano, turns into a direction parallel to the Matese Mountains; in former times it probably maintained a southerly direction through the Teverano depression and along the present bed of the Saccione River. It receives the Calore River which flows into the Volturino at almost right angles, while the latter, turning to the west, flows through the Cai-azzo Pass and opens onto the plain at Capua, with a breadth of about 500 feet, and from there on it is navigable as far as the sea (17 miles). It flows into the sea through swampy lowlands that have been developed by its own alluvial deposits. The Sele takes its rise from numerous copious springs. Its principal affluent is the Tanagro, which disappears in the ground at Tola and appears again, about one-third of a mile from the town of Tusa, which is the most important of the Ionian and Secchiari, which constitutes the valley of Cosenza. Near its mouth it receives the Cos- cile, and passes the valley of Cosenza, having been engrossed by the waters of the Pollino. The Basento passes by Potenza and flows into the sea near the ruins of the ancient Metaponto. The Salerno-Potenza-Taranto railroad lies along the whole course of this river. The only stream of any importance on the Southern Adriatic watershed is the Ofanto River which beyond Conza describes an arc around the Vulture mass, the waters from which flow into the Ofanto through the Rendina River; the Loccone is another branch of the Ofanto. The southern branch, the Volturino supplies the waters of the artificial canal by which it is connected with Lake Salpi.

(2) Lakes.—The Italian region has more lakes than rivers, especially on the plain of the Po, at the foot of the Alps. They are usually divided into (a) pre-Alpine lakes, (b) volcanic lakes; and (c) post-lakes of Pre-Alpine Lakes. These lakes that temper the climate of the Continental portion of the pre-Alpine region are one of the principal causes of the fertility of the soil, making possible the cultivation of the southern plains. The zone that contains them extends from Lake Orta to Lake Garda and is north of the moraine hills that close the entrance of the valleys of the Central Alps. Lake Orta or Cusio, north-west of Arona, is 950 feet above the level of the sea and has an area of about 7 sq. miles, with a maximum depth of 80 fathoms; its waters flow through the Nigglia River into the Ticino River; and the Arona, a stream that itself empties into Lake Maggiore (Lacus Verburnus). This lake stretches from north to south, the principal streams that flow into it being, at the north, the Ticino and the Maggi; on the west the Toce, and on the east the Tresa, which flows from Lake Lugano, and the Bardello which flows from Lake Varese. The River Ticino flows into Lake Maggiore at Magadino and leaves it at Sesto Calende. In its Gulf of Pallanza, Lake Maggiore contains the Borromean Islands, so famous for their beauty. The principal towns situated on the shores are Locarno in Canton Ticino, Pallanza, Intra, Luino, and Arona, the birth-place of St. Charles Borromino, where a static water level was fixed in 1697, having a height of 100 feet, including the pedestal, and representing the saint in the act of blessing Arona. Lake Lugano or Ceresio lies between Lake Maggiore and Lake Como; the Agno is the principal stream that flows into it, while its waters empty into Lake Maggiore through the Tresa River. On the shores of this lake are Lugano at the north, and Por- lezza at the north-east, Capolago at the south, and Ponte Tresa at the west. Lake Como or Lario is formed by the River Ardja that enters the lake at Colico and leaves it at Lecco, to form the minor lakes of Pescarenico and the Colterno. A stream flowing from Lake Como are the Merca, which receives the Lario, and the Pioverna. To the north of Lake Como is the minor lake of Mezzola through which flows the Mera. This small lake is in reality the nar-rowed part of Lake Como, developed by the alluvial deposits of the Adige. Bellagio Post divides Lake Como into two branches, the south-western one, which terminates at Como, and a south-eastern branch called Lake Lecco. Its varied shores are beautiful gardens of luxuriant vegetation, studied with villages, chapels, inns, and sumptuous villas. Manzoni made it still more celebrated by the description he gave of it in his immortal novel, "I Promessi Sposi". Lake Iseo or Sebino is situated between Lakes Como and Garda, at the entrance of the valley of Camonica, and is formed by the Oglio River which enters it at Lovere and flows from it at Sarnico. It contains the island of Monte Isola. Then next in importance after Lake Garda or Benaco is the largest of the Italian lakes and the most southerly one of the Sub-Alpine region. The River Sarse is the principal stream that flows into it, while the Mincio is its chief outlet. Its smiling shores are covered with a growth of southern vegetation. The Iseo passage upon them being Riva, Soló, Desenzano, Peschiera, and Berga. The narrow peninsula of Sermione that pro-
trudes into the lake between Desenzano and Salò was the happy sojourn of the Latin poet Catullus (Catul., XXXI, 1); it is nearly two miles in length. Lake Idro is formed by the Chiasso River, which is an affluent of the Oglio; it has an area of over 4 sq. miles, and its surface is 1200 feet above the level of the sea. Other minor lakes are: Arcoggia, Ascogna, Assoe, Ivrea, Varese, Alsezio, Pusiano, Amnone, and Segrino, between Como and Lecco; Lake Endine or Spinone between Val Seriana and Lake Iseo; Lake Molveno, Lake Ledro, west of Riva, and Lakes Caldonazzo and Levico, from which flows the Brenta.

The lakes of the peninsular, being smaller than those of Continental Italy, are, almost all of them, of a volcanic nature, or are coast lakes. The lakes of Montepulciano and of Chiussi, however, at the southern extremity of the valley of Chiana, constitute a class of their own, together with Lakes Perugia and Massaciucchi, the latter, on the mountain group of the same name, having a length of 2.5 miles and a breadth of 626 mile. To this class belongs also the small Lake of Pergusa, in the Erei Mountains, in Sicily. The Lake of Perugia or Trasimeno is the largest lake of peninsular Italy and contains three islands, Polvese, Maggiore, and Minore. Its shores are low and marshy, and its waters, which abound in fishes, are carried by an artificial outlet into a sub-affluent of the Tiber. The lake is a remnant of a larger one that covered nearly all of the valley of Chiana, and there is a project on foot to drain it dry. It was near Lake Trasimeno that Hannibal defeated the Romans in 217 B.C. The two minor lakes of Montepulciano and of Chiussi are of the same nature, and were probably a part of Lake Trasimeno. At the first of the two begins the Canal of Chiana, a work of the Grand Dukes of Tuscany, which drains the Chiana valley and directs its waters into the Arno. From the second flows the Chiana River, which empties into the Paglia, an affluent of the Tiber. Therefore, through these two lakes, connected by a canal, the Tiber and the Arno communicate with each other.

(b) Volcanic Lakes. - Volcanic lakes are very plentiful in the peninsula; they are so called because they occupy the craters of extinct volcanoes, which accounts for their small dimensions. The principal one among them is Lake Bolsena (Lacus Vulturnus), containing two islands, Biscina and Martana, on the second of which, it is said, Amalasuntha, the only daughter of Theodoric, was killed by Teodato in 534. The outlet of this lake is the Lago di Vico. The other lakes of the same nature are those of Bracciano or Sabatino and Vico (Lacus Ciminius), which is situated between Lakes Bolsena and Bracciano at a height of 1500 ft. above the level of the sea; also Lakes Albano and Nemi, near Rome, on the Albanian Mountains, having an area of 2.53 sq. m., and of 524 sq. m., respectively, and an altitude of 961 ft. and of 1096 ft. Lake Albano having a depth of 585 ft., and Lake Nemi, a depth of 112 ft.; lastly, Lakes Averno, Agnano, and Lucrino, with others, in Campi Flegrei, and Lake Guerra, to the northwest of Mt. Etna. (c) Coast Lakes. - The Italian region abounds in lakes of this kind, but in many cases, rather than lakes, they are swamps that should be drained and their sites redeemed for agriculture. Among them the best-known are Lake Varano, to the north of Mt. Gargano; that of Salpi, between the Ofanto and the Carapelle Rivers; Lake Lesina; Lake Massaciuccoli, at the mouth of the Serchio (nearly 15 sq. miles); Lake Orbetello, at the mouth of the Ombrone, with an area of 10 sq. miles; Lake Salso between the Carapelle and Manfredonia; Lake Fondi to the east of Terracina; and the Lake of Fogliano, to the west of the Pontine Marshes; the lakes of Alimeni, in the Salentine peninsula, and of Quarato, near Cassia.

(3) Canals. - There is no country in which a system for the distribution of waters is more complete than that of northern Italy, a pre-eminence which the other portions of the kingdom do not share. In the country between the Adda and the Ticino, especially, a close network of canals and ditches, rivulets and aqueducts, now meeting, now separating from each other, intersecting or passing over and under one another, makes all the waters, whether of spring, river, or rain, available. Probably works of this kind existed in ancient times; it is certain, however, that they were resumed in the twelfth century; and from that time, the Italians spent enormous sums of money on this undertaking and employed in it a special intelligence that established their position as the first hydrologists of Europe. There is no greater manifestation of the wealth and of the civilization of medieval Italian Republics than these gigantic works.

Physical Divisions. - Northern Italy is divided into the following regions, Piedmont, Lombardy, Venice, Emilia, and Liguria, which are politically subdivided into provinces. Piedmont, Lombardy, and Venice are the subjects of special articles.

Emilia is subdivided into the provinces of Bologna, Ferrara, Forli, Modena, Parma, Piacenza, Ravenna, Reggio nell' Emilia. Emilia, a region through which passes the ancient Emilian Way, whence the name, is quadrilateral in shape and embraces the territory formed by the north-east watershed of the Northern Apennines, and by the triangular plain, the sides of which are the Emilian Way, the Po, and the Adriatic Sea. The former is a rolling country ploughed by torrential streams that have washed out deep valleys, on which account its inhabitants live on the mountain sides; the apex of the triangular plain points towards Piacenza, while the base between Rimini and the mouths of the Po attains a length of 60 miles. It is a part of the great plain of the Po, the origin and nature of which it shares. In the district between Ferrara, the Po della Maestra, and Ravenna, it has lands that have not yet been drained, containing the so-called salati or lagoons of Comacchio, abounding in fish, and near which stands the town of the same name. They are connected with the sea by the Magnavacca Canale. Some of these valleys, like the polders of Holland, have been drained and are very fertile. The River Reno divides this region into two parts: the western, Emilia properly so-called, and the eastern, Romagna, a name that recalls the time when Ravenna was capital of the Western Roman Empire, and therefore called Romandola, meaning Little Rome. All the roads from France, Germany, and Austria that lead directly to Brindisi, and by the Suez Canal to the Indies, pass through Emilia. The climate of this region is almost the same as that of the Continent, and agriculture is its chief industry, principally corn, sugar-beet, and cattle raising. In the lands around Bologna and Ferrara the cultivation of hemp predominates, of which staple
these two districts are the chief centres of production. The cities of Emilia, with the exception of Ferrara and Ravenna, are all built on the Emilian Way, which skirts the base of the Apennines. Piacenza (pop. 36,000), on the Po, was an ancient Roman colony that lived a idle life in the Middle Ages and was, with Guastalla, a duchy of the House of Farnese. It is now a stronghold, defending the Pass of Stradella. Its communal palace of the thirteenth century and its cathedral of the twelfth century are notable structures. Piacenza was the birth-place of Melchiorre Gioia (1279) and of the famous man of letters, Pietro Giordani. To the south-west of this city is the Field of Roncaglia, where the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa convoked his feudal lords to support the claims of the empire (1154-1159). The city of Bobbio (pop. 5000), on the River Trebbia, is famous for the convent founded there by St. Columbanus; and on the lower course of that river was fought a battle in 218 a. c. between Hannibal and the Romans, and one between MacDonald and Suvoroff in 1799. On the Arda is Florenzuola d’Arda (pop. 12,000), the birthplace of Cardinal Giulio Alberoni. In its neighbourhood were discovered the ruins of the ancient Veolo, and an ancient statue of Augustus. Borgo a, Tar on the River, where it receives the Ceno, is Foronna, where Charles VIII of France defeated the Italian Confederation in 1495. In the valley of Stirone is Salsomaggiore, famous for its therapeutic springs; and in the plain is Borgo San Don nino (pop. 12,000), with its Gothic cathedral, and Busseto, the birth-place of the great musician Giuseppe Verdi. Parma (pop. 48,000), a very ancient Etruscan city on the Parma River, contains noble monuments, such as its cathedral and its baptistery. It became famous by its defence against Frederick II, who besieged it unsuccessfully (1247-48). It was the capital of a duchy under the princes of the House of Farnese and under the Bourbons of Spain. At the foot of the Pietra Bismantova (3440 feet) is the Castle of Canossa, where Queen Adelaide took refuge and where Gregory VII humiliated the Emperor Henry IV. Reggio (pop. 59,000), on the Crostolo River, once the capital of Cisalpine Gaul, was the birth-place of the poet Ariosto and of the famous astronomer of our times, Angelo Secchi, S. J. Where the River Secchia opens into the plain, stands Sassuolo, famous on account of its volcanic phenomena, called salare, and to the north-east is Modena (pop. 91,000), the ancient Roman city of Mutina, which became the capital of a duchy and was the birth-place of the naturalist Spallanzani, of Sado leto, of Sigonio, and of Tassoni. It contains a military school. Vigolana is the birth-place of Ludovico Antonio Muratori, and contains the famous Abbey of San Silvestro. Faenza (pop. 40,000) on the Lamone River was once famous for its majolica, called Faience by the French. It is the birth-place of the physicist Torricelli. Cesena (pop. 42,000) is the birth-place of Pius VI and of Pius VII. Rimini (pop. 44,000), at the termination of the Emilian, and the beginning of the Flaminian Way, is rich in historical memories. It contains the birthplace of Augustus, the birth of St. Francis, called the Malatestian Temple, after the Malatestas, lords of the city, who caused the church to be built by Leon Battista Alberti. Two hours from Rimini, between the Marecchia and the Conca Rivers, rise San Leo, the stronghold where Berengarius II was made prisoner and where the famous Cagleron died. Ravenna (pop. 36,000), a most important port under the Romans, became the capital of the Western Empire, later the capital of the Goths, and finally of the Greek Exarchate. It has exceptionally fine examples of Byzantine architecture, among which should be mentioned the basilica called the Archiepiscopal, the church of St. Apollinare, and the shrine of the Virgin. It was in this city that the immortal Catholic poet Dante Alighieri died, and where also is preserved his sepulchre. The ancient military port that was constructed by Augustus is now covered over, and the town is at a distance from the coast, with which it is connected by a small canal, 5 miles in length. Along the coast stretches the famous Pineta, 25 miles long, and from 1 to 25 miles broad; but the negligence with which it is treated makes it unsightly. It embraces the provinces of Genoa and Porto Maurizio and is bounded by the Apennines and the Ligurian Alps, and by the Rio and the Magra rivers. It is a mountainous country, with no other plains than the small one near Albenga. The mountain spurs that project into the sea make an attractive view at the point of which is the port of Genoa. Rains, especially in the Apennines, are abundant (50 inches). This region is separated from the rest of Continental Italy by steep mountain ranges, but this barrier has been over come by railroads that have made Liguria the natural outlet to the Mediterranean Sea for the valley of the Po and for western Germany. It has a maritime climate, but the natural fertility of its soil does not correspond with that climatic advantage, and therefore its inhabitants devote themselves to a seafaring life, as the fisheries along this coast are not remunerative. Sixty-one per cent of the population live on the coast, and 11 percent of the coast is devoted to the culture of oil, fruits, and flowers; but commerce is its chief industry. Between the Pocevera and the Bisagno Rivers, in the form of an amphitheatre, stands Genoa. (q. v.)

Central Italy contains five regions: Tuscany (q. v.), Umbria, Lazio, the Marches, Abruzzo and Molise. While northern Italy may be called the head, central Italy is the heart of Italy, for it was this section of the country which in ancient times, as well as in the Middle Ages, was dominated by its power, by its laws, and by its religion, as in modern times by its arts and by its letters. The fertile genius of its inhabitants, together with the happy conditions of its soil and freedom from prolonged foreign domination, all conspire to intensify an artistic and literary sentiment and to maintain in the race the ethnical type of its ancestors, the Etruscans, the Marsians, the Umbrians, and the Latins—who together conquered the world. The chief occupation of its inhabitants is farming, there being few manufacturing industries. Although this section has a coast-line of 600 miles, it has only three ports: Ancona, which is the only one on the Adriatic Sea, and Leghorn and Civitavecchia on the Tyrrhenian Sea. Ancona, Sabaudia, and Sora are towns without inhabitants, owing to the malaria, Tuscany and Lazio have little or no seafaring populations; the corresponding shores on the Adriatic Sea, however, are abundantly peopled, but, as they are straight and low, they have no natural harbours, and consequently at the mouths of rivers small canal-ports have been dug out for fishing craft. This explains why the Marches and the Abruzzi have a considerable seafaring population that is devoted to the fishery, and not to navigation, as is the case in Liguria and Venice. The principal inland cities are Florence, on the banks of the Arno, and contains the famous Academy and Medici Library; Siena, Perugia, Urbino, and Pesaro, are famous cities that flourished in past centuries; but they have not a brilliant future under present economical conditions.

Umbria consists of a single province called Perugia. It has an area of 3800 sq. miles, an estimated population, on 1 January, 1906, of 693,253 inhabitants. It is an essentially mountainous region, of which the elevation is determined by the dorsal aspect of the Apennines and by the parallel chains of the Umbrian Sub-Apennines that form the upper basin of the Tiber, the valley of Poligno, and the basin of the lower Tiber. Its affluent, the river of Norcia, the basin of the Sibenni, the basin of the Sabine mountains. In the Middle Ages, the preference given to the Tuscan roads over the Flaminian Way, left Umbria in an isolated position, on
which account it lived apart a life of faith and of artistic inspiration all its own. It has a mild climate, and agriculture is the chief occupation of its inhabitants. Perugia (pop. 61,000), one of the twelve Etruscan Lucumonies or sacred towns, not far from the Tiber, contains many monuments of art, for the most part churches, and many antiquities. It was the adopted country of the Perugian Pietro Varrone a writer of the first rank. Orvieto (pop. 15,000) is famous for its magnificent thirteenth-century cathedral, one of the grandest in Italy, especially on account of its splendid façade. At Gubbio, on the Chiascio, the Gubbio Tables were found. Assisi, the birth-place of St. Francis and of St. Clare, was the cradle of the Order of the Friars Minor. Its convent and church contain treasures of the mystic art of Umbrian painters and are the objects of devout pilgrimages. Spoleto (pop. 55,000), between the Ticino and the Maroggia Rivers, was the seat of a powerful Longobard ducy, and afterwards the residence of the Frankish dukes, of whom the last two, Guido and his son Lambert, were Kings of Italy. Terni (pop. 80,000), the ancient Interamna, home of the historian Tacitus, is now the site of important metallurgical works that use the waters of the Nera River, into which flows the Velino, over the famous Falls of Terni. Norcia (Nursia) was the home of St. Benedict; Narni, a very ancient city on a precipitous height near the Nera, was the home of the Condottiere Gattamelata; Rieti is on a high plain called Agro Restitno, one of the most fertile lands in Italy, where celebrated grain is produced.

Lazio consists of but one province, called Rome, and has an area of 7,400 sq. miles, a population estimated to be 1,300,014 inhabitants, on the 1st January, 1908. Its boundaries are the Mediterranean from the mouth of the Flora to Terracina, and the Rivers Liri, Turano, Farfa, Tiber, and Paglia. It includes the Roman Sub-Apennines and Anti-Apennines, the deserted, undulating Roman Campagna, the Pontine Marches, and the promontories of Linaro, Anzio, and Crecce. The lands on the right of the Tiber, formerly inhabited by the Etruscans and afterwards conquered by the Romans, constitute the territory of Viterbo and the Campagna of Civitavecchia. The Albanian and Sabine hills and the valley of the Tiber among the Comaros, better known by the name of Agro Romeno; the valley of the Sacco or Tiber, with the hills that surround it, forms a region that is called Cicerchia on account of the style of footwear affected by its inhabitants. Lazio has essentially a maritime climate. The principal occupations of the inhabitants are the grazing of corn, grapes, oil, and olives, and the raising of horses and of cattle. The region is represented by Rome, that owes its origin and the beginning of its greatness to the advantages of its topographical position. In the volcanic zones of the Roman Anti-Apennines the centres of population are on the hill-tops; the principal ones being Accio, Apennineto, the Etruscan city on the Paglia, that received its name on account of a neighbouring waterfall; Bolsena, on the lake of the same name; Montefiascone, to the south of that lake, famous for its Moscato wine; Viterbo, on the skirts of Mt. Cimino, rich in historical memories of the popes, and in the neighbourhood of which are the famous hot springs called Bulicame; Civita Castellana, near the ruins of the ancient Faleria and of the Castello di Piaterno, where Otto II died; Corneto, built on the site of the ancient Tarquinia; Civitavecchia (pop. 17,000), the ancient Centumcellae, a port that has brought fame to what was for a time the chief port of Rome (q.v.). Ostia, founded by Ancus Marcius, was the ancient port of Rome, but now its ruins are totally buried and at a distance of one and a half miles from the sea. In the valley of the Aniene is Subiaco, and near it the cave to which St. Benedict, the founder of monasticism in the West, was wont to withdraw; Tivoli (Thur) contains many ruins of ancient monu-

ments and palaces. The falls of the Aniene River at this point furnish Rome with electricity. In this neighbourhood are found the rich quarries of travertine marble that the Romans used so much in their monuments, and the sulphur springs, which are a bathing resort. By the wooded and vine-clad Albanian hills are the Castelli Romani, small villages that are popular summer resorts; Frascati, near the ruins of ancient Tusculum; Castelgandolfo, the papal villa; Marino: Ariccia, that has a splendid viaduct; Albano and Velletri (pop. 19,000). In the valley of the Sacco are Palestrina, upon the ruins of the ancient Praeneste, which was the home of Pier Luigi, known as Palestrina, the prince of sacred music. Here remain still the ruins of the Temple of Fortune, famous for its oracles, called auspicia praenestina. Anagni, the home of Boniface VIII, who there received grievous offence at the hands of Sciarra Colonna and of Nogaret, envoy of Philip the Fair, King of France. Alatri, which has a Pelasgian burial-ground; Terracina (pop. 11,000) on the sea, the former Anxur, a watering-place that was much frequented by the ancient Romans.

The Marches, comprising the provinces of Ancona, Ascoli Piceno, Macerata, Pesaro e Urbino, is bounded by the Apennines, the Adriatic Sea, the Marecchia River at the north, and the Tronto at the south; it unites the ancient maritime Umbria and the northern half of the ancient Picenum. Originally, its elevation was formed by a group of mountain chains, parallel to the Apennines and diminishing in height as they approached the sea, but the rivers washed their way through these hills, cutting deep passes into them, so that now are seen only some isolated trunks that indicate the primitive direction of the chains. The climate of the Marches is less mild than that of Tuscany, and agriculture is its chief industry, while the fisheries, if they were well directed, would make the fortune of the numerous portion of the population that lives by that industry. This region, which in ancient times was inhabited by different peoples, became Romanized after the Flaminian Way, which was the chief outlet of Rome, had been carried through; but it lost somewhat of its impor-
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tance when preference came to be given to the shorter way through Tuscany. It is a mountainous country that was subject to petty lordships, some of which were promoters of literature and the arts. The principal centers of population and places of historic interest are Urbino (pop. 28,183), the birthplace of the duchy (1213-1631) that was made famous by its fine arts; it was the birthplace of Raphael and of Bramante; Pesaro (pop. 25,000) at the mouth of the Foglia, the birthplace of the great musician Gioachino Rossini, and of the philosopher Terenzio Mammiani; Sassocorvaro (pop. 29,000), the birthplace of Pope Clement X; Jesi (pop. 25,000), the birthplace of the Spanish Emperor Frederick II; Ancona (pop. 56,000), on the inshore of a hill which forms an angle projecting into the sea. After Triest and Venice it is the most important port on the Adriatic Sea; it is famous for its heroic and successful defense when besieged in 1144 by Frederick Barbarossa. Not far from the mouth of the Musone, on a pleasant height, is Loreto, with its famous sanctuary, erected from plans by Bramante, and which according to pious tradition contains the Holy House of Nazareth that was transported from Damascus, to the cave where later was erected this beautiful temple in honour of the glories of the Virgin. Macerata (pop. 23,000), between the Chienti and the Potenza, containing a university; Recanati (pop. 17,000), the birthplace of the modern lyric poet Giacomo Leopardi; Tolentino (pop. 13,000), famous for its sanctuary of St. Agostino, the burial place of the Holy Virgin; Livorno, city of the Chiesa di S. Agostino. It was here that the treaty was signed between Napoleon I and Pius VI in 1797, and here, also, Murat was defeated in 1815. Camerino (pop. 12,000) was once the seat of a duchy, and has still a free university; Fermo (pop. 21,000) distinguished itself in the First Punic War by its fidelity to the Romans, whence its name; and finally, on the right of the Tronto, amid fertile lands, is Ascoli Piceno (pop. 29,000), a very ancient city and an enemy of Rome.

Abruzzi and Molise.—The boundaries of Abruzzi and Molise are the Tronto River, the Adriatic Sea, the Fortore River, and an irregular line towards the Apennines. This region consists of the Altipiano or Abruzzo-Aquilano, along the seashore, which is divided into Abruzzo Teramano and Chietino; Molise, that consists of the entire watershed between the Sangro and the Fortore Rivers; the Marsica, which is formed of the valleys of the Fucino River on the west, the Liri and of the Salto. The climate is variable; severe on the uplands of Aquila and mild on the coast. The land is not very fertile, but pastoral pursuits are considerably developed: the flocks go for wintering to the Agro Romano or to Apulia, and especially to Capitanata, following very ancient grazing tracks called tratturi, which the flocks alone use. Industries are not flourishing, but they are being developed by the hydro-electric plants. The central part of this region may be called the Helvetia of the peninsula; in ancient times it was the home of the intrepid Sabines. Mussomeli, Pescara, and Pescara, which more than a century checked the progress of Roman arms. They were subjugated, and then revolted under the Italic League; but Rome triumphed again, and from that time these people furnished the sinew of the Roman armies. Being a mountainous and poor country, it had little importance in the Middle Ages. Abruzzians have a great love for their native region; each winter great numbers of them, poor, honest, and industrious, go in search of work to Rome and to Naples, but invariably return to their homes in the spring, with their savings. This population furnishes the backbone of Italian peasants, shepherds, and a mass of boys, hotel servants, and policemen. The principal centres of population are Teramo (pop. 24,000) on the Tordinio River, formerly the capital of the Pretuzzi, whence the name Aprutium, Abruzzo; Aquila (pop. 21,000) on the Aterno River, founded in 1240 by Frederick II, not far from the ruins of Ammotto, the capital of the Sabines and birth-place of Sallust; it is famous for its saffron; Solmona (pop. 18,000), a city of the Feligni and the home of Ovid; Castel di Sangro, a strategic point on the main road from the Po to the Adriatic; Lanciano (pop. 18,000) has a beautiful cathedral; Campobasso (pop. 15,000), having a very old cutlery industry, and Tagliacozzo, at the source of the Salto or Imle River, an affluent of the Velino, where Conradin was defeated by Charles of Anjou, in 1268. Campobasso, as the capital of the small district of the Fucino River, is the most important place in the Marsica.

Southern Italy.—The line drawn from the mouth of the Trigno River, on the Adriatic Sea, to that of the Garigliano, on the Tyrrenhian Sea, marks the shortest distance between those two waters and separates Southern from Central Italy. This division of the peninsula lies between three seas, the Adriatic, the Ionian, and the Tyrrenhian, and at its southern extremity, bifurcates into two peninsulas, the Salentine, which follows a south-easterly direction, and the Calabrian, which follows a south-westerly direction; and there are many more points of division. Before the invasion of the Goths, in the 5th century, central Italy, it has yet other smaller peninsulas; they are the peninsula of Gargano, that of Sorrento, the promontory of Monteoliveto, and the headland of Sila, between the Gulf of Squillace and of Taranto. The distance between the Gulf of Salerno and that of Taranto is 100 miles; between the mouth of the Fucino River and the Tyrrenhian Sea, 30 miles; and between the Gulf of Squillace and of Santa Eufemia 18 miles. Southern Italy is divided into the following regions: Campania, Apulia, the Basilicata, and Calabria. On account of its distance from the rest of Italy, which was increased by the wars of the papacy and the austere life of its upper class, Southern Italy had a civil and political life of its own; it suffered little from the incursions of the barbarians, but was occupied by the Greeks and by a few Normans who established there the first Kingdom of Italy. The Carlsbergians and the Othonians did not succeed in binding it to the empire. Notwithstanding the fact that the peoples of the two watersheds of Southern Italy were politically united for eight centuries, and notwithstanding the undeniable ascendency of Naples, its capital, the various sections of which this region consists were almost strangers to each other until within the last century, although the Apennines provided an obstacle to communication between the different parts of the country; this was due to the want of roads, for which little provision has been made, although laws have been passed to that effect. The great majority of the inhabitants are agriculturists whose homes, contrary to the custom in Northern and Central Italy, are in the towns, in which they have all the vices, without any of the rural virtues. The country is divided into vast estates whose owners live at Naples or abroad, so that the labourer gives his day's work without any interest or love for the soil he cultivates. The soil is very fertile and rewards every agricultural effort. The crops are: wheat, corn, wine, olives, almonds, figs, and vegetables. Nevertheless, the length of coast, the region contains a sparse maritime population, and therefore secures little advantage from a sea that teems with riches for other people. Its industries are as yet little developed; nevertheless, there is already a naval arsenal at Castellamare, important metallurgical works at Naples and at Pozzuoli; factories for farinaceous foods, cotton mills, and others (Laws of 31 March, 1904, and 15 July, 1906, in favour of the Basilicata, of the South of Italy, Sicily and Sardinia).
the Liri. Its elevation is formed by the Neapolitan and the Lucan Sub-Appennines and by the Neapolitan Apulian and Campanian, which form three different sub-regions, the Campania Plain or Terra di Lavoro, the Beneventana Basin, and the mountains of Cilento. The ancient Campania (from campus), so famous for the fertility of its soil and for the enchantments of its coast, extended from the Garigliano to the Gulf of Policastro and was the ancient seat of the Oscans and of the Ausoni. It was later subjugated by the Etruscans and the Samnites, and later still by the Romans, who made it a place of recreation. This delightful region, which seems to have been destined always to be conquered, whether by Romans or Greeks, Normans or Saracens, conquerors to itself, by the fascination of its beauty. Its climate is variable, and agriculture is the chief occupation of its people; the raising of cattle, however, is not much pursued. The industries are few, but they are being developed gradually by means of fiscal assistance, for which provision is made by the recent law that was promulgated in behalf of Southern Italy. The chief cities of this section are placed along the coast, between the coast and the Sub-Appennines, and between this mountain range and the Appennines. In the valley of the Liri is the thriving town of Sora (pop. 16,000), with its famous paper mills, called the Fibreno, after the waterfall of this tributary of the Liri which furnishes their power; the town is of Pelasgic origin; Arpino, the birth-place of Marius and of Cicero; Pontecorvo, a former possession of the Church; Aquino, the home of Juvenal and of St. Thomas, the prince of scholastic philosophy; on the Gari is Cassino, above which stands upon an eminence the great Abbey of Montecassino, mother-house of the order established in 519 by St. Benedict of Nursia and the most ancient monastery in western Europe; Capua (pop. 14,000), on the Volturno River, a strong town that was the battle of the ruins of ancient Casilinum, where Narses defeated the Goths, and further to the south-east is Santa Maria Capua Vetere (pop. 22,000), occupying a part of the site of ancient Capua, which proved so harmful to the interests of Hannibal, and which, until the defeat of the Longobardi, remained the second city of Italy; it was determined by the Saeculum, the town of the Beneventana basin is Benevento (q. v.). Avellino is an agricultural city in the neighbourhood of which is the famous sanctuary of Monte Vergine to which pilgrimages are made. In the Campania plain are Caeretana (pop. 52,000), founded by the Longobardi in the eighth century, and a village named Fiore, which is celebrated by Charles III of Bourbon; this wonderful architectural production of Vanvitelli, after many years of depopulation, is about to be restored by Victor Emmanuel III; Nola (pop. 15,000), a very ancient city where Augustus died and where were born St. Paul and Giordano Bruno; Aversa (pop. 23,000), the first possession of the Normans in Italy; Montesarchio, southeast of Benevento, is probably in the neighbourhood of the ancient Caedia on the Appian Way; from which the famous pass, so fateful to the Romans, was named the Caedia Forks. On the coast is Gaeta, a stronghold; it has a good port and is noted for the sieges that it underwent in 1799, 1806, and 1861. Pius IX took refuge there in 1848, as did also the last King of Naples, Francis II of Bourbon. Naples is treated in a special article (q. v.). In Pozzuoli (pop. 17,000) the ruins of the Temple of Apollo can be seen; the city was the residence of Ptolemy I, who reigned there under his splendid of the town, near which is obtained the pozolana earth that is excellent for building purposes. At the foot of Mt. Vesuvius are Portici and Resina, under which, at a depth of from 65 to 100 feet lies Herculaneum that was buried under torrents of lava in the year 79 of the Christian Era. Further to the east are the ruins of Pompeii, buried also by the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius; but, contrary to what happened, at Herculaneum, Pompeii was buried under heaps of ashes, on which account the excavations that were begun there in 1748 were relatively easy, and now the town is almost entirely unearthed. Another city destroyed by Mt. Vesuvius, in the same eruption, was Stabiae over which is now built Castellamare, amid attractive surroundings, and having a good harbour and important docks. Sorrento, a beautiful spot, was the home of Torquato Tasso. The Parthenopian Islands rise around the Bay of Naples; they are Nisida, at the entrance of the Gulf of Baja; Procida that gave its name to the conspirator Giovanni da Procida, the enemy of the French; Ischia, with the volcano of Epomeo; Capri, mountainous, picturesque, and famous for its blue cave and for its wines; it was the last home of Tiberius. Salerno (pop. 42,000) is at the northernmost point of the gulf of its name; it was once the seat of a famous school of medicine and was an important place under the Longobard and the Norman kings; the cathedral of St. Matthew, where the great Pope Gregory VII is buried, was erected by Robert Guiscard and is one of the grandest Norman structures in Italy. Amalfi, in the Middle Ages, was one of the strongest of the maritime republics, a rival of Genoa and of Pisa, was destroyed by them. It had the glory of framing laws, the "Amalfian Tables," by which maritime and commercial regulations were regulated. Cava dei Tirreni contains a famous abbey of the Benedictine Order. To the south-east of the mouth of the Sele are the much admired ruins of Paestum, which was founded by the Greeks, about the year 600 B.C., under the name of Poseidonia; the Temple of Neptune there is one of the most beautiful examples of Greek architecture in existence. Eboli (pop. 12,000) is an important road centre of this part of Italy.

Apulia comprises the provinces of Bari or Terra di Bari, Foggia or Capitanata, Lecce or Terra d'Otranto. The territorial boundaries of this region are the coast of the Ionian Sea, as far as the mouth of the Brindisi, this river and its tributary the Basentello, the Saddle of Spinazzola, the Locone, the crest of the Appennines and the whole of the mountains of Capitanata as far as the mouth of the Biserno, its topographical configuration is determined by the Promontory of Gargano, by the heights of the Maglie, and by the Tavoliere. The Maglie heights and the Promontory of Gargano at one time were two separate islands, and it is probable that the southern Maglie, to the south-east of Brindisi and Taranto were also islands. Apulia was debarred from exercising influence on neighbouring peoples, and its subjugation by them was made easy by reason of its position, its topographical conditions and the character of its inhabitants, the Apulians, the Daunians, the Mea-
Apianus, the Japygians, who were never of a warlike disposition. In ancient times, as at present, Apulia was the station between the East and the West; it was in the possession of the Greeks until the tenth century, when the Normans conquered it and established there the county of Galatina. Apulia, their first possession, is a region that has a mild climate and is essentially an agricultural country, wonderfully fertile in some parts; it has the disadvantage of lacking a sufficiency of water, but this defect is being remedied by the construction of a great aqueduct that will bring the waters of the Sele to this section. Its chief products are wines, oil, grains, chestnuts, and figs. Messina and Crotone are as yet little developed. Its principal towns are Foggia (pop. 53,000), the capital, on the right bank of the Celone River, in the heart of the Tavoliere; it is a railroad centre and a grain and wool market; it contains the notable ruins of the palace of Frederick II; Lucera (pop. 17,000), an ancient city upon a height, destroyed in the seventh century and rebuilt by Frederick II, who took it Saracen from Sicily; Mandremonia (pop. 12,000) was founded by King Manfred, near the ruins of Spitonum; Monte Sant' Angelo, at the head of Gargano, contains the famous sanctuary of St. Michael the Archangel, famous for the victory of the Spaniards over the French in 1503; Barletta (pop. 42,000), a former fortress, on the coast; here occurred the challenge of Barletta on 16 May, 1503; and in its neighbourhood was Canne, where Hannibal destroyed the Roman army; Trani, a port that was famous during the Crusades; Bari (pop. 78,000), a commercial port, containing the famous sanctuary of St. Nicholas. In the interior is Canosa (pop. 24,000), the ancient Cauna, not far from the position on the Ointo River where the Romans found refuge after the defeat of Canne; it contains the ruins of a temple and also that of Ebbonem the crusader; Altamura, on the Murgie Mountains, was the birthplace of the musician Mercadante. Terra d'Otranto, which comprises nearly the entire Salentine peninsula, was called the Tuscany of Southern Italy. Its four important seaports, Brindisi, Otranto, Taranto, and Gallipoli are situated respectively at the angles of a quadrangle, in the interior of which is Lecce, the capital. Brindisi (pop. 25,000), which is built on two inlets in the shape of horns, was in the time of the Romans the most important commercial and naval port, where the Appian, the Trajan, and the Taranto sea tines terminated. In the Middle Ages, but in our days it has returned to new life and has become a station of communication with India. Otranto is famous for its saxes by the Turks in 1480. Gallipoli (pop. 14,000) does a considerable commerce in oil and in wines. Taranto (pop. 61,000), the ancient Tarantum, is on the canal that unites the Mare Grande and the Mare Piccolo; it was founded by the Spartans, and through the fall of Sibari, became the strongest and richest town of Magna Graecia, but decayed after its defeat by the Romans; now it is one of the three principal points of naval defence and supply, where it controls the two divisions of the Ionian Sea. The town is situated on the Apennines, the Ointo River, the group of Mt. Santa Croce, the Maddalena Mountains, the Poliino group, and the Ionian Sea. It has the shape of a hirsehoe, with its caks on the Ionian Sea. Originally the Basilicata must have been a high plain, like that of Sisla, but having been deeply ploughed by the waters, it became a rough and desolate country, in which the communication is difficult. Its coasts are infected by malaria, on account of the swamps formed by the rivers and of neglect; and yet on these now deserted coasts there flourished Metapontum and Eraclea, cities of Magna Graecia. Besides its dense forests, the mode of life of its inhabitants, separated as they are from the rest of the country on account of the difficulty of communication, contributes to keep this region in a condition inferior to that of the other parts of the kingdom. The climate varies with the altitude: some parts are subject to sudden changes. Agriculture and herding are the principal occupations of its people, among whom industries and commerce are not developed. In view of the fact that the country is divided into vast estates, the peasants are very poor, and they emigrate, so that the numerous abandoned huts and farms are becoming desolate. Potenza (pop. 16,000), the chief town, built at a height of 2700 feet above the sea, near the source of the Basento River, is relatively a modern city, because the ancient one, which was on the plain, at the place called La Murata, was destroyed by Frederick II and by Charles of Anjou. Metapontum (pop. 15,000), on the slopes of Mt. Vulture, was the capital of the Normans and a stronghold of Robert Guiscard. Venosa was the home of Horace; Matera (pop. 17,000) has a splendid site.

Calabria comprises the provinces of Catanzaro or Calabria Ulteriore, Cosenza or Calabria Citeriore, Reggio Calabria or Calabria Ulteriore I. Calabria includes the extreme western limit of the Italian peninsula and is connected with the rest of Italy by the Polino group, which is its northern boundary; on all other sides it is bounded by the sea. A considerable narrowing between the Gulf of Santa Eufemia and Squillace divides Calabria into its northern and southern parts. In ancient times it was called Bruzio, and on its Ionian coast stood the luxurious Sibari and the powerful Cotrone, with other famous cities of Magna Graecia. In the Middle Ages the pirates infested the coasts, whose plagues were driven away from the mountains and abandoned the care of the waters so that the coasts became swampy; this is the reason why Calabria does not furnish a maritime population in proportion to the development of its coasts. Calabria is the land of all Europe that is most desolated by earthquakes. Its climate varies, according to altitude, between a southern climate on the Ionian coast and an Alpine one on the heights. It is an agricultural country of which the principal products are grain, oil, wines, figs, and especially bergamot, for the extraction of its essence. The extensive forests of Sila produce the greatest amount of this most valuable product. The prevalence of vast landed estates keeps the labourers in poverty, and they emigrate to countries beyond the sea. Beginning at the north, the principal cities are Cosenza (pop. 21,000), capital of the Bruttians, on the Crati River, at its confluence with the Basento, in the bed of which, according to tradition, Alaric was buried with his treasures. On the mountain sides there are distributed sixteen Albanian towns, of which Spezzano is the most important. Corigliano (pop. 13,000) has a beautiful castle. San Giovanni in Fiore (pop. 13,000), on the Sila, was so called on account of a famous abbey founded in 1044 by Urban II, to which the pope who landed at the mouth of the Neto River to bring about an insurrection in Calabria, were defeated and taken prisoners. Castrovillari (pop. 10,000) is an ancient city on the slopes of the Polino, and Paola on the Tyrrhenian coast, the birth-place of St. Francis of Paola, the founder of the Order of Minims (1416-1507), contains a very famous sanctuary. Catanzaro (pop. 32,000) is built upon a height above the valley of Marcellina. Squillace, on the gulf of the same name, was the birth-place of Cassiodorus, a civil officer of Theodoric. Cotrone, on the site of the victorious rally of Sibari, and seat of the Pityuses, is the only a small port. At Pizzo, on the Gulf of Santa Eufemia, Joachim Murat, once King of Naples, was shot 17 October, 1815. Niceastro (pop. 18,000) has a population of Albanian origin. Filadelfia was founded.
in 1783 by the survivors of Castelmenardo, a town that was destroyed by an earthquake. Reggio (pop. 45,000), a beautifully situated city of Greek origin, has undergone many calamities at the hands of men and by the action of nature; it was devastated by the Romans, by Totila, by the Saracens, by the Pisans, by Robert Guiscard, and by the Turks, and it was almost totally destroyed by the earthquake of 1738. It rose again, beautiful and splendid, but a more terrible earthquake, on 25 December, 1908, reduced it to a heap of ruins, under which were buried more than the half of its inhabitants. As has been seen, large cities are numerous in Italy; in fact, that country contains a greater number of them, in proportion to territorial extent and to population, than does any other country.
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in Europe; there are 65 cities with a population of more than 35,000 inhabitants each. This abundance of large cities, surrounded by smaller ones, is of great historical and artistic importance; it is also the cause of the limited influence of the capital upon the life of the nation, in contrast with the rule that obtains in other countries.

Climatology.—As a whole, Italy has a good climate, due to the Alpine wall that screens it from the northern wind and to the sea that surrounds it on three sides. From the Tyrrhenian and the Adriatic Seaward vapours, with alternating winds, those from the south-west (Libeccio) and those from the south-east (Scirocco), which blow from the middle of September to the end of spring and which accumulate the sea vapours on the Apennine heights, where they are precipitated in rain and snow, and whence they furnish to the soil the humidity necessary for vegetation. Unhappily, the ill-advised devastation of forests over a great portion of the Apennines has destroyed, in great measure, what provident nature had done in that connection for the good of Italy. The mean rainfall as a rule is between 20 inches and 40 inches, but it is subject to a considerable fluctuation on account of topographical conditions; so that it increases to a maximum of 100 inches on the Alps. The Tyrrhenian coast has a heavier waterfall than that of the Adriatic; while the plain of Apulia and the Salentine peninsula are the driest regions of Italy. In the north, the most copious rainfalls occur in October and in the spring, and then the rivers of the valley of the Po are at their highest, whereas little rain falls in winter. In peninsular and in insular Italy the winter rains, on the contrary, are heaviest, and the absence of drainage causes the waters that overflow from the river-beds to inundate the lowlands of the coast and thereby to develop malaria, from which only six provinces are free. The regions where this evil prevails to the greatest extent are the Tuscan Maremma, the Roman Agro, the Basilicata, and almost the whole of Sardinia. Snow falls with frequency in the Alpine region and in the valley of the Po; it is more abundant along the Adriatic watershed than on that of the Tyrrhenian Sea.

Fauna and Flora.—Italy lies within the Palearctic region, in which live a majority of the animals useful to man. It lies within the Mediterranean division of the floral kingdom and contains five botanical divisions: (1) The Alpine region, limited to the higher parts of the Alps and of the Apennines, between the highest line of forest vegetation and the lowest line of perpetual snows; characteristic of it are the edelweiss (Leontopodium alpinum), the rhododendron and the Alpine grasses of the reed (Cyperaceae), the rush and the clover variety. (2) The mountain or forest region, of which the pines and beeches are characteristic. (3) The region of the Po, devoid of forests and of evergreens; here grow vines, the elm, the mulberry, the poplar, the willow, the elder, hemp, flax, etc. (4) The Mediterranean or evergreen region, which comprises the remainder of the peninsula and of which are characteristic the evergreen trees and plants, as the olive, the fir, the cypress, the orange, the lemon, the myrtle, and the oleander. (5) The submarine region, which comprises the various sea-woods. The Italian flora contain 14,912 species, of which 325 have been introduced from Asia, Africa, and America.

Demography.—(1) The People of Italy.—It would seem that in the quaternary period man lived in Italy,
together with species of animals that have been lost or have emigrated, and witnessed those great commotions of the earth through which the sea receded from the lands of the Po, the Apenines arose, and the volcanoes and mountains of Campania became detached from the mainland. There has been much discussion as to the origin of the early inhabitants of Italy, as to the way by which they came, and as to the periods of their immigration, but, until now, only the most contradictory hypotheses have been reached. The most recent results that have been furnished by palaeontology, by linguistics, and by archaeology lead to the conclusion that Italy and a considerable part of Western Europe were primitively occupied by a race having a dolichocephalic cranium, and therefore of a branch of the family of the Cham. Relatively nearer to our times, there are two orders of the Aryan immigration into Italy: the primitive and the posterior immigrations. In the former (1200-900 B.C.) we find two very ancient races, the Messapico-Iapygian, which came of the Illyrian trunk, and the Italic, properly so called. It would seem that the Messapians came by sea from Greece; and at a later period, by land, the Iapygians, who occupied the Adriatic coast, migrated to Campania by the sea, probably, the historical Autochthonians of the peninsula. The Italics, who are divided into two great families, the Latins and the Umbrians, descended into Italy from the East, or, as seems more probable, from the North, by the valleys of the Inn, of the Adige, and of the Alpe, and occupied the territory of the Po; but other peoples appearing, they moved to the south of the peninsula and became identified with the Latins, occupying the western watershed and dividing into the branches called Oscans, Ausonians, and Enotrians or Italics. Then came the Umbrians, whose rule lasted a short time; and, having been defeated by the Gauls on the Po and by the Etruscans on the Arno, they withdrew to that region to which they gave the name of Umbria. But, a great family of this race, the Sabines, passed farther on and established itself on the highland of Rieti, nearer Campania and Apulia; and having increased greatly in their new territory, they gave origin to the Samnian, Marsian, Pelignian, Vestinian, Marrucinian, and other peoples.

That broad territory that lies between the right of the River, the Apennines, and the sea, came to be inhabited by the Etruscans, called also Rasenians or Tyrrhenians. As to the origin of this people there are two theories, one that of Herodotus, which taught that the Etruscans came by sea, driven from Lydia by famine; and the other, that of Niebuhr, Mommsen, and Helbig, according to which the Tyrrhenians came into Italy by land, over the Rhetian Alps. Of the primitive inhabitants of Italy, these were the ones who reached the highest degree of civilization, as is shown by the splendid remnants of their cities and by the objects found in their tombs; it is a pity that their language is not yet known. Later immigrations were those of the Gauls and of the Greeks. The Gauls, who were formerly held to be of Celtic origin, which now, having been confirmed, came down the Alps beginning of the sixth century B.C., divided into several families: Cenomanian, Insubrian, Boian, Senonian, etc. They were harsh and rapacious people, who made Cisalpine Gaul return to the barbarous state out of which the Etruscans had taken it, and often, in later historical ages, their nefarious influence was carried over the whole of Italy. On the southern portion of the peninsula there were established numerous Greek colonies, whose cities, as we have seen, arose to great power and splendour, whence the name Magna Graecia, given to the southern part of Italy. The north was inhabited by the Ligurians and by the Venetians, the origin of which race is not yet established. Some persons consider the Ligurians to be a very ancient race, preceding the Aryans and allied to the Iberians, while other authori-

ties hold that the Ligurians were of Celtic origin. However that may be, this people occupied a great portion of the western watershed of Italy, and then, expelled by the Italics and by the Etruscans, they sought new homes on the Rhone and on the Pyrenees.

It seems that the Ligurians were the first to come to Illyria and that its expansion in Continental Italy was stopped by the Gauls; at any rate, this people, who, unlike the Etruscans, had not abandoned a pastoral life and its habits, knew a great deal about agriculture, which was the basis of private life and social relations among the peoples of the third and second centuries before Christ, but whose economy was extremely poor and which, owing to the Illyrian, was even further impoverished.

(2) Population.—In 1770 the population of the territory that now constitutes the Kingdom of Italy was in round numbers 16,477,000 inhabitants; at the beginning of the nineteenth century it had grown to 18,125,000; and the census of 1901 showed a population of 32,475,253 inhabitants, implying an average annual increase of 7.38 per cent from 31 December, 1881. On 1 January, 1908, Italy had 33,909,776 inhabitants, being, therefore, the sixth state of Europe from the standpoint of population. The mean density of the population is 267 inhabitants per sq. mile; that of the cities, which is 6600 per sq. mile, is higher than that of Great Britain and Ireland; but, when it is considered that those countries are agricultural, industrial, and commercial while Italy is devoted essentially to agriculture, and is backward in the development of that industry, its population is shown to be inferior to that of the cities, accounts for only about 3.8 per cent. The population, moreover, is very unevenly divided over the territory, according as life is more or less easily supported by the fertility of the soil, by industry, or by commerce. The most crowded population is that of the province of Naples: 3448 inhabitants per sq. mile; after that come the provinces of Milan, the district of Genoa, the coast of Apulia, between Barletta and Monopoli, and the slope of Mt. Etna. The province of Sassari is the least inhabited (80 inhabitants per sq. mile); but there are extensive regions, such as the Roman Campagna and the plateau of the Murgia, that are almost uninhabited. As to the distribution of population, 71.8 per cent of the inhabitants live in towns and 28.2 per cent live in a country life. It is only in Venice and in Tuscany that the numbers of the town and country dwellers almost balance each other, while in Emilia, the Marches, and Umbria the country people do not exceed the towns, while the opposite is the case in Sicily and in Sardinia. It is to be regretted that an ever-increasing tendency towards agglomeration is manifested, which, together with the absence of the landowners from the small centres where their properties are located, is the source of great economical, educational, and moral evil.

Foreign residents in the kingdom, on 10 January, 1901, which is the date of the last census, numbered 61,606, of whom 37,762 were permanent residents, and of these there were 9079 Swiss, 7985 Austrians, 5748 Germans, and 5033 French, after which came in order of number the English and the Norwegians.

The highest averages of marriages are furnished by Abruzzi and Molise (9:1), Campania and Calabria (8:1), Apulia (8:2), and the Basilicata (9). The highest birthrates are those of Lombardy, Venice, Apulia, and Calabria. And here it may be observed that depopulation through the vice of neonatalism begins to show itself also in Italy, especially in the large cities, considering that the average of 36, in 1872-75, is reduced now to 31.4, notwithstanding the fact that the average of marriages has remained approximately constant; and while there is an average excess of 10.6 per 1000, the number of births is also inhabited by the Ligurians and by the Venetians, the origin of which race is not yet established. Some persons consider the Ligurians to be a very ancient race, preceding the Aryans and allied to the Iberians, while other authori-
which is found especially in the cities of more than 100,000 inhabitants. In 1907 there were 4,338 for every 100 births, including those born dead. The lowest averages of mortality are furnished by Piedmont and by Liguria (19.7); and the highest are those of Lombardy (23.2), the Abruzzi (22.7), the Basilicata (27.7) and Sardinia (22.4). Tubercular and intestinal maladies and tuberculosis furnish the highest figures to the death-rate, together with acute and chronic bronchitis and heart disease. In 1907 there were 1,315 homicides (3.9 per 100,000 inhabitants) and 2,312 suicides (8.9 per 100,000 inhabitants).

(3) Emigration.—It is subject to this very important sociological phenomenon, not only on account of over-population, as some believe, but because capital does not promote industries, which is due to a moral as well as to an economic cause, the former being a lack of confidence between lender and borrower, and the latter, an exaggerated fiscalism and the want of a protective tariff; it is due also to a social cause, namely the subverting theories with which socialism inspires the working classes. These are the true mediate reasons for Italian emigration that produces a lack of labour, and, therefore, economical disorder, which itself is the immediate cause of Italian emigration; all the other causes, such as the example of relatives and of friends who emigrate, the cheapness of travel, the facility of receiving news and of returning home, and the propaganda of navigation companies are of little consequence, when they do not rest upon economic uneasiness—which has been the determining element of every migratory movement in the world—nor can any human power prevent its effects. The law of 31 January, 1901, regulates emigration, and it is to be hoped that its provisions will remain in force, because the state should not promote, encourage, or guide the current of emigration. Figures are clearer than words in these matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Emigration</th>
<th>Emigration to Europe and to Mediterranean Countries</th>
<th>Transoceanic Emigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL NUMBER</td>
<td>PER 100,000 INHAB.</td>
<td>ACTUAL NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876-80</td>
<td>106,797</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>82,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-95</td>
<td>151,131</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>94,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-99</td>
<td>221,977</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>90,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-05</td>
<td>256,311</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>109,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>251,671</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>149,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>255,050</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>244,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>278,077</td>
<td>2356</td>
<td>278,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>274,261</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td>285,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>486,674</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>245,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between temporary and permanent emigration is no longer taken into account in statistics, for the very good reason that it does not show positive facts, either because of the facility of translocation, or because the emigrant, having found work and comfort at the place to which he emigrated, may establish there his home. In any case, temporary emigration occurs more frequently from the provinces of Venice, Lombardy, and Piedmont, and is directed more especially towards France, Switzerland, Austria, and the Balkans. Sixty-four per cent of the emigrants are farm labourers. The regions that furnished the largest numbers to the total emigration in 1906 were Piedmont, Venice, the Marches, the Abruzzi, Campania, the Basilicata, Calabria, and Sicily. With relation to transoceanic emigration the largest proportions per 100,000 were furnished by the Marches (2222), the Abruzzi (3569), Campania (2677), the Basilicata (3764), Calabria (3583), and Sicily (3390). From 1 July, 1906, to 30 June, 1907, there emigrated to the United States 235,731 Italians, nearly 43 per cent of the total of emigration. In 1907, during the economical crisis in the United States, 154,500 Italians who had emigrated returned to their country, and there was a suspension in emigration—only a suspension, because in the first six months of 1908 there were 218,482 emigrants, of whom 187,086 went to the United States, an increase of 152,320 and 151,406, respectively, over the figures for the same period of 1898. The undesirable element in Italian emigration is not furnished by the illiterate cafone, who has given and continues to give—actual value to lands in the United States, but rather, by ungodly educated emigrants who use their unfortunate fellow-countrymen, as well as the native of his class, for their own ends. Is Italian emigration a good or an evil? For the economy of Italy it is a good, seeing that the credit of Italians in foreign countries, on 31 December, 1908, in the savings postal accounts amounted to 290,479,711.94 lire ($12,000,000 nearly), and the deposits of emigrants for the period of 1 January, 1907, to 31 August, 1909, amounted to 21,702,664.20 lire. In other words, there are nearly 4,000,000 Italians scattered over the world, like the overflow of a prolific and sober race, in search of better living; and over the world is said advisedly, because the Italian emigrant, overcoming all obstacles, as poverty and ignorance, goes, exploited and little protected withal, into distant lands, among peoples whose customs are totally different from his own, and whose languages are unknown to him. This adaptation to climate and to social life is indicative of his cosmopolitan character.

(4) Language and Religion.—Although the population of Italy is ethnically mixed, and although there is considerable variation in its physical types, it is nevertheless different from that of all the other countries of Europe in the astonishing unity of its culture, of its language, and of its religion. That which is foreign is soon absorbed; and the Italian nation has the further advantage that, among a population of nearly 36,000,000 inhabitants, only 2,000,000 of them are subject to permanent foreign governments. The Roman conquest spread popular Latin, first, over Italy, and then over the known world; it was at first slowly altered by the linguistic habits of the various countries, and then, more rapidly, through the decay of the Roman Empire and through distance from Rome. Thus originated the Romance or neo-Latin languages, and the first of them, by its historical excellence, is the Italian, which is the pure and clear continuation of vulgar Latin, because the latter, in Italy, was unaccompanied by other tongues. Formerly was the principal commercial language known by foreign peoples, especially by those of the Levant. At present it is spoken by nearly 36,000,000 people.

The dialects that properly belong to the Italian system are the Tuscan, which is the typical and the literary language of the Italians, the Venetian, Corsican, Sicilian and Neapolitan, the Umbro-Romish and the Marchesian. To the Gallo-Italian system belong the dialects of Liguria and Piedmont and the Lombard-Emilian. Those are the principal dialects, spoken in the various regions after which they are respectively named, having themselves subdivisions that are due
to phonetic alterations. To the neo-Latin non-Italian dialects belong the Franco-Provençal, which is spoken in the high valleys of the Western Alps, and the Latins of the Grisons, in Friuli, and in Molise. The German language is spoken in Piedmont and in Venetia by the descendants of colonies that were established in those provinces in the eleventh and in the twelfth centuries. The language of Albania is spoken by the descendants of colonists who went to Southern Italy and to Sicily, in 1461, with Skanderbeg after the fall of Albanian independence. The descendants of the Greeks who migrated to Calabria and to the territory of Otranto, between the ninth and the eleventh centuries, preserve their original language. In all, there are 770,000 persons in Italy who speak languages other than Italian.

The predominant religion is the Catholic, to which belong 97-12 per cent of the population. The census of 1901 showed the presence of 65,595 Protestants and of 33,617 Jews, while 793,276 persons made no mention of their religion in their declarations.

(5) Arts.—In the first half of the Middle Ages, among the fine arts religious architecture reached a certain degree of perfection; the churches which it created reproduced the ancient Roman basilicas (Santa Maria Maggiore, San Clemente, and others, in Rome), and the ornaments, octagonal and semicircular vaults of the Roman baths; in this way the Christian-Roman or neo-Latin style was developed. At the same time the Greeks brought the Byzantine style to Italy (San Vitale in Ravenna, 537, and San Marco in Venice, 876). Towards the year 1000 there appeared in Italy the Romanesque style, which substituted the vaulted roof for the plain ceiling (the cathedral of Pisa); while Arabic influence was felt in Sicily in the construction of the magnificent cathedral of Monreale and of its adjacent cloister. Towards the latter part of the Middle Ages, painting, through the impetus given to it by Giotto, produced true masterpieces. Among the painters who became famous at that time are Senesi, Buoninsegna, and Martini, the two Gaddi, Fra Angelico, and Masaccio, who was the true founder of the modern school of painting. Among the famous sculptors were the two Pisano, Orgagna, Giberti, and Donatello, whom we shall mention later (1466), who may be called the Masaccio of sculpture. Finally, we should name Luca della Robbia, a popular sculptor who invented the terra-cotta process that is known by his name. The erroneously so-called Gothic style that was developed in France was brought into Italy; where, however, it was not fully adopted, except in the north, the church of St. Stephen in the cathedral of Milan; the churches of Santa Maria Novella and of Santa Croce in Florence, the cathedrals of Siena and of Orvieto and others are based upon it, as are, among other civil edifices, the Ducal Palace in Venice, the Orgagna Loggia, in Florence, and the communal palaces of Udine and Siena.

The Renaissance in the first decades of the sixteenth century led to the further development of the fine arts, and great masterpieces were produced. Here it is enough to mention the three great names of Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), Michelangelo Buonarroti (1474-1564), and Raphael Sanzio (1483-1520), which have made that age immortal. In architecture Roman forms were adopted, and the first examples of Renaissance architecture were the churches of Santa Maria dei Miracoli in Venice, San Lorenzo in Florence, etc.; and among civil buildings, the Pazzi and the Sassetti palaces of Florence, the Palazzo Uguccione di Urbino, etc. The best architects were Bramante, Giacomo Barozzi, called Vignola, Peruzzi, Palladio, the two Sangallo, Sansovino, and Buonarroti, who planned the cupola of St. Peter's. Sacred music reached its acme in the compositions of Palestrina (1529-1594). The straining after odd and exaggerated forms which were condemned in the literature of the seventeenth century also appears in the architecture and in the sculpture of that time. Bernini (1598-1680) and Borromini (1599-1672) in the seventeenth century introduced the baroque style which was disfigured by their imitators. But painting remained free from the defects of that period, through the influence of Doci, Sassoferrato, the two Carracci, Alban, Domenichino, and Guido Reni. The heavy and comforted manner of building in the seventeenth century gave way to a lighter but peculiar style marked by ornamentation; it was brought to Italy from France. This style, which is called rococo, corresponds to what in literature is known as preciosity; but towards the middle of the eighteenth century classical forms were revived, especially in Italy, in the works of Vanvitelli and Juvarra, while Canova restored its simplicity to sculpture, combining the study of nature with that of classic forms. Music also continued its ascendant progress under Pergolesi, Porpora, and Paisiello. In the nineteenth century architecture attempted the "liberty" style, which came from beyond the Alps; sculpture developed, as is shown by the names of Bertolini, Tenerani, Dupré, Monteverde, and others; but painting produced less noted names (Celestino, Fraccassini, Morelli, Maceri, Michetti, etc.). Profane music, on the other hand, reached its greatest height in form, initiated by Rossini and the operas of Bellini.

ECONOMICAL FACTORS.—(1) Agriculture.—Italy was once the classic land of agriculture; but, in our day, notwithstanding a reawakening that foretells better times, it is one of the countries in which agriculture is most backward. This is due to many causes, of which the chief is fiscalism and the landlord system (there were 3,351,498 landed proprietors in 1852, which number was reduced to 3,286,691 in 1901); absenteeism and the inertia of the large landowners, the ignorance of agriculture and the lack of capital and of agrarian credit are also to blame. And consequently the average yield of the farms in Italy is less than one-half the yield in Germany and England, notwithstanding better conditions of soil and of climate. Exact data concerning these matters will not be had until the valuations that are made concernable to the law of March, 1886, are available. So far as wine is concerned Montello, a remarkable product, to the silk-worm industry and to the cultivation of tobacco. But, in order to remedy this evil, there was established, in 1907, an office for the express purpose of collecting agricultural statistics. The production of wheat is inferior to the demands of the population, and great quantities for that staple are imported, notwithstanding the high duties. On the other hand, there is an over-production of wine. The cultivation of vegetables is important, as is also that of kitchen herbs and of fruits, in which there is a great deal of exportation that could be profitably increased if refrigerator cars were used for transportation, as in America. In the production of silk-worms, Italy is the leading country of Europe, and the third, after Japan and China, in the world: in 1906, there were produced 538,380 new cocoons, and the native and the imported cocoons that were spun by the factories throughout the kingdom produced a total of 26,000 tons. Among industrial plants hemp and flax hold an important place in Italian agriculture, there being a yearly product of nearly 80,000 tons of the former and of nearly 20,000 tons of the latter, furnished in greater part by Lombardy. Among the other industrial plants are the sumac and the marmal in Sicily, from which in Autumn the first products are obtained, and the manufacture of hate, etc. Cotton is imported from America, and of late years there has been a successful effort to cultivate beet-root for the manufacture of sugar, and also to cultivate tobacco, which, in 1905, yielded a product of more than 7000 tons from 12,500 acres. Horticulture has made notable progress

226
in recent times, especially in Tuscany and on the Ligurian Riviera, which has an exceptionally favourable climate for this industry. Unfortunately, notwithstanding so many favourable conditions, agriculture, which is so prosperous in England, in Italy is in a rudimentary state as yet. Between 1867 and 1906 there were rearested, at the expense of the Government and with its assistance, 114,000 acres, costing in all $1,700,000, a very small showing in the presence of the serious problem of reforestation.

(2) Livestock.—There is not much raising of live stock in Italy, not enough even to supply the home demand, in which that country is behind the nations of Central and of Northern Europe; and it is not easy to understand why agriculturists do not profit by the advantages offered by the Government in this connection. The animals that are chiefly raised are oxen, horses, asses, mules, goats, sheep, and hogs. On account of the natures of the different peoples, in northern Italy is found chiefly the raising of the larger animals, while on the peninsula the raising of smaller animals is prevalent. Poultry and eggs are a special source of wealth; still their supply is not equal to the demand. The fisheries, of river and of sea, are neglected by the Government; each year there is a retrogression in these pursuits that is stayed by the co-operative efforts of a few fishermen of the Adriatic shores of the Marches, assisted by their priests.

(3) Minerals.—In view of the lack of coal, Italy is not very rich in mineral products, although lignite, anthracite, and peat are not scarce. It is the first country in the production of sulphur, however, as we have seen, when speaking of Sicily; formerly there was no competition in this commodity, but now California has closed the American markets to the Italian produce. Italy abounds in salt (Salsomaggiore and Volterra); it is rich also in iron ores of the best quality, found in the regions of Brescia, Bergamo, and Como, and more especially in the island of Elba. In Liguria, Piedmont, and Venice is found copper, but more abundantly in Tuscany, near Campiglia Maritima, where there is a great establishment for smelting the ores of Lansi and of Mt. Temperino; these mines were known to the Etruscans and to the Romans, who left there the traces of their industrial spirit. The greatest yield of mercury is obtained from the mines of Grosseto, Mt. Amiata, and from those of Siena. In 1906 the total production of minerals, in which 69,224 workmen were employed, amounted to a value of $20,000,000. Another source of wealth to Italy are the quarries that produce valuable materials for construction, as pozzolana (cement), volcanic tufa, calcare, sandstone, etc., and stone, such as decorative and statuary marbles, granite, slate, peperino etc., as well as other materials for use in the arts, such as pumice stone, lithographic stone, asbestos, and colouring clays, etc. Italy is rich in thermal and in mineral waters that compare favourably, from the therapeutic standpoint, with those of other countries, and they could be made the sources of considerable profit, if they were competently exploited. Among these thermal waters special mention should be made of those of Acqui (Alessandria), Salsomaggiore (Parma), Tese (Benevento), and Bornio. Among the mineral waters, the following obtain highest favour: Monte Cateni (Tuscany), Recaro (Venice), San Gemini and Nocera (Umbria), and Ischia and Casamicciola (Naples).

Of late years Italy has not been idle in regard to the redemption of lands: from 1884 to the present time nearly 4,000,000 acres have been redeemed, whether by the process of filling-in, by draining, or by the use of hydraulic machines. In 1905 the King of Italy, at the petition of the American agriculturist Lubin, initiated the establishment of an International Agricultural Institute which, totally independent of all political and national connection, should study agricultural conditions in the different countries for the general good. All the Powers accepted the initiative and appointed each a representative in accordance with it, so that the institution is now an accomplished fact.

(4) Industries.—Industries and manufactures fell from the prosperous condition in which they were in the Middle Ages when Italy was the teacher of other countries. Political dissensions, internal strife, and lack of technical instruction, the want of capital, and an exaggerated protectionism produced a certain relaxation and want of care, in consequence of which national industry neither followed the progress of the times nor even produced the supply required by national demand; and it fell entirely upon the discovery of steam, which revolutionized the economy of peoples and of states. But in recent years Italy has reawakened and, notwithstanding obstacles in the way of development, increased by an exaggerated and ill-advised fiscalism, has made notable progress in its industrial life, especially through the intelligent efforts of its northern population, to the extent, in fact, of attaining the highest ranks in the silk industry, as well as in those of cotton, wool, leather, of the metals, and of alimentary products (cheese, salted meats, and pastes). Notable also are the soap industry, the chemical products and the paper industries, the manufacture of artistic furniture of jewellery, of objects in straw, matches, glasses, beads, porcelains, majolica, mosaics, and, in general, all of the artistic industries, due to the natural good taste of the Italian people. Visitors to Italy take into the country from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 each year. Available fuel and motor power are the measure of industrial activity, and in 1887, in which year regular investigations on these points began, the amount of fuel used in the industries aggregated a tonnage of 4,004,685, representing a value of $18,000,000 while, in 1905, according to the most recent statistics, the tonnage was 6,912,183, with a value of $33,000,000. The importation of coal alone, deducting the amount of that commodity that was exported or entered
into the manufacture of conglomerates, was nearly 6,000,000 tons. The total sum of the various motor forces available on 1 January, 1904, according to the statistics of the "Ispettorato generale dell' Industria e Commerce," published in 1905, was as follows: steam engines, 2,472,133 horse power; motors, 45,855 horse power; hydraulic forces, 490,000 horse power; motors of other kinds, exclusive of windmills, 446,000 horse power—total, 3,008,452. As regards textile industries, in which Italy is making an effort to regain the primacy that it enjoyed in the glorious Middle Ages, we give in Table 2 the following approximate data:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Factories</th>
<th>H. P. Spindles in Operation</th>
<th>Looms</th>
<th>Workmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jute</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Weaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mechanical industries, in the working of iron, are also growing, as in the manufacture of arms, foundries, and naval construction. Coal has been used until now almost exclusively in the industries, and consequently Italy is yearly a tributary to foreign countries in the sum of nearly 50,000,000; but now it can be guaranteed electric power derived from numerous watercourses, an inexhaustible wealth that Raddi estimates to be equal to 10,000,000 horse power. This is the white coal, according to the happy expression of Bergès, which will be capable of supplying both the great and the small industries; and the Italian mind must have presaged this new force, in which the future prosperity of Italy lies, seeing that in this country, where, nearly a century ago, Volta discovered the electric pile, there have appeared also the two greatest transformers of electrical energy, Pacinotti and Galileo Ferraris; while Marconi, utilizing the Heritian waves, has opened up a new horizon.

The principal centres of the silk industry are Milan, Como, Genoa, Turin, and Florence; those of the cotton industry are Milan, Bergamo, Como, Turin, Novara, Genoa, Salerno, Udine, and Padua; the principal centres for the wool industry are the Biellese, Vicenza (Schio), and Tuscany; the principal centres for the manufacture of woolen fabrics and for the woollen industries in Lombardy, Emilia, Venice, and Campania; the metallurgical industries are centred at Follonica (Grosseto), Cecina, Piombino, Portoferro, Terni, Isernia, and Pertusella in Sardinia. Pozzuoli, Terni, and Brescia enjoy a high reputation for their metallurgical industries in general, and for the manufacture of arms in particular, while the products of important shops in Lombardy, Piedmont, Venice, Tuscany, Liguria, and Naples, in marine engines, railroad supplies, automobiles, and kindred productions enjoy high favour. Naples, Leghorn, Spezia, Genoa, and Sestri Ponente have considerable dock yards, and the largest naval arsenals are at Spezia, Venice, Naples, Castellammare di Stabia, and Taranto. Italy occupies an important position with regard to the industrial trades, the development of which is being promoted through the establishment of the museums of Turin, of Rome and of Naples, and by the opening of industrial schools. Florence, Venice, and Rome are famous for their mosaic productions; Venice, the Romagna, the Milanese, and Tuscany, for their terra-cotta, majolica, and porcelain arts; Venice and Murano for their mirrors, for glass, and for glass beads; Naples, Genoa, Leghorn, and Sestri Ponente for their manufacture of glass, Naples, Venice, Rome, and Florence, for their bronzes, statues, pictures, tapestry, etc. Tuscany, and especially Florence, enjoys a good reputation for the manufacture of straw hats, as do the establishments of Piedmont, Lombardy, and Liguria for the manufacture of paper, and especially so Fabbrano, in the Marches, for its hand-made paper, one of the oldest establishments of its kind in Europe. Milan is the principal centre of Europe for the printing of music and is the chief centre of Italy for papermaking. In alimentary products Liguria and Naples lead for pastry, and Bologna and Modena for their sausages; Liguria for salt fish; Lombardy for its cheeses; Tuscany and Liguria lead in the production of oil. The best-known wines, enjoying high esteem in foreign countries, are Barolo, Balsamina, Gugnolino, and Vernaccia of Piedmont; Sangiovese and Canino, of the Romagna; Chianti, Pomino, and Rufina, of Tuscany; Orvieto and Aleatico, of Umbria; the wines of the Roman Castelli; Taurasi, Capri, and Falerno, from the southern provinces.

(5) Commerce.—More intimate relations with the principal powers, with which Italy has commercial treaties, and the increase of ways of communication by land and sea, especially the tunnelling of the St. Gothard, and the Simplon, and the opening of the Suez Canal, have facilitated commercial relations and have increased the interest of traders in all the countries. This is sufficiently shown by the fact that, while the sum total of Italian commerce in 1861 was of a value of $3,200,000, it was of a value of $922,000,000 in 1907, exclusive of precious metals, of which amount $552,000,000 represent the imports, and $370,000,000 the exports; the commercial interests are Lombardy, Piedmont, Liguria, and Venice, which is due not only to the greater activity of the inhabitants of those regions and to their contact with the neighbouring foreign peoples, but also to the many good highways of those provinces, and to their navigable canals, which are the third rank are Emilia, Tuscany, the Marches, Umbria, and Lazio. The commerce of Southern Italy and of Sicily is yet at a low standard, although it is slowly awakening. The greater portion of foreign commerce is done by maritime transportation, the most active ports being those of Genoa, Leghorn, Naples, Palermo, Catania, Brindisi, and Venice. The economical conditions of Italy, on the whole, are not unfavourable, but the nation is far from enjoying the prosperous conditions to which other countries have attained in this regard. The weak points are in the backward unscientific condition of agriculture, in the raising of cattle, waving on the verge of excessive cultivation; while there is a considerable danger in the exaggerated protectionism that gradually is fixing its roots in the sentiment of the people and in that of nations.

The merchant marine is not at the height that it attained in the Middle Ages under the glorious maritime republics, and a complication of historical and of geographical causes, added to the inertia of Governments and to the lack of judicial protection, have obstructed its favourable progress. Nevertheless private enterprise has not been abated in the development of the merchant marine, although it has not attained the favourable results that have crowned like efforts in other countries. In the last four years, however, the Societé di Navigazione Generale Italiana, the Veloce Company, the Italy Company, the Italian Lloyd, the Sabaudo Lloyd, and the Società Sicula-Americana have added thirty-five large, twin-screw, transatlantic steamships to the emigrant service, with a capacity of 240,000 tons burden, and accommodation for nearly 70,000 passengers, which was done at an expense of not less than $28,000,000. The Italian merchant marine occupies the seventh position among those of the large countries. The State, to assure the merchant marine, and to secure partial and compensative construction of the ships and for repairs that are carried out in Italian yards, amounting in all to a yearly maximum of $1,600,000. This system, however, which has been in force since 1886, and in—
volving a larger sum of money, has not produced the results desired, because the cost of construction in Italian yards is higher than in those in other countries, and consequently the Government’s compensation is without practical effect. According to a new bill, the direct aid of the State would assist the mercantile marine by a compensation of equipment for a duration of not less than ten months per ton burden and by compensation for velocity, for every half mile above a 14-knot speed, as well as per ton. For ships constructed in foreign yards, the bill provides that these compensations be one-half of those granted in the case of ships that are built at home. It grants a great many reimbursements of taxes and other compensations to the thirty-one shipyards of the kingdom, if they use the home metallurgical products. This bill continues the former policy of uniting the metallurgical, the shipyard, and the navigation interests. The sum total of merchandise that was shipped or unloaded in 1906 amounted to 23,287,916 tons, of which

In sum, the paper circulation on 31 December, 1907, amounted to 2,289,060,360 lire, or 68 lire per head of the population.

(2) Labour Organisation.—The highest wages for workmen in the manufacturing industries and in commerce is of slightly more than a dollar a day, and the lowest is 30 cents, for men; and the salaries for women vary from 60 to 10 cents a day. According to the census of 1901, there were 2,471,672 wage-earning women, above the age of 9 years, as compared with 5,862,572 men; and according to the declaration made by employers conformably with the law of 19 June, 1902, concerning the work of women and of children, there were, in 14,510 establishments, 414,915 workmen and 414,975 working women. The laws of 17 May, 1908, and of 30 June, 1903, compel the employer, in some trades, to insure his workmen against accidents in work, and by the law of 8 July, 1853, the Cassa Nazionale was established for that purpose, without, however, prohibiting such insurance in private companies or in syndicates of mutual insurance. According to the statistics of the Ufficio del Lavoro, working men and women, insured and non-insured, who suffered through accidents, in 1906, numbered 166,561, of whom 9963 were women; there were 398 cases of death and 259 accidents in which many workmen suffered. It should be noted that the great increase in the number of accidents is not to be ascribed to a noteworthy increase of industrial activity, or to less prudence, but rather to the malice of the workmen, and it is extremely doubtful whether there does not exist a medical criminal school, established for the purpose of encouraging the most serious and dangerous injuries. Recently a bill has been introduced into the Legislature to remove these evils, which cause high insurance premiums and are otherwise detrimental to industry and to insurance societies. The statistics compiled by the “Ispettorato generale del Credito e della Previdenza” in 1906 show that there were 63,369 accidents for which financial compensation to the amount of $120,900 was paid. In 1905 there were 540,850 workmen insured in the Cassa Nazionale di assicurazione; the number of injured among them amounted to 145,50 per 1000, and the indemnities paid to $830,000. In the third quarter of the year 1906 there were 48,621 accidents.

Regarding the organization of workmen, on 1 January, 1908, there were 4477 leagues, having a membership of 612,804 industrial workmen; on 1 January, 1909, there were 95 camere del lavoro, having 3854 sections with 501,220 members; 43 of these camere belonged to the Confederazione del Lavoro; there were 22 federazioni of trades, on 1 January, 1908, with 2550 sections and 191,599 members. There were 2814 leagues registered in the camera del lavoro, and 1324 in the federazioni of trades, while 339 were independent. In 1906 there were 1902 strikes, affecting 255,809 workmen; in 1907 there were 1983 strikes, involving 276,535 workmen, and in 1908 there were 1543 strikes in which 218,289 workmen participated. The year 1907 developed the greatest number of strikes.
much in excess of those of 1903, in which latter-named year there occurred the maximum of industrial strikes. The chief cause of strikes related to wages, to the monopoly of labour, and to discipline, and, as is natural, the first two produced the greatest number, and times of discipline more than those related with the monopoly of labour. In 1906 20-5 per cent of the strikes were entirely successful, while 2-53 per cent were unsuccessful; in 1907, 25-5 per cent succeeded, as compared with 27-7 per cent that failed; in 1908, 21-1 per cent were successful and 26-4 per cent concluded. The remainder were partly successful. In the first quarter of 1909 there were 217 strikes, in which 34,118 workmen took part. There are in all Italy 69 organizations for the defence of the demands of workmen in the industries and in commerce.

The habit of making savings, which is one of the forms of natural provision, and also that of attending to the needs of parents have always obtained among Italians, especially in the labouring classes, whether agricultural or industrial, with greater force, in fact, than that of physical and intellectual development, and this is reflected in the remittances made by emigrants. From such remittances and savings banks, these fruits of economy were merely hoarded up by individuals and exposed to the dangers of loss; and when those banks were established, however, offering ample security through the supervision of the State, and also facilities in relation to time and place, the proportion of savings was vastly increased. In 1872, there were 120 savings banks in Italy, a number that has increased now to 208, while the number of depositors, which was 676,237, has now grown to 2,048,364. The aggregate of deposits in 1872 amounted to nearly $100,000,000, and is now equal to $400,000,000. The people’s banks, which take savings accounts, had, in 1898, deposits to the sum of $75,000,000, and now have deposits of a total of $147,000,000; and the post-office savings bank that was established in 1876 has now 5,000,000 depositors, with accounts to their favour of more than $300,000,000. The sum total of savings, therefore, may be estimated, in round numbers, at $800,000,000. Unhappily the savings banks are obliged to invest their deposits in state bonds and in first-class hypothecary loans, while the post-office bank invests deposits in loans to the Communes and to the provinces; the former, therefore, are useful to the many other industries in the manufacturing and other branches of agriculture. Here it may be observed that while the figures given above are evidence of the habit of Italians of making savings, which is nothing but deferring consumption, those figures show also the want of the habit of placing savings in profitable investments, that other form of provision which consists in renouncing the possession of the sum saved, that is, of the power of consumption, to transform it into other powers, or for one’s own security against want. Hence the slow and laboured progress of the professional unions and of the leagues, of the so-called cooperative, assistance against sickness, loss of employment, or old age, the existence of which institutions depends upon the contributions of their members. Possibly this condition may be in a measure due to the malversation of funds by the directors of such corporations and to the failure of kindred establishments that are without solid foundations or competent direction, all of which causes have increased the want of economical confidence that is instinctive in the Italian character. The proof of this is furnished by the national bank that was established in 1898 for insurance against disability and against old age; in agreement with the law of 31 May, 1907, No. 376; for in this establishment, notwithstanding its total amount of funds of nearly $13,000,000, there were registered on 28 February, 1909, only 297,719 workmen, mainly by public corporations which, in their own interests, wished to provide for the old age of their employees.

COMMUNICATIONS.—(1) Highways.—The highways of Italy, exclusive of those bordering on private property, in 1904, measured in the aggregate 85,757,300 miles; while there was a total length of 33,400 miles of mule and foot roads. (2) Railways.—In Italy, the Napoli-Portici, was opened on 4 October, 1839; in 1871 there were 3960 miles of railroad in operation, and on 30 June, 1907, there were 10,705 miles of railroads. The principal railroad lines are: (1) the one from Turin to Venice, by Novara, Milan, and Verona; (2) that from Florence to Genoa, the station of the Indies, by Piacenza, Bologna, Ancona, Foggia, Bari, and Otranto; (3) that from Genoa to Naples, by Pisa, Rome, Salerno, and Reggio-Calabria. The Italian railroads and those of France communicate by two lines, that from Genoa to Marseilles and that from Turin to Lyons, through the Fréjus, and they will soon connect, also, by the Cuneo-Nice line. They connect with the Swiss and with the German railroads by the Novara-Luino-Bellinzona line, by the Milan, Chiasso, Lugano, Bellinzona, and Airolo (the St. Gotthard road), by the Genoa, Alessandria, Novara, Dome establishment, and other lines. The Italian railroads connect with those of Austria by the Verona-Trent (the Brennero line), by the Venice-Udine (the Pontebbana line) and by the Udine, Cormons, Görs, and Monfalcone line. (3) Tramways.—The first tramway that was operated by mechanical traction was opened in 1875 between Turin and Montelieri, and on 31 December, 1904, there were 2450 miles of tramway lines in operation, 475 miles being electrified; and the combined personnel employed on all these lines included 14,742 persons. With the tramways are connected waterways, aggregating a length of 110 miles and 150 miles by navigable canals. Interior navigation, however, has been neglected until now by Italy, to the detriment of commerce and of industry, and it is a matter for congratulation that the Bertolini bill, bearing upon this matter, became law on 2 Jan., 1910. (4) The Postal Service.—On 30 June, 1908, the postal-telegraph offices and the places for collection numbered together 10,580, an average of 28 for each 100,000 inhabitants; there were, moreover, 143 such offices on wheels or afloat. This important public service is due in great measure to mutual conventions between Italy and other countries. In the last 10 years, from 9 October, 1874, and developed in subsequent congresses (Berne, 1876; Paris, 1878 and 1880; Lisbon, 1885; Vienna, 1891; and Washington, 1897), leading to the establishment of the Universal Postal Union. In some foreign places where the Italian colonies are considerable, whether through the number of emigrants or by the importance of their commerce, post-offices have been established, as in the Republic of San Marino, in Albania, Tripolitania, and Crete, at Constantineople, Valona, Salonica, Jerusalem, and in the Italian colony of Eritrea and Somalia. On 30 June, 1908, there were 198 post offices in the postal and telegraphic service, and in 1908-1909 the postal, telegraph, and telephone receipts continued to increase, notwithstanding the effects of the great economical crisis in the United States that caused a stagnation in business, in exchanges, and in emigration. The combined expenses in 1898-1899 amounted to $12,490,000, and in the last year of the following decade, that is, 1907-1908, they amounted to $24,610,000. The combined issue of stamps, postal orders, post-cards, cards for packages, registrations, and answers prepaid amounted in value to $17,296,000. During the fiscal year there were 12,743,309 packages mailed, and 2,205,214 packages received from foreign countries. These figures were due to the creation of the United States, providing for the direct exchange of packages of from
64 lb. to 11 lb., which came into force on 1 August, 1908. There were established 11 automobile services; and in order to expedite the distribution of letters and of telegrams in Rome, Milan, and Naples, there is about to be established the pneumatic postal service of the American engineer Batcheller, in a total length of 226 miles. By the year 1902, 5 April, the postal service of the navigation lines between Italy and the islands of Sicily and of Sardinia was placed under the administration of the railways of the State, while the postal and the commercial service of other lines is entrusted to private parties, with the association and control exercised by the State. For the benefit of all, profits above 5 per cent. must be paid. The contract period is limited to twenty years; the present contracts coming to an end on 30 June, 1910.

(5) Telegraphs.—Statistics for 30 June, 1908, show that there were 30,650 miles of telegraph lines, with 1,570,044 miles of wire. The submarine cables belonging to the State are of a combined length of approximately 1,250 miles. There are 5,312 telegraph offices belonging to the Government, while the number of those belonging to railroads and to other companies is 2,582; in all, 7,894.

(6) Telephones.—Telephone service was established in Italy in 1881, and, until 1907 it was furnished by private companies, except for international communication; but, by the law of 15 July, 1907, the State assumed control of city telephones, for which purpose it established the Direzione Generale dei Telefoni. There are 10 international lines, and 300 lines between cities. Moreover, there are four submarine telephone cables of a combined length of 22 miles. On 30 June, 1908, there were 2,988 telephone employees and 50,278 subscribers to city telephones.

(7) Wireless Telegraphs.—Italy has 14 fixed wireless telegraph stations that transmitted, in the period of 1907-1908, 1,475 messages, containing 29,320 words, and received 4,760 messages containing 77,186 words.

History.—With the foundation of Rome (754 B.C.), the historical life of Italy begins. About 600 B.C. the Gauls appear settled on either side of the Po (Padus); to the west along the Mediterranean are the Ligurians, and eastward around the Adriatic the tribes of Venice and Istria. In central Italy the Etruscans, of mysterious origin, had reached a high degree of civilization, as their sepulchral architecture and art remain to prove. Their neighbours, the Italic, were divided into two great groups, the Latin tribes and those of the Etruscan origin. To the northwards again was "Etruria Magna" (Magna Graecia), a number of Greek colonies, the most important of which was Tarentum. This is not the place to relate how gradually the small city of Rome extended its rule until all Italy, the Mediterranean lands, Gaul and Germany, Egypt and the Later Orient, i.e., the known world ( terra incognita) acknowledged its authority (see Rome). In those centuries of conquest and assimilation Rome was alternately a kingdom, a republic, and finally an empire. It was under the first Roman emperor, Augustus Caesar, and through his world-wide edict, that Jesus Christ came to be accepted by all classes of the Jewish and Gentile world, and in an incredibly short time the religion of the Crucified One had been established at Rome (Romans, i, 17; xv, 23; Suetonius, "Vita Claudii", xxv; Tertull., "De Praescr.", xxvi; Taeit., "Ann.", lib. XV, xlvii; see Peter, Saint; Paul, Saint), had penetrated all parts of the world, and has become the official religion in almost all of the major non-Semitic countries of the world. The churchs of these countries, in their turn, have sent missionaries to speak of the more or less reliable claims of many Italian cities to Apostolic origins for their churches (Cappelletti, "Le chiese d'Italia", Venice, 1844-71; J. Rivière, "La propag. du Christ. dans les trois premiers siècles", Paris, 1907). The historian Eusebius exhibits the most interest in the events which preceded Constantine (see Fabricius, "L. salutaris Evangelii"; Harnack, "Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums", 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905; Duchesne, "Hist. Ancienne de l'Eglise", I, Paris, 1906, and Idem, "The Roman Church before Constantine", New York, 1909).

Political necessity eventually led to the abandonment of Rome as the administrative centre of the unwieldy empire and the foundation (327) of a new city (Constantinople, New Rome) on the site of ancient Greek Byzantium, in a situation so incomparable for defence and attack that for many centuries the new city was impregnable (Bury, "History of the Later Roman Empire", London, 1889). In the meantime had been fought (311) near Rome the battle of the Milvan Bridge which sealed the fate of paganism, though in the higher classes and amid the rural population it lingered to the end of the fourth century (De Broglie, "L'église et l'empire romain au IVe siècle."); Paris, 1856-66; Duchesne, "Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise", II, Paris, 1907; Allies, "The Formation of Christendom", IV, VI, London, 1861-95; G. Boissier, "La fin du paganisme", 5th ed., Paris, 1907). Out-of-
"Konige der Germanen", Munich, 1861-97). Rome itself was on the point of falling into their hands, when Pope Stephen II made his famous journey across the Alps, 754 (see Pope) to intercede at the Western Empire (see Byzantine in the Byzantines (Von Schack, "Normannen in Sicilien", 1889; Von Heinemann, "Normannen in Unteritalien u. Sicilien", I, 1894; Chalandon, "Domination normande en Italie et en Sicile", Paris, 1907; Don- dorf, "Normannen u. ihre Bedeutung f. europ. Kultur", 1913). Owing to them, and to the hearty support of the Lombard League of cities, the papacy was victorious in the first phase of its conflict with the empire (Peace of Venice, 1177). Matilda, Countess of Tuscany (1064-1115), had meanwhile passed away, and left to the papacy her vast territories in the north of Italy, and Mantua, Ferrara, etc., a new bone of contention with the empire that asserted its lordship over rights of inheritance and administration (Tozzi, "La Contessa Matilde", 3rd ed., Rome, 1886; Renée, "La grande Italiane", Paris, 1859; M. Huddly, "The Countess Matilda", London, 1905). When Emperor Henry VI married in 1194 Constance, heiress of the great Norman house, the Kingdom of Sicily (with Southern Italy) passed into the hands of the Hohenstaufen, a combination most odious to the papacy, which rightly feared the near extinction of its independence. Out of Internal Crisis and Political and the royal crown of Sicily arose the second phase of the great medieval conflict between pope and emperor (see Frederick II; Gregory IX, Pope; Honorius III, Pope) that ended (1265) in the complete ruin of the Hohenstaufen and the establishment of a French dynasty, the House of Anjou, on the throne of Naples. Only a few years did Charles of Anjou retain Sicily, for the native population came to detest the French knights and in the famous "Sicilian Vespers" (1282) cast off the yoke of France and called in the Spanish line of Aragon (Broglio, "Storia del Vespri Siciliano", Milan, 1838; see "Science e Pede", 1832-34). Meantime, Italian genius had been cultivating variously during this stirring thirteenth century. Education had been nobly fostered by the growth of universities like Bologna and Padua, created or protected by the papacy, law and order had been put on a firm basis, and a more general recognition of the Roman law (see Law; Pandects); and by the new codification of the canon law (Decretals, Papal; Corpus Juris Canonici); religion had been honored and confirmed by the rise of the Mendicant orders (Franciscans, Dominicans); the fine arts had been enriched, especially in architecture and sculpture by the return of Greek characteristics (C. Lenormant, "La Grande Grèce", Paris, 1884).

With Otto I the German imperial authority reasserted (951) its right to the crown of Italy, and henceforward the episcopal see of Northern and Central Italy, in order to sustain its claims (Cantù, "Storia degli Italiani", 4th ed., Turin, 1893-96; M. Hartmann, "Gesch. Italiens im Mittelalter", 1897-1903; Leo, "Gesch. der ital. Staaten", 1829-32). Secularly minded bishops were only too often imposed on the population of these cities, which soon resented the feudal rights and privileges of their spiritual rulers, while these, on the other hand, found support in the German emperor, whose ambitions aimed at that period culminated in the world-empire that Otto III (d. 1002) hoped to realize (Drescher, "Kultur u. Sittenwandel d. ital. Geistlichkeit im 10. u. 11. Jahrhundert", Berlin, 1890; A. Vogel, "Rathenius v. Verona u. das 10. Jahrhundert", 1854; Atto of Ver- celli, "De pressuris ecclesiasticis", in P. L., CXXIV). The second half of the eleventh century ushered in the long and disastrous conflict between the papacy and the emperors (Gregory VII, 1073-1085 and Henry IV (d. 1106). Meanwhile a new political power, the Normans, had been growing up in Southern Italy at the expense of the Byzantines, the Saracens, and the remnants of the former Lombard duchies. During the first half of the eleventh century the foundation of the second Lombard kingdom, it united it with his own, and by new gifts added the greater part of the exarchate to the papal possessions.

The generosity of the faith, the political results of the attempt to spread Iconoclasm in Italy, the hard necessity of the presence of imperial agents in the Roman Church (see PERNUS SHONNZ), again in 774, at the call of Pope Adrian I, Charlemagne entered Italy, and suppressed the Lombard kingdom, united it with his own, and by new gifts added the greater part of the exarchate to the papal possessions.

The generosity of the faith, the political results of the attempt to spread Iconoclasm in Italy, the hard necessity of the presence of imperial agents in the Roman Church (see PERNUS SHONNZ), again in 774, at the call of Pope Adrian I, Charlemagne entered Italy, and suppressed the Lombard kingdom, united it with his own, and by new gifts added the greater part of the exarchate to the papal possessions.
and the Fredericks. The former power of empire and papacy was now eagerly divided up between their more or less authorized representatives, and soon the "age of the despots", the "nubes tyrannorum", set in, bold and resourceful men who kept and increased on all sides the power they had once obtained. The Visconti and Sforza at Milan, the Baglioni at Perugia, the Malatesta at Ravena, the Scaligers at Verona, and a hundred others are types of a masterful and unique race that dominated for personal ends the prevailing anarchy (J. A. Symonds, "The Age of The Despots" New York, 1888). The great Spanish captain and cardinal, Gil d' Albornos, between 1350 and 1370 restored in great measure the papal authority in its hereditary possessions (Wurm, "Cardinal Albornos", 1894), but it was not until after the close of the Western Schism (1417) that in Martin V the States of the Church again recognized in a practical way the domination of the pope (Von Reumont, "Gesch. d. Stadt Rom", Berlin, 1867).

Fifteenth-century Italy beheld the famous reform councils of Basle (1431), Ferrara-Florence (1438–39), the vain attempts at a parliamentary organization of the Roman Church, the equally vain efforts at reunion with the Greeks, the fall of Constantinople (1453), the rapid and influential development of a pagan-minded humanism (Symonds, "The Revival of Learning in Italy", New York, 1888; Burchardt, "The Culture of the Renaissance") and of the fine arts, the moral disorders of some high-placed ecclesiastics, offset however by an extraordinary development of sanctity (St. Bernardine of Sienna, St. John Capistran, St. Antonine of Florence, St. Frances of Rome, and others). For a while the well-known "five states" of Italy (Milan, Venice, Florence, Naples, Rome) represented the political order, but from the end of the fifteenth and the first half of the sixteenth century Spain and the pope divided the mastery of the peninsula until early in the eighteenth century. After vain efforts to establish its suzerainty at Naples and Milan, France was obliged to abandon the rich prize, and after the first quarter of the sixteenth century no longer repeated its earlier attempts at the hegemony of the peninsula. The Protestant Reformation made little headway in Italy, owing to the vigorous measures of the civil and ecclesiastical order, the antipathetic genius of the people, the Inquisition (reorganized at Rome, 1542), the Society of Jesus (1540), the Council of Trent (1545–63), the lives of holy reformers like St. Charles Borromeo, the new orders and congregations, and the combined religious, ecclesiastical, and theological activities known as the Counter-Reformation (Canità, "Gli eretici d' Italia", Florence, 1865–67; see Protestantism; Socinianism; Bruno, Giordano).

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries offer a rather sad spectacle in the various politico-ecclesiastical conflicts of Catholic states with the Holy See, in large measure, however indirectly, a result of the Thirty Years War (1618–48), e. g. Naples apropos of the so-called Monarchia Sicula; the conflict of Venice in 1605–07 with Paul III, on which occasion its state-theologian, Fra Paolo Sarpi, contributed powerfully to the Venetian opposition; the stubborn purpose of Victor Amadeus II, Duke of Savoy, to control fully all larger ecclesiastical appointments in his state; the offensive attitude of Louis XIV apropos of his ambassador's impossible privileges (1685), and other similar troubles. To these may be added the political workings of Jansenism (see Jansenius and Janseniæm; also Unigenitus) and Gallicanism (q. v.), and the concern for the safety of Christendom against the encroachments of Islam. By the Treaty of Utrecht (1713–14) Austria succeeded Spain in Northern Italy (Mantua, Milan) and later (1737) obtained the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. Savoy received Sardinia (1720) and by the middle of the century, Naples and Sicily, Parma and Piacenza acknowledged the rule of Spanish Bourbons. The ecclesiastical relations of the new powers with the Holy See, much troubled in the previous fifty years, were placed on a more satisfactory basis by a series of concordats, with Sicily in 1741, Sardinia in 1742, and Milan in 1745 (Vincenzo Nussi, "Concordata" etc., Rome, 1870). The Patriarchate of Aquileia, whose territory lay partly in Austria and partly in the Republic of Venice, was divided into two archiepiscopal sees, Görz for Austria and Udine for Venice. Italy was henceforth alternately the instrument of Spanish or Austrian policy, as was seen when in 1767 the Bourbons of Naples, Parma, and Piacenza expelled the Jesuits, and in 1786 when the ill-famed Synod of Pistoia promulgated in Italy the anti-ecclesiastical principles and measures of the Austrian Emperor Joseph II (see Prus VII, Pope; Ricci, Scipio). Religious life nevertheless flourished in Italy where the orders of the Redemptorists (1732) and the Passionists (1741) were established by their
respective holy founders, St. Alphonseus Liguori and St. Paul of the Cross. Ecclesiastical learning was also vigorously cultivated, and few ages show more erudite scholars than Muratori, Mansi, Bianchi, Bianchi, the Balleoni brothers, Zaccaria, Noris, and others.

The French Revolution put an end to the ancient Republic of Venice (1797) which fell to Austria, while the latter lost Lombardy, where the short-lived Cisalpine Republic of northern Italy was soon followed by the equally ephemeral Illyrian (Genoa, 1796), the Roman (1798), and the Porteinepan (Naples, 1799) republics. The Congress of Vienna (1815) restored the ante-revolution situation, save in Venice, which remained subject to Austria, henceforth mistress of northern and central Italy, the rest of Italy being subject to three other powers, the Kingdom of Sardinia (Turin), the papacy, and the Spanish Bourbons of Naples and Sicily. The second quarter of the nineteenth century is noted for a deep unrest in Italy against Austrian rule (the Carbonari, also Massini, Gioberti, Balbo, and others) culminating in a general adoption of all the instruments to the House of Piedmont whose prime minister, Cavour, was henceforth the soul of the new Italian unity (Kraus, "Cavour", Munich, 1901; Von Reumont, "Charakterbilder", 1886). The revolutionary agitations of 1848 led to the flight of Pius IX to Gaeta and the establishment of the Roman Republic, supported by the French under General Oudinot (July, 1849).

Prior to 1859, Italy was divided into the following states: the Kingdom of Sardinia, the Duchies of Modena, Parma, and Piacenza, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Pontifical States, the Republic of San Marino, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the Principality of Monaco. The Italian territories subject to foreign powers were: Corsica, belonging to France; the group of Malta, belonging to England; the Canton Ticino, belonging to Switzerland; Lombardy, Venice, Trent, Triest, and Istria, belonging to the Austrian Empire. In 1848 Piedmont went to war with Austria for Italian independence, but was defeated at Novara in 1849. Ten years later, however, Piedmont made an alliance with France, the second war of independence was declared, and Austria having been defeated at Solferino, 20 July, 1859, by the Piedmontese army, which consisted of the Two Sicilies and the Kingdom of Piedmont. In 1860 the Duchies of Modena and Parma, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the Roman- gnas (12 March), the Marches and Umbria (5 November), Naples and Sicily (21 October), were incorporated with Piedmont, and on 17 March, 1861, the Parliament was proclaimed the Parliament of Italy. On 10 May, 1866, by its alliance with Prussia, Italy obtained Venice; finally, on 20 September, 1870, Rome, having been taken by force of arms, declared its union with the Kingdom of Italy through the plebiscite (2 October) of that year.

In the formation of the new kingdom, says Minghetti, the revolution was the impelling force, not abandoned, however, to the hands of conspirators unorganized and without authority, but directed by the government of Piedmont, especially by Baron Cavour, who used it in the interest of Piedmontese supremacy, while he appealed to the sentiments of independence and of Italianism very strong in the people of northern Italy. By these two forces, ably manipulated, Cavour secured the political unity of Italy under the sceptre of Savoy. The unification of Italy was essentially an act of the Piedmontese Government; otherwise Cavour had no instrumentality to accomplish the object that once Italy was created it remained to create Italians, nor would there be still, after fifty years of legal unity, that latent germ of regionalism which occasionally asserts itself more or less vigorously. If the truth of history be regarded, it will be recognized that the idea of Italian unity arose towards the end of the eighteenth century; with the exception perhaps of Machiavelli, who thought Duke Valentino (Cesar Borgia) able to bring about the union of the Italians, not one of the great men of Italy like Dante, Petrarch, and others, and none of them considering Italian unity. Joachim Murat, by his Rimini proclamation (1815), first suggested this idea but was not understood and was left to perish alone. His idea, however, was taken up and was vigorously pressed by the enemies of Christianity who held that, if, under the pretext of the union of Italy, his temporal power should be wrested from the pope, the Church of Christ would of necessity come to an end. In 1871 Rome was declared the capital of the Kingdom of Italy. In that same year Pius IX refused to accept the Law of Guarantees (see Guarantees, Law of), and in 1877 issued the decree "Non Expedit" against Catholic participation in elections to the Italian Chambers. Pius X modified this measure (1905), and has permitted, under given circumstances, the participation of Catholics in the national elections.

**POLITICAL AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.**—(1) **Political Establishment.**—The Kingdom of Italy took the form of a constitutional monarchy, hereditary in the male line of the House of Savoy, according to the Salic law, and conformably to the Fundamental Statute that was promulgated by King Charles Albert on 4 March, 1848, for the Sardinian states. This statute which was extended to the provinces annexed by the Piedmontese realm, is similar to the French Constitution of 1830; according to it, sovereignty is divided between the king and the nation, the latter electing its representatives by popular suffrage. The legislative power is exercised by the king and Parliament, which consists of the Senate and of the Chamber of Deputies. With the exception of the right of initiative, which is common to all, these three governmental entities have each special functions: it is the province of the king to convolve both houses of Parliament, to close the sessions, to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies, to sanction and promulgate the laws. The Senate and the Chamber of Deputies have the functions of legislation and of watching over the finances, that is to say, the approval of the state budget, which is prepared by the executive branch of the Government; the houses of Parliament have also the function of announcing to the king the administrative matters; it is exercised through inter rogation, interpellation, inquest, committees of vigilance, and by other means. Laws of taxation, however, and those concerning the budget must first be approved by the Chamber. On the other hand, the Chamber is the only one to judge of the constitutional validity of the laws; if the king vetoes a law the house may be turned into a high court of justice, to pass upon cases of high treason and of attempts against the security of the State and to judge the ministers who may be accused by the Chamber of Deputies. The latter consists of 508 members who are elected upon the uninominal system by as many electoral constituencies, into which the nation is divided, there being an average population of 66,000 inhabitants for each constituency; the constituent districts may be changed every five years. The period between two general elections is called a legislatura, of which there have been 23, since 5 May, 1848, when the first legislatura was opened. The electoral franchise is exercised by all male citizens who, enjoying their civil and political rights, have attained the age of twenty-one years, know how to read and write (Electional Law of 28 March, 1895), and have the minimum value of a local cadastral tax. All citizens who have attained the age of thirty years and who enjoy political and civil rights are eligible to office. In 1909 there were 2,930,473 registered voters, an average of 11.7 per cent of the total population of the kingdom. In the last general election there were 1,905,957 voters, or 65.0 per cent of the total electorate.
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The Senate consists of members, partly hereditary (the princes of the blood), and partly appointed by the king for life, and without a definite limitation in their number, the age of forty years being a requisite for appointment. Since 1848, 1392 senators have been appointed by the authorization of the king, and counting the princes of the blood, who become senators at the age of twenty-one years and receive the voting power at the age of twenty-five. Senators and deputys enjoy personal immunity in penal matters, and therefore the Senate alone is competent to judge a senator; while, to judge a deputy, the magistrates must have the consent of the Chamber of Deputies. A senator or a deputy cannot be arrested, except in flagrante delicto. Their service is without financial remuneration. The king, as the head of the executive power, has the assistance of ministers who are responsible to Parliament; they constitute the cabinet, and are responsible collectively for the official acts of each. They are named and dismissed by the king, who, however, in the exercise of this function must hold in account the manifest tendencies of the Chamber; wherefore the government of Italy is strictly parliamentary. The minister-president of the council of ministers, representing the president of the council, represents the unity of action of the Government, in contradistinction to the diversity of functions among the different ministers. The royal prerogatives are: power to declare war, to conclude treaties of peace and of alliance, providing they do not touch the territory or funds, the right of pardon, and that of decree. In the relations of individuals to the State the constitution establishes the following general principles of justice: legal equality, individual liberty, inviolability of domicile, that of property and of public debt, liberty of the press, freedom of association and of meetings, and, finally, equity and proportion in taxation.

(2) Church and State.—The first article of the constitution of the kingdom declares the Catholic religion to be the only state religion. Nevertheless the Italian State and its jurisprudence are athetical; and in all solemn public functions, as in speeches from the throne, for several years past, any reference to the Divinity is studiously avoided, while the Government, whether conservative or liberal, has always been more or less covertly Voltairean and given to State-worship. The famous formula of Cavour, "A free church in a free state", which is a truth in the United States of America, is banished in public notices and in the documents of the Church; in all else the Church, in civil and in parliamentary matters, is subject to the State through a jus singulare, which places it in a worse condition than a private citizen in regard to property rights. The laws affecting the Church in Italy are mainly Articles 1 to 10 of the Fundamental Statute of the kingdom; the fundamental constitutional law of 13 May, 1871, on the prerogatives of the sovereign pontiff and on the relations of the State to the Church, called the Law of Guarantees; the law on the suppression of regular and of secular ecclesiastical legal entities, and on the rights of the clergy and of the clergy in the Church; the law of 5 August, 1867). By the eighteenth article of the constitution, excepting Rome and the six suburbanicarian bishops sees, the revenues from ecclesiastical benefices that are vacant belong as of royal right to the Crown, which, after deducting expenses of administration and those incurred in the interest of the vacant benefice, ought to apply the funds to purposes of worship and of charity, such as subsidies to priests and parochial needs, public worship, and the repair of poor churches. By the Law of Guarantees, the person of the sovereign pontiff is sacred and inviolable; offences committed against the king; royal honours are granted to him; the precedence recognized in him by Catholic sovereigns is maintained, and he is given the right to have guards for his person and for the protection of his palaces. The latter, that is the Vatican, the Palace of the Lateran and the Villa of Castel Gandolfo, with all their appurtenances, enjoy the right of extraterritoriality, which makes them free from visitations and inspections by public authorities, without the authorization of the pontiff and the consent of the sovereign ministry is freed from all intervention by extraneous authority, and to this end the pope is given the right to post his decrees on the doors of the churches of Rome, without censorship and with immunity for those persons whose office it is to make such publica- tions. The law also ensures to the sovereign pontiff free freedom of correspondence with the Catholic world, there being preserved to him, with this object, the head houses of the various religious orders in Rome, while he is given the faculty of establishing postal and telegraphic offices, with employees of his choosing, at his residence. The envoys of the pope and those accredited to him by foreign powers are guaranteed the prerogatives and immunities that are recognized in diplomatic agents, by international law. Finally, the law sets aside an annuity of $645,000, to be paid to the pope for the needs of the Holy See, for the maintenance of the pontifical property and the salaries of servants attached to his person; this annuity is exempted from taxation for all time. During a vacancy of the pontifical throne no judicial or political authority may interfere with the personal liberty of cardinals, and the Government is obliged to protect the meetings of the cardinals of external influence. The cardinalate is among the titles that make the holder eligible to the Senate, and, in matters of ceremonial precedence and of military honours, cardinals are made equal with the princes of the blood. The law assigns a sum of $30,000 to be paid to the Holy See for the maintenance of the houses of the various religious orders, excepting that of the Jesuits. The right of royal executur over the acts of the sovereign pontiff and that of royal placet over the acts of diocesan bishops, is exercised by the State only in regard to the use of ecclesiastical property and to the provision for the benefices, except in the city of Rome and in the suburbanicarian sees; this royal prerogative, however, is of a provisional nature, because it is to cease with the re-arrangement of ecclesiastical property that is promised by the Law of Guarantees. All religious character has been taken from maternity and from oaths; all intervention that the Church formerly exercised in public matters and in the internal concerns of the Church; in all else the Church, in civil and in parliamentary matters, is subject to the State through a jus singulare, which places it in a worse condition than a private citizen in regard to property rights. The laws affecting the Church in Italy are mainly Articles 1 to 10 of the Fundamental Statute of the kingdom; the fundamental constitutional law of 13 May, 1871, on the prerogatives of the sovereign pontiff and on the relations of the State to the Church, called the Law of Guarantees; the law on the suppression of regular and of secular ecclesiastical legal entities, and on the rights of the clergy and of the clergy in the Church; the law of 5 August, 1867. By the eighteenth article of the constitution, excepting Rome and the six suburbanicarian bishops sees, the revenues from ecclesiastical benefices that are vacant belong as of royal right to the Crown, which, after deducting expenses of administration and those incurred in the interest of the vacant benefice, ought to apply the funds to purposes of worship and of charity, such as subsidies to priests and parochial needs, public worship, and the repair of poor churches. By the Law of Guarantees, the person of the sovereign pontiff is sacred and inviolable; offences committed against the king; royal honours are granted to him; the precedence recognized in him by Catholic sovereigns is maintained, and he is given the right to have guards for his person and for the protection of
revenues, less 5 per cent for the expenses of administration, exception being made of parishes, confraternities, artistic buildings and those destined to religious cult, and the building necessary to these bodies in pursuance of their liturgical, educational, or charitable activities. Simultaneously with the suppression of ecclesiastical bodies, there was established an autonomous administration, independent of government superintendence, called Fondo per il Culto, with the function of administering the property of the suppressed bodies and, in the name of the State, disposed of the same, with a consequent transfer of about 25 per cent of its value and converted into public bonds, and of applying the income thereof to the purposes of religion and charity. The first duty of this administration was to provide for the charges upon the suppressed bodies in the cases of the existence of their personal incumbents, under the right to require such provision through process of law; the duty also devolved upon this establishment of paying pensions to the members of suppressed religious orders; and when the pensions become extinct, three-fourths of the capital sum registered in favour of the Fondo per il Culto, representing the property of the suppressed corporations, will revert to the State. The administration is also obliged to supplement the episcopal incomes that may not have reached the sum of $1200, as also to supplement the salaries of parish priests whose net income is less than $200. Under the pretext of distributing the remainder, as a revenue in equitable proportions among the different ecclesiastical and substantial reality to bolster up the Fondo per il Culto, upon which were imposed expenses beyond its resources, all the ecclesiastical bodies that were retained are obliged to make yearly increasing contributions, called "quota of assistance". As to the confraternities, the law places them under the power of the Fondo per il Culto to manage and direct their operations in this field, and authorizes the communes to require them to divert their resources to lay works, for local benefit, allowing the confraternity only a minimum annuity for expenses of religious worship. Wherefore, of all the property of the Church in Italy, the State has left only a small portion to the bodies that have been retained, and that under strong vigilance and censorship, as regards either the diminution or the increase of the property, and the expenditure made on them. Another proprietary body, to establish a fund for religious cult; and a small part was taken from the Church, to be returned to lay patrons who might ask for it, or to apply it to purposes of instruction and of beneficence. In short the greater part of the ecclesiastical property, under the guise of showing and by subtle expedients, was confiscated.

(3) Ecclesiastical Circumcision.—The territory of the kingdom is divided into 275 dioceses, including that of Rome, the Pontifical See, of which the bishop is the Vicar of Jesus Christ, successor of the Prince of the Apostles and Pontiff of the Universal Church; 16 dioceses are suburbanicarian, namely, Ostia and Velletri, Porto and Santa Rufina, Albano, Frascati, Palestrina, and Sabina. The titular cardinals, i.e. the suburbanicarian sees, the titular churches, and the diaconal ones existing in Rome number 75. Of Italian sees, 75 are immediately subject to Rome, of which 13 are governed by archbishops, and the remaining 62 constitute 37 ecclesiastical provinces, consisting each of a metropolitan see, which is one of the archdioceses, and of a number of suffragan sees that are governed by bishops. Among the metropolitan sees, that of Venice is that of a patriarchate. There are 11 abbeys and places which are declared to be the episcopal see of Rome, divided into parishes, of which there are 20,835 in all the kingdom; there are 60,446 churches, chapels, and public oratories, the service of which is maintained by 69,310 priests, regular and secular. The episcopal seminaries have 21,453 students. There are 30,564 religious; lastly, the Catholic educational establishments consist of 532 schools for boys, having 55,870 scholars, and 1302 for girls, with 102,491 scholars. The (4) Codice Napoletano, law of 1799, the civil, the commercial, the penal, the civil procedure, the penal procedure, the military, and the mercantile marine codes. The confusion between Roman and canon law, Germanic and Italian written law, and local common law obstructed the straightest path toward a more uniform motion of justice; and this gave rise to the first codifications, chief among which in Italy is the "Codice Vittorino", formulated in 1723, under Victor Amadeus II of Savoy; but the most important and best prepared work of codification was without doubt the "Codice Napoleonico", which was published on 21 May, 1804, and which served as a model for the civil legislation of almost every country in Europe or in America, including the states into which Italy was divided; the present civil code of the kingdom is directly derived from it, and for this reason, the history of French law is of great importance for the interpretation of Italian law. The authors of the Napoleonic Code were not carried away by the doctrines of the school of natural right, as were German legislators, but they sought in the countries de droit coutumier and in the jurisprudence of parliamentaries to guide the Roman written law, the Germanic law, and the law of the land most harmoniously to the needs of the modern state. Once this code had constituted itself into a nation, there was found the need of a common civil code which should unify the various codes of the former states of the peninsula; accordingly, on 25 June, 1865, there was published the Civil Code of the Kingdom of Italy, which went into force on 1 January, 1866. This code, which is based upon Roman law, is the only civil law of the land; and it needs some reformation to make it consonant with new economical and social needs. The code consists of three books and, like the French code, follows the clear and traditional Galian division: "Omnis jus, quo utinam, aut ad personas, aut ad res, aut ad actiones pertinet." Furthermore, the code is preceded by twelve articles which, as leges legum, lay down rules for the publication, the interpretation, and the application of laws in general. The very ancient rules of merchant guilds, which date back to the infancy of the kingdom, was taken away; the greatness of the Italian communes, were the source of the commercial legislation, and little by little they were systematically put in order, so that between the years 1200 and 1800 the various statutes, when approved by the overlord, came to constitute the written mercantile law of the different states of Italy. The provisions of Louis XIV (1673, 1851) the commercial law was codified and from this the Napoleonic Code was partly taken (1808). The latter was carried by French arms into many European countries. The Italian Code, the Albert Code of 1842, and the code of 1865 also modeled, on the French Code. But the one of 1865 was no longer in harmony with the modern conditions of traffic, it was succeeded on 1 January, 1883, by the new Code of Commerce, which shows progress by the wealth of its contents, by its recognition of the freedom of the contracting parties, by its simplicity of its forms, by the conciseness of its language, and by its efficacious protection of credit, especially in regard to exchange. Rumania adopted this code, almost literally, in 1857. Contrary to the order obtaining in civil matters, the law regards commercial matters as resting, primarily, on the code of commercial laws in the Staatsordnung. The commercial practice is divided into three places, one on civil law. The code is divided into four books; the first relates to commerce in general, the second to maritime commerce and to navigation, the third to bankruptcy, and the fourth to commercial causes.
Before the unification of Italy, each one of the states into which the country was divided had penal laws of its own; when, however, the union had been accomplished, the Albert Code of 1859, which was in force in Piedmont, was made applicable to the other states, excepting Tuscany, where there remained in force the Code of 1833. Reasons, analogous to those suggested for the civil code, or for sanitary matters, were apparent the need of a new penal code, and one was published on 30 June, 1889, which came into force on 1 January of the following year. This code deals first with transgressions and punishments in general, and then with transgressions in detail, and it adopts the usual, ordinary and exceptional applications of the law to felonies and misdemeanors. On the other hand, in the case of participation of several persons in a crime, by articles 63 and 64, the law accepts the sound doctrine of aiding and abetting, while the system of intensive cumulation of punishments of Bauer was adopted for cases of multiplicity of crimes and punishments. With regard to relapsed criminals the following principles were adopted: (a) relapse into crime aggravates its malice against the State; (b) such malice may be incurred even though the criminal has not hitherto been brought to the bar for his crimes; (c) the fact that a crime is habitual must be kept in sight; (d) a crime can only be branded as habitual if committed within a certain fixed period of time dating from last conviction. The system of punishment adopted, and known as the Irlandese, consisted in (a) a period of solitary confinement; (b) a period of hard labour with solitary confinement at night; (c) a period of intermediate imprisonment; (d) a period of ticket-of-leave. Imprisonment for life has taken the place of the death sentence, and periods of imprisonment for various offences vary from three days to twenty-three years, with or without hard labour according to the nature of the offence. Another penalty enforced for periods of not less than a month and not more than three years is enforced residence within assigned limits but without imprisonment. The only financial punishment is in the nature of a fine of not less than $2 and not more than $2000. Finally, there is the loss of civil and political rights, and of public office, which may be temporary, for periods varying from three months to five years, or it may be perpetual. The punishments for misdemeanours are arrest for not less than one day or more than 2 years, and fine, of not less than $0.20 or more than $400, and finally suspension from the practice of a profession or of a trade, for a period of not less than one year or more than two years. Domiciliary arrest and judicial reprimand may be substituted for other punishments; admonition, surveillance, and forced residence in a certain place are additional punishments. A recent law sanctions conditional condemnation. Causes that may nullify the trial besides the death of the accused, are amnesty, or withdrawal of the charge by the interested party, and prescription. A special reason for annulling a trial in cases of misdemeanour is voluntary surrender. Amnesty, pardon and rehabilitation are special causes of the nullification of a trial. In civil proceedings the usual course is to issue a summons citing the individual to appear for trial on a fixed day. Arrest in civil proceedings is the exception. Finally, as the present Code of Penal Procedure does not fulfil the modern requirements of a speedy trial and of fairness to the accused, several modifications have already been introduced, especially in the case for the purpose of avoiding the evils of long preliminary arrest, which violates the principle of habeas corpus, especially as the State pays no indemnity to those detained in prison while awaiting trial.

(6) Judicial Establishment. — Justice emanates from the people and is administered in his name by judges whom he appoints. To secure judicial independence judges cannot be withheld, and their residences cannot be changed. In Italy the function of the judge is limited to recognizing the existence of a law and to applying it. As regards the acts of the executive power, these, to be valid before the courts, must be conformable to the laws. For the administration of justice the kingdom is divided into five principal districts with High Courts of Appeal, for civil cases, subdivided into twenty districts with Courts of Appeal, for both civil and criminal cases and consisting each of one or more Assize Courts, which have only criminal jurisdiction; there are 162 districts of civil and criminal tribunals, and 1535 prelature, or petty-sessions courts having civil and criminal jurisdiction. Every commune, according to its population, has one or more arbitration judges, dealing only with civil cases. These unskilled officials may be called on to arbitrate money disputes, and they have the right to pass sentence in trials not involving sums of more than $20. The prator, who sits alone in his court, is the representative of the law in the popular imagination, and the State attaches to his office many functions of a purely administrative nature; in civil matters his court is also one of appeal from the sentence of the arbitration magistrates, and it is the court of first instance for civil cases involving sums of more than $20 and less than $300, and for cases of possession, whatever be the sums involved, excepting questions of taxation, in which only the tribunals have jurisdiction. The prator has jurisdiction in all felonies and misdemeanours in which the accused may be sentenced to confinement or imprisonment for not more than three months, to restriction of residence for not more than one year, or to a fine of not more than $200. Each tribunal consists of three members and has civil and commercial jurisdiction, as a court of first instance, in all cases that are above the competency of the prator, from whose judgments there is an appeal to the tribunal. In criminal matters, the Tribunal is the court of first instance, in cases not belonging to the jurisdiction of the prators or of the Assize Courts, and it hears appeals from the sentences of the prator. Jurisdiction in the second instance, in cases that are appealed from civil or criminal tribunals, belongs to the Courts of Appeal, which consist each of five members. The Assize Courts consist each of a president, who is a state judge, and of twelve citizens, called jurors, who are selected by lot from the district lists of those who are duly qualified by age and by intelligence to fill the office. The Assize Courts have jurisdiction in criminal cases in which the punishment may be imprisonment or other restriction of personal liberty, for a period of not less than five years or more than ten years, and also in cases concerning political rights, those relating to the offences by ministers of religion in the exercise of their functions, and to public violations of the liberty of the press.
The High Courts of Appeal are the supreme custodians of the law and of judicial functions, and therefore their jurisdiction is limited to matters of law, determining only the question of legal error on the part of inferior courts, confirming the sentence, if such error be found, or, on the contrary, annulling the sentence and ordering the rehearing of the case by another judge. If the new judge does not observe the principles of law laid down by the High Court of Appeal, the defeated party may again appeal to a competent High Court of Appeal, which will then upon deciding on the merits of the case, such decision to be final. Concurrency of the decisions of the High Courts of Appeal, which are established respectively at Turin, Florence, Naples, and Palermo, that of Rome is final in criminal, in revenue, and in ecclesiastical matters. According to statistics of 1904, published in 1908, civil proceedings were instituted in 1,909,356 cases, an average of 67 per cent of the population, the greater number of which originated in the southern provinces; the criminal statistics of the year show 304,685 indictments, 523,206 for felony and 281,477 for misdemeanours. The number of convictions, which in 1831 was 305,393, was increased by 24,352 in 1889, and by 378,250 in 1879, and by 433,095 in 1897, and by 484,060 in 1901. The results of the execution of criminal sentences, resistance to authorities, commercial dishonesty, crimes against public and private morality, and criminality among juveniles have increased. All suggest remedies for this condition of things, ignoring, either through stupidity or malice, the fact that the only remedy consists in religious education.

(6) **Administrative Departments.**—The ministries are the superior directing offices of the Italian administration at the capital; each one of them is under a minister assisted by a sub-secretary of state; they are eleven in number, and are known as Ministers of the Interior, of Foreign Affairs, of Finance, of the Treasury, of War, of the Navy, of Clemency, of Justice and of Religious Worship, of Public Works, of Agriculture, of Industry and Commerce, and of Public Education. There is a Council of State, the function of which is to advise the Government; it is a supreme assembly whose duty it is, besides that of administrative justice, to give the administration "opinions", which are called "obligatory" in those cases in which the law obliges the minister to seek such opinions; and in these cases, if the Council be not consulted, the administrative act is unconstitutional and legally void. The supervision of the state over the public administration, is the Court of Accounts; its chief functions are to examine all decrees, from the standpoint of their legality, and thereafter to affix to such decrees its approval, after which they become executive, to control and audit all income and expenditure, to represent the State in all litigation over public funds or other securities of the State or for which the State is liable, and over those salaried officials guilty of peculation or mal-administration of public funds.

(7) **Political Divisions.**—The kingdom is divided into 25 provinces, 296 counties, 1,805 borghi, and 8,920 communes. The province and the commune are self-governing entities, having a legal personality, exercising their activity in their own interest and indirectly in the interest of the State; they are, moreover, territorial organs of the national administration. On the other hand, the district is a hierarchical division of the province, while the borough is a division of the large communes or an aggregation of small ones and is an electoral territory, and in some measure a judicial and fiscal one. Although the commune is a natural division, like the Italian province, it is a creation of the Italian law. In the province, which is re- garded as a territorial division, the State exercises its functions through a prefect, who represents the central executive power and is assisted by a prefectural council and an office of his own. Under him are the sub-prefects at the capitals of districts, the executive and governmental offices, and the public charities. In the commune the State exercises its functions through a syndic, who, therefore, is a government officer. The province and the commune are bodies which are self-governing and are called respectively provincial council and communal council; they consist of a membership that varies in numbers according to population, there being from sixty members to twenty members in the provincial councils, and from eighty to fifteen in the communal council, all of whom are elected by the people. The president of the provincial council is the deputation, consisting of from ten to six members, according to population, while that of the commune is composed of the syndic and the communal board, which consists of from ten to two members called assessors. All of these bodies are drawn from their respective councils. The prefect, representing the State, exercises juridic control over all the acts of the provincial council, of the communal council, of the deputation, and of the boards; and if they be not according to law, he annuls them. By administrative control, a semi-elective assembly, called provincial board, over which the president presides. Crimes of public credit, all of those acts of the above bodies that are beyond those of normal administration, as are the alienation or the hypothecation of capital, expenses that are binding upon the budget for more than five years, regulations, etc. Finally, for weighty reasons of public order or because of maladministration, the Communal Council may dissolve the communal or the provincial councils and name, to replace them, a commissary for the commune, and a commission for the province, for the time required to reconstruct the councils.

(8) **Administration of Justice.**—In Italy, conformably with the principles of comune jura and jurisdictio, all differences between the citizen, the self-governing political divisions of the country, and the State are referred to the judicial power, whether it be a question of civil or of political rights; but controversies concerning private interests or damage through a given act of the Government are referred to two administrative bodies which have jurisdiction in litigation of this nature; they are the administrative board, in each province, and the Council of State (sections 4 and 5). The former determines the right and wrong, in the first instance, of cases of illegality on the part of provincial or of communal executive authorities; in the second instance, in acts that may be done by those officials to the detriment of private persons or of corporations in cases that are enumerated by the law. The Council of State judges in cases of appeal from the decisions of the provincial administrative boards (section 5); moreover it exercises jurisdiction alone in cases of incompetence, of abuse of power, or of violation of the law by a deliberating administrative body, except in regard to acts of government done in the exercise of political power (section 4). By this novel institution, which the executive power has borrowed from the judicial, the Staeutaxe, has been given for the first time to the State the not remote possibility of conflict between the judicial and the executive powers, the Court of Cassation of Rome, which is the supreme organ of the judicial branch of government, has the deciding power. Finally, for the protection of the property of the commune, under certain conditions, the actio popularis procuratoria may be exercised by any taxpayer, as actio suppletiva, to supplement the work of the communal authorities, or as actio correctiva, in pursuance of a right of the commune against its functionaries; but the actio popularis, or motion on behalf of the people, must be made before the usual magistracy, whether criminal or civil, excluding, however, the administrative magistracy.

(9) **Finance.**—The new Kingdom of Italy not only inherited the financial burdens of the former Italian
states, but also bore those of the debt incurred on account of the wars and of the expense of maintaining the army on a war footing, so that the first budget (1862) was closed with a deficit of nearly $30,000,000, which in 1866, on account of the war for the acquisition of Venetia, was increased to $81,000,000. From that time the financial policy of Italy has had no other purpose than to balance its budget, and consequently new taxes were imposed upon the people, e. g. by the taxation of the grinding of cereals and by an increase of one-tenth on all direct taxation, while the expense of civil administration was increased from $6,900,000 to little less than $4,000,000 by increasing the annexation of Venice; and the military expenses were reduced from $116,000,000 to little more than $37,000,000. As, notwithstanding these measures, the deficit continued, the law of 11 August, 1870, increased existing taxation and created new taxes, till finally, in 1875, the budget closed with a surplus of nearly $3,000,000; nevertheless the former deficits still weighed upon the treasury: 50 per cent of the receipts was disbursed in the payment of interest on debt, and the compulsory acceptance of paper currency encumbered circulation and maintained money at a high price. There were still no sound principles of taxation, and the State was not able to pay the public services, and that in the same period of time in which the public expenses for civil administration, which in 1886 were $3,750,000, are now more than $8,000,000, having increased 221-49 per cent, while those of the public services have increased about 219-53 per cent. The increase of $35,500,000 between 1868 and 1897-1908 in the ordinary military expenses is the result of an increase in the war budget of $17,200,000 and of $18,300,000 for the navy. The nominal capital of the public debt on 30 June, 1908, was $2,655,000,000.

The law on the administration of the property of the State and on the general accounts, and the corresponding rules and regulations, enacted, etc., are all conditions for accounting, whether in regard to economical or to property matters or in regard to the budget.

DEFENCE OF ITALY.—The Alps and the sea, the natural boundaries of Italy, constitute the best frontiers that a nation could desire, while they do not isolate the country from the neighbouring states. But the many political vicissitudes that Italy has undergone have left considerable portions of the Alpine region in foreign hands; consequently the northern barrier is partially nullified for defensive purposes; and with a view to strengthening the weakened points of the western frontier, many fortifications were built, as those of Zuccarello, St. Bernard, Tenda, Fenestrelle, Assietta, Cenisio, and others. The River Po constitutes the second line of defence, protected along its western portion by the fortresses of Genoa and of Alessandria; at the centre, by those of Piacenza and Pizzighettone, and on the east, by the Quadrilateral and by Venice. The Northern Apennines constitute the third line of defence; it is not as strong as the former two, but is none the less important because it is oblique to the line of invasion; on the west it has the fortresses of Genoa and of Piacenza, and on the east those of the Apennines. Italy in fact has no lack of good positions for defence, but they are of little value if the army be not supported by a powerful fleet. It should be noted, as history shows, that the determining events of war in Italy always take place—or thus far have done so—on the Continental portion of the territory. The present parliamentary committee of inquiry for the army, in order to correct the serious defects in the defence of the frontier, has proposed the establishment of new defensive works costing approximately $28,000,000 for the land frontiers, and $10,000,000 for the coasts.

(1) Army.—The army is divided into the permanent army, the movable militia, and the territorial militia. All citizens capable of bearing arms are obliged to serve in the army or in the navy (law of 6 August, 1888); this compulsory service extends from 20 to 39 years of age, partly in the ranks and partly under unlimited leave; while service in the ranks should be three years, a new law of 29 May, 1898 reduced service to two years. After the eighth or ninth year of compulsory service, the citizen is transferred from the permanent army to the movable militia, where he remains registered until 31 December of the twelfth year of compulsory service, and during the last seven years of it he is in the territorial militia. The recruitment is done under the mixed system, that is, national, with movable posts, in time of peace, to strengthen the sentiment of union; and territorial in the case of
mobilization; the first is based upon the district, and the second upon the regimental reserves. In 1907 and 1908, 225,000 men constituted the army on a peace footing; on this basis the average strength of a company of infantry is 80 men. About 29,300 men of all arms (except cavalry) on unlimited leave are recalled each cent. Therefore more than one third of the men are not with their company, as compared with 75 who are recalled in Germany, 100 in France, and 135 in Austria-Hungary. The contingent of men that must join the ranks is determined annually by Parliament and is thereafter divided among the provinces, the districts, and the companies. The first draft; that is, the over and above that number are given unlimited leave and belong to the second draft. Whether a man will belong to the first or second draft will depend on the number of men in his year, on the number of recruits wanted, on the chance of his drawing a high number from the urn, and on the number of recruits dismissed as unfit for military service. The third draft consists of young men who have been declared capable of bearing arms, but who are exempt from service in the ranks for family reasons, determined by law (law of 15 December, 1907). Soldiers registered in the second class, that is, those not called to arms because of fitness or other, but for a combined length of time of not more than six months (law of 24 December, 1905). The rapid or progressive increase in the losses of the yearly contingent, notwithstanding the growth of the population, is alarming. In the decade comprising the call of those born between 1864 and 1873, 1.84 per cent of those registered were excused from service; in the call for 1906 the proportion of those excused from service was 26.09 per cent, 14.48 per cent of these on account of weak chests and 19.24 per cent on account of diseased constitutions, making 39.72 per cent excused. Nevertheless, more than one third of those excused from service owe their release to lack of nutrition or to the effects of vicious living, and in 1909, 39 out of every 100 conscripts have been found unfit to bear arms; in the southern provinces those unfit for service amount to three-fifths of the whole; Sicily furnishes an average of 1 out of 5 competent for the service, and Sardinia only 1. The insufficiently nourished come from the country, and those broken down by vice from the towns and large centres. There is a markedly increasing reluctance among the young men in answering the call to arms and in presenting themselves for military training. In 1896, 5.1 per cent were disaffected; in 1905, 8.1 per cent were disaffected; in 1906, 8.8 per cent; and in 1906 alone the number of defaulters was 11,443. Nor does the number seem to have diminished in succeeding years.

The law of 20 June, 1897, divides the Italian army in time of peace into twelve army corps of two divisions each; the territory of a division is subdivided into eighty-eight districts, the recruiting for each division being under the charge of from two to seven of these districts in time of peace, while mobilization is under the charge of the regimental reserves. Each division consists of two brigades of infantry, one of cavalry and one of artillery, besides two skeleton regiments of infantry and one section of artillery of the movable militia. The Bersaglieri and the Alpine regiments are under the direct orders of the commanders of army corps. The territorial service of troops and of administration is under territorial direction, 13 for the territorial service, 15 for the engineers, 12 for the sanitary corps, 12 for the commissary department, and 13 military tribunals. There are 96 regiments of infantry, two of them grenadiers, and 94 of the line, and consisting each of 3 battalions of 4 companies, each company in time of war consisting of 3 battalions, with 1 cyclist company for each regiment: 7 Alpine regiments that are divided into 22 battalions and 76 companies. The permanent army and the movable militia are armed with the Mannlicher-Carcano rifle, model 91, calibre 6.5 mm., with a fixed magazine for 6 cartridges; the territorial militia is armed with the modification of the Wetterly rifle. The total force of the army in time of peace consists of 15,765 officers, 272,817 non-commissioned officers, 5,886 men, and 52,548 horses and mules. In 1908 the army on a war-footing amounted to 3,401,978 men, that is, 272,817 men under arms; 488,407 men on leave; 372,560 in the movable militia, and 2,274,757 belonging to the territorial militia, besides 39,067 officers.

The infantry and cavalry officers are educated at the Military School of Modena, and those of the artillery and of the engineers at the Military Academy of Turin; there are, moreover, the military colleges of Naples and of Rome for primary military education, while the School of War, the School of Application for the artillery and the engineers, the Central School of Marksmanship for artillery, furnish instruction to officers; non-commissioned officers are taught at the Central Military School of Defence; and surgeons are trained at the School of Applied Military Hygiene.

The service of military intendency is exercised by a twelve months' service of peace beginning the 1st of May and ending the 31st of August; and by a twelve months' service of peace beginning the 1st of August and ending the 31st of July, with vigour and vigilance, and by twenty-four commissariat sections, stationed with each commander of an army corps or of a division. This body, in time of war, has the duty of assuring the subsistence of the army, of managing the funds, and of providing the uniforms and equipment; while the accountants have charge of the accounts and administration in these matters. The regiments provide themselves by means of the fixed allowance granted by the State per man and per day of service as follows: daily pay 10 centimes; food 61 centimes; uniform 12 centimes; extras 16 centimes, total, 90 centimes, or nearly 20 cents. This allowance goes to meet the cost of mess, uniform, etc., and is used by each regiment to best advantage.

The permanent Council of Administration of the regiment has charge of the regiment's administrative matters and is responsible to the ministry. This system, which has the merit of being a well-ordered decentralization of power does not satisfy present military requirements; whether through the interference of the central administration or because the assignment is no longer in harmony with economical conditions, the messes of the regiments are either in danger to be abolished.

(2) Navy.—For the administration of the navy the coasts of the Kingdom of Italy are divided into three maritime departments: Spezia, Naples, and Venice. The department of Spezia comprises the coast from the French frontier to Terracina, the island of Sardinia and its dependencies, and the Tuscan Archipelago; the department of Naples comprises the coast from Terracina to Cape Santa Maria di Leuca and the island of Sicily and its dependencies; the department of Venice includes the littoral from Cape Santa Maria di Leuca to the Austrian frontier. The twenty-four maritime divisions are divided into two admiralty sections, the navy, consisting of the depots of stores and of coal, the maritime fortifications and the sixty-four telegraphic posts along the coast are all under their respective maritime division. The recruiting for the navy is, in principle, identical with that for the army: all citizens registered in the twenty-four maritime divisions are liable to be called to naval service, those whose time are put on unlimited leave, and are at once transferred to the permanent army, so that, with the exception of the officers, there is scarcely any naval reserve. In 1906 they were in the naval service 23,143 men, 85 on the coasts, and 2,065 officers; total men, 25,277. In 1906, 75 per cent of the time are put on unlimited leave, and are at once transferred to the permanent army, so that, with the exception of the officers, there is scarcely any naval reserve. In 1906 there were in the naval service 23,143 men, 85 on the coasts, and 2,065 officers; total men, 25,277. In 1906, 75 per cent of the time are put on unlimited leave, and are at once transferred to the permanent army, so that, with the exception of the officers, there is scarcely any naval reserve.
There were, moreover, 2 battleships, 1 protected cruiser, and 10 torpedo-boats in course of construction. In 1909–1910 the expenses on naval construction are estimated to amount to $30,000,000. Italy is the seventh of the naval powers and has an efficient tonnage of 150,980. The naval academy at Leghorn and the engineering school of Venice provide officers for the navy.

Education.—In the Kingdom of Italy education is divided into a primary or elementary, secondary and superior, and the scholastic administration, in general, is under the Ministry of Public Instruction, which is assisted by a partly elective Superior Council, consisting of thirty-two members; local educational administration, excluding universities, is under the prefect, so far as the communes and the heads of families are concerned, is, as yet only a laudable wish, seeing the very slow diminution in the numbers of those unable to read and write, to the census of 1872, constituted an average of 68.7 per cent of the population; the same class, in the census of 1901, furnishes a corresponding average of 52.3. The illiterate among the army conscripts born in 1886 numbered 50,642, or 29.3 per cent of the enrolled, and the corresponding figures of the navy conscripts born in 1885 were 5833 or 48.7. In the marriages contracted in 1906 there was a proportion of 29.3 per cent of the men, and 42.1 per cent of the women illiterate. The causes of permanent illiteracy, notwithstanding expenditure and govern-

ARCHIDIOCESES AND DIOCESES OF ITALY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburbicarian Seas</th>
<th>Piedmont and Liguria</th>
<th>Lombardy and Venice</th>
<th>States of the Church</th>
<th>Tuscany and Emilia</th>
<th>Southern Provinces</th>
<th>Sicily</th>
<th>Sardinia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
<td>Pistoia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>Parma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
<td>Conegliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
<td>Udine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a provincial scholastic council, the superintendent of studies, the board of vigilance for the technical and nautical institutes, and the district inspectors of the elementary schools. Elementary instruction is divided into two grades, the lower and the superior, each of which is divided into three classes, and the law compels the communes to furnish it; it is, as a rule, gratuitous, and parents and guardians are obliged to see that their charges receive it between the ages of six years and twelve years, unless they provide otherwise for their children’s instruction (laws of 15 July, 1877, and 8 July, 1904). The State furnishes primary instruction also, in schools established in foreign parts. No citizen is allowed to vote who has not passed the examination at the end of the primary course. The normal schools train the teachers of the elementary schools. It is evident, however, that compulsion in regard to this elementary education, both
dent effort, are poverty of workmen’s families, which are constrained to make their children earners before they have reached the age of twelve years; the moral debasement of the teachers who, with some exceptions, have become apostles of socialism and atheism, because of their miserable remuneration, which is inferior to the salary of a workman; the want of care on the part of the communes in regard to the hygiene of the schools, which makes the school a repellent rather than an attractive centre; the fact that the agricultural population is scattered through the country, which makes profitable attendance at school difficult for the children; many children leave school without having acquired instruction, knowing scarcely how to write their names. What are the remedies? There is only one: the liberty of elementary teaching in the broadest sense of the word, not only as regards the teachers but also as regards the course of studies, ex-

VIII.—16
cept on questions of morality; and the establishment of premiums in proportion to the number of children who obtain the diploma of the course.

schools had in all 3759 students, a decrease of 445 during the preceding five years. There are five conservatories of music belonging to the Government,

### ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>Pupils per 1000 Inhab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Asylums</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>271,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary, various</td>
<td>83,289</td>
<td>2,548,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>105,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festive and Autumnnal</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>72,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary for Girls</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal for Boys</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal for Girls</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the law of 13 November, 1859, secondary instruction is of two kinds, classical and technical. The classical course of the first grade is given in the gymnasium (colleges) and extends over a course of five years; that of the second grade is given in the lyceums, the course being three years. The technical instruction is also of two grades, the first, given in the technical schools, lasts three years, and the second, in the technical or in the nautical institutes, the course lasting four years. Ordinarily the burden of secondary instruction is divided among the State, the province, and the communes.

### SECONDARY INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>Pupils per 1000 Inhab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>34,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycées</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Schools</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>55,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Institutes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nautical Institutes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of other special courses of secondary instruction that are not wholly allied with those to which reference has already been made are given by the State under the ministry of Public Instruction and under that of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, and also by the autonomous divisions of the kingdom.

### SPECIAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Establishments</td>
<td>Students per 100,000 Inhab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Practical Agriculture</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools of Agriculture,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agro, Iglesias, Calabria)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Schools</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools of Industrial Arts</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>20,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Schools</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools for Women</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Institute (Naples)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are thirteen government institutes for the study and assistance of the fine arts, and as many other establishments of the same kind that are not governmental, with two hundred and twenty-seven teachers. In the school year of 1903-1906 these Palermo, Parma, Pavia, Pisa, Sassari, Siena, and Turin. There are four free universities, those of Perugia, Camerino, Urbino, and Ferrara. Higher education is also furnished by three law schools connected with the lyceums of Aquila, Bari, and Catanzaro, by the three
polytechnic schools of Milan, Turin, and Naples, by the Finishing Institute of Social Science at Florence and by the Scientific and Literary Academy at Milan. In the scholastic year of 1893-1894, these universities, endowed by 22,289 students, an average of 71.9 per 100,000 inhabitants; and in the scholastic year of 1905-1906 the number of students was 27,069, an average of 81 per 100,000 of the population. The professors are divided into ordinary (who are irre- movable), extraordinary, and special lecturers, and prov- dents. The university is governed by a rector, appointed by the king on the recommendation of the body of ordinary professors, by an academic council, consisting of the rector and of the presidents of the different faculties, and by the general assembly of professors. There are other institutions connected with public instruction, as the libraries, some of which enjoy the prerogative of incorporation, while others are merely the property of the State, of the commune, or of the province. The public has not the same free use of all these libraries, there being a distinction between those that are accessible to the public and those that are accessible to other institutions, or to offices, as those of the min- istry, of the Senate, of the Chamber of Deputies, etc.; the first are public in the full sense of the word, while the second are so only upon certain conditions. Only persons over the age of sixteen years may receive books from them. Among these is the library of the University of Bologna, consisting of a number of books, and of the libraries of other universities. These are per- mitted to be taken out of the library only in special cases. There are approximately 1830 libraries open to the public, 32 of them belonging to the Government.

Other educational institutions are: the national boarding schools for boys, and those for girls, under the direct supervision of the Ministry of Public In- struction; institutions belonging to the provinces or to the communes; endowed institutions; the seminaries; and private boarding schools. Those of the Govern- ment are 43 in number for boys, and 8 for girls, and according to the last statistics the former had 4165, and the latter 593 pupils. The others together num- ber 880, with 60,000 boarders. There are no precise statistics as to the teachers in boarding schools for boys; it is known, however, that in 1906, 30 of the directors, approximately, were laymen, while the re- mainder were ecclesiastics. In 320 boarding schools, all the teachers were laymen; in 215 all were ecclesiastics, and in the remainder of these schools the teachers were, some ecclesiastics, and some laymen. The number of persons who are connected with the administration and with the teach- ing in these schools, is placed out with nearly 10,000, of whom only 3587 are lay, the remainder belonging to the secular clergy or to religious congregations. New publications, including the new editions of works already published, amounted to 9975 in the year 1900, at which time statistics on this subject were discontinued; this was exclusive of monthly publications, which, in 1898, amounted to 971. There were 151 new daily papers, and the total number of periodicals in 1905 was 3120, published in 363 cities, 815 of these publications dealing with politics, and 147 daily. Lombardy has the greatest proportion of periodicals (544), and the Basilicata the smallest (11).

Charities.—Charity, which was unknown to pagan- ism, is a Christian growth that found a fertile soil in Italy, the home of the head of the Christian Church, and under his influence that country developed a wealth of benevolent institutions for the relief of every form of suffering. While the Constitution has promul- gated laws to prevent the waste of the funds of the public charities (Sess. VII, "De reform.", c. xv; Sess. XXV, "De reform.", c. viii). And the stream of charity flows on, notwithstanding the exclusion of the Church from all intervention in charitable works, for, between 1881 and 1900, there were founded 1629 new charitable in- stitutions, with a combined capital of nearly $27,000,- 000, while the donations and legacies of that same period, to already existing establishments amounted to 31,529, with an aggregate value of $56,000,000. There are 27,078 charities with a capital of $400,000,000, an average of $12 per inhabitant; their combined income is nearly $34,000,000, and their charitable disbursements amount to $22,000,000. The English system of official charities (taxation on behalf of the poor) is unknown in Italy, where charity is left to the voluntary acts of individuals, and as we shall see is made compulsory only in fixed cases. The law of 17 July, 1890, limits the action of the State to protecting and favouring the free exercise of public charities, to watching over the opera pie, which are the chief benefactors of the poor, and to reforming them by the union of several, by statutory revision, and by the changing of their purpose. In Italy the forms in which charity is generally practised are: aid to infants (founding asylums, orphanages, asylums for education, hospices, etc.); aid to those who are in want and unable to work (recreation for mendicants, dormitories, etc.); eleemosynary aid (to hospitals, hospices, etc.); hospital aid (hospitals, insanes, hospitals, etc.); and monti di pietà. The law requires the existence of a charity association in each commune for the care of the interests of the poor; it's members are taken from the communal council and of the municipal councilors, according to the population. The charitable asso- ciation and the opera pie are required by law to give aid in urgent cases, to support the needy who are unable to work, where there is no local home for the poor, and to care provisionally for orphans and for deserted mothers, for the blind, and for the deaf mutes who are poor.

Besides the work of institutions that are created for the purpose, the State, the province, and the commune are obliged to provide otherwise for certain public charities; thus the commune is compelled to provide sanitary service, doctors, midwives, surgeons, and medicines for the poor, when they are not provided for by any institution. The province is bound to care for the insane poor, and the law divides between the province and the commune the expense of the support of foundlings. Lastly, the support of those who are unable to work regularly, is the charge of the State, of the province and the commune are unable to provide for them. According to the last statistics, in 1899, the provinces spent $5,000,000 in public charity; the provinces spent $4,600,000; and the State, in 1905-1906, spent $1,500,000. There were assisted by orphan asylums and dormitories directly by the State and by the provinces in the five years from 1902 to 1906, 127,536 children, of whom 8456 were born in lawful wedlock. According to the last statistics of the monti di pietà; on 31 December, 1903, there were 327 of these establish- ments that loaned money on 4,790,358 pledges to the amount of $4,140,000, of which 1,405,206 were re- viewed for an amount of $4,889,205; there were also 4,425,422 redemptions for an amount of $13,348,493 and 412,336 sales of a total amount of $769,345.

All institutions of public beneficence are under the watchful care of the Government with the assistance of a superior council for public aid and charity, which has an advisory function. In all that concerns eco- nomic ends, local vigilance is exercised by provin- cial commission; and the administration of any opera pie may be dissolved for grave reasons, but must be reconstituted.

Hygiene AND HEALTH.—Sanitation, which is an important juridical and social function of the modern State, has made no little progress in Italy, where it is regulated, in general, for all the kingdom by the law of 7 August, 1907, by other sanitary laws, and by cor-Responding rules and regulations, while it is regulated for local purposes by various provincial and communal
regulations of importance. The sanitary laws provide for the safety of the public health by a series of imposts on the citizen, and by police restrictions regarding the practice of medicine, of surgery, of the veterinary art, of pharmacy, and of obstetrics, all of which professions are subject to supervision and have special obligations imposed upon them for the security of the sick and for the gratuitous attendance of the poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDICAL-SURGICAL SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL ESTABLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE PRAC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITIONERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to prevent the spreading of infectious diseases, physicians are obliged to denounce cases of infectious disease, and citizens are obliged to submit to visitations, to disinfections, and to vaccination. Under this head comes a special supervision over aqueducts, the sewage system, and the right of the Minister of the Interior to prevent or to suppress evils regarded as causes of contagious disease. There are, moreover, burial laws, the chief end of which is to prohibit the burial of bodies elsewhere than in cemeteries, exception being made in favour of illustrious personages and of private burial grounds that are situated in the country and not open to the public. Landing in Italy is made under special supervision, for which purpose there is a medical officer in each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSTETRICAL SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBSTETRICAL ESTABLISHMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREE PRACTITIONERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY AND NAVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Africa; Italy also entered upon the course of colonial conquest, and consequently it has come into the possession of territories, and has created protectorates and zones of influence on the western coast of the Red Sea, on the Gulf of Aden, and on the Indian Ocean.

The direct possessions of Italy are the colonies of Eritrea and Italian Somalia (Benadir). The colony of Eritrea originated in the possession of the Bay of Asab, which was proclaimed by the law of 8 July, 1882. The colony extends along the western coast of the Red Sea from Cape Kasar (18°24' N) to Cape Doumeirah (12°30' N) on the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb. From Cape Kasar the boundary line has a generally south-western direction to the confluence of the Khor-Um-Hagar and the Setit Rivers. The southern or Abyssinian boundary is formed by a line drawn towards the west from the confluence of the Khor-Um-Hagar and the Setit Rivers, along the latter stream, to its confluence with the Maiteb, and follows the course of the latter to the Mareb at the confluence of the Mali-Ambessa; it follows the Mareb River as far as its junction with the Beless, and then the latter river, after which it follows the course of the Muna, and turning to the south-east, at a distance of 37 miles from the coast, it reaches the frontier of French Somalia, near which the boundary line leaves the extremity of Doumeirah and follows the watershed line of the promontory of the same name for one mile, and then the place called Bisidro on the Weima; from this point it turns east and south-east as far as Daddato (Italo-British Agreements of 15 April, 1891; 7 December, 1898; 1 June, 1899; 16 April, and 22 November, 1901; Italo-French Protocols of 24 Jan-

port. There are many pure food regulations, the first of which is the right of inspection and that of providing evidence of suspected articles by the sanitary authorities, the establishment of laboratories for chemical analysis, the prohibition of slaughtering unhealthy animals, or of any animals outside of the regular slaughter houses. Special attention is given to preventing the adulteration of wines and to the prevention of skin diseases.

Hygiene is under the Minister of the Interior, and in charge of the prefects, the sub-prefects and the syndics, under him. He is assisted by a superior sanitary council, or advisory body, and by a General Directory of Sanitation; the prefect is assisted by a Provincial Sanitary council; the former care for the sanitary conditions of the whole kingdom; the latter, for the communes of the whole province. In each province there is a physician and a provincial office whose function is to watch over the sanitary service, the hygienic conditions of the communes, the sanitary institutions and the execution of the sanitary laws; the physician investigates the causes of diseases and inspects pharmacies, hospitals, etc. There is a provincial veterinary whose business is to supervise disease among animals. In each commune, moreover, there is a sanitary officer, who, besides his supervisory duties, must inform the syndic and the provincial physician of all circumstances that may in any way affect health or hygiene.

Foreign Possessions.—(1) Colonies.—At about the time of the Mahdi's revolt in Upper Egypt, European nations were seized with the desire of acquiring

uary, 1900, and 10 July, 1901; Italo-British Ethiopian Convention of 15 May, 1902; Italo-Ethiopian Conventions of 10 July, 1900, and 16 May, 1908). The Archipelago of Dahlac and the minor islands along the Dancala coast belong to the Colony of Eritrea. The Colony of Somalia consists of that region of eastern Africa that lies between the Sultate of Obbia, which is an Italian protectorate, the Giuba River, the Gulf of Aden, Ethiopia, and Eritrea. The boundary between Somalia and the Ethiopian Empire is a line that, beginning at Dolo, reaches the confluence of the Daua and the Ganaule Rivers, and, to the north of the fourth parallel, it takes an easterly course, as far as Uebi-Scebeli, which is located at the extreme north of the Badili Addi country; from Uebi-Scebeli it follows a north-easterly direction towards British Somaliland.

The Colony of Eritrea, within its present boundary, has an area of nearly 50,000 sq. miles, of which the Dahlac Archipelago occupies 530, and its population is 279,531 inhabitants, of whom 3849 are Italian. The area of the Colony of Somalia may be estimated at 146,000 sq. miles, with half a million of inhabitants who, along the coast, are Somalis, and in the interior, Gallas. The plain of Danakil and the coast country about Massowah, in Eritrea, are worthless for agricultural purposes, but the higher portion of the territory and the land which are intermediary between it and those of the coast and which are watered by the Barka and by the Anseba Rivers, may become fertile through a good system of irrigation. In the colony there is little industry and less commerce, as is shown by the statistics
of the custom house of Massowah, which show imports for a value of 2 millions of dollars, and exports for $600,000, approximately. The United States send to the country annually, it sends to the custom house, in English bottoms, for a value of about $40,000, and they export a small amount of hides. Commerce by caravan with Ethiopia increases continually; in 1906 it amounted to $1,200,000 for imports, and nearly $2,000,000 for exports. The commerce of the country is in the hands of Greeks, and of Russians, Indian merchants. Hair, musk, wax, medicinal plants, and especially pearls and mother-of-pearl, are exported. The imports of the Colony of Somalia for 1906 amounted to $720,000, and the exports to $540,000. The principal exports include animal products, hides, hides, and skins. The arrivals at the port of Massowah numbered 146 steamships, and 1893 sailing vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of 164,148; the clearances were 147 steamers and 1874 sailing vessels, with an aggregate tonnage of 204,814. In Eritrea there are 10 post offices, for both the postal and telegraph services; there are 4 of the kind in Somalia. The number of postal orders issued in the Colony of Eritrea in 1904–1906 was 28,619, to the value of $3,850,000, and 14,507 were cashed, for an aggregate sum of $2,770,000. There were 2395 deposits in the postal savings banks, amounting in all to $100,000, and there were 11,752 savings withdrawals of $70,000. The number of telegrams sent was 15,697, and of those received, 2610. The telegraph system of Eritrea consists of (a) Massowah-Assab and the Assab-Perim cables, which connect with the wires of the Eastern Telegraph Company; (b) the land line of Massowah-Assam-Cheren-Balderar, which at Kassala connects with the Sudano-Egyptian wires; (c) the Asmara-Addis-Abeba line. The law of 14 July, 1907, authorized the expenses for the establishment of wireless telegraph stations at Asmara, in the Colony of Eritrea, and at Mogadiisch, Brava, Merka Giumbai, Barbada, and Lugh, in Somalia. The first railroad line, the Massowah-Saati, 164 miles long, was opened in 1887; thereafter, the line was extended to Ghinda, and so attained a length of 43 miles. In 1907 the Ghinda-Asmara line, 31 miles long, was opened to traffic. The colonial budget is approximately $2,000,000, both for receipts and expenses; and the nation's African expert, Dr. G. S. (1899), estimated that they would amount to $1,700,000, exclusive of provisions and materials to the army and to the navy. The corps of colonial troops consists of 126 officers and 4451 men, 193 horses, 521 small mules, 147 mules, and 10 scouting camels. Each one of the colonies is governed by a civil governor, assisted by a council, who are placed under his orders. The chief centres of population in Eritrea are Massowah (population, 10,000), situated upon an islet that is connected with the mainland by an embankment, Keran (population, 2000), and Asmara, the capital. The chief places in Somalia are the ports of Brava, Merka, Mogadisch, Marshack, and Obbia. The administration of justice is under colonial judges, and is based upon Moslem jurisprudence (Cheri), the common native law (Testur), and the different religious regulations and habits.

(2) Protectorate.—Under the protectorate of the Kingdome of Italy are (a) the territory of the Sultan of the Migiartina, which extends along the coasts of the Gulf of Aden and of the Indian Ocean from Bender-Zia (49° E. of Greenwich) to Cape Bovven in the Bay of Dar-es-Salih (Convention of 7 April, 1889, and 18 August, 1904); (b) the territory of Nogal, the head of the coast, which is called the Maziad territories, this territory extends from Cape Bovven to Cape Garad (Agreement of Illig, 5 March, 1905); (c) the territory of the Sultan of Obbia, which extends from Cape Garad to the northern boundary of the territory of Varasek, 2° 30' N. (Treaty of 8 February, 1889). The limits of the zone of influence in Somalia were established by the Italo-British protocols of 24 March, 1891, and 5 May, 1894. They first established the western and the southern boundaries by a line which, from the extreme point of the Gulf of Elba, at a degree of northern latitude, and from there to the thirty-fifth meridian E. of Greenwich, where it reaches the Blue Nile. The second protocol established the boundary by a line from Gildesa towards the eighth degree of N. latitude, along the north-eastern frontier of the Sudan; but, from the point of Gildesa, if from that point, the line follows latitude 8° N. to its intersection with parallel 48° E. of Greenwich, whence it goes to the intersection of latitude 9° N. with the parallel of 49° E. of Greenwich, and thence on follows that meridian to the sea. Bender-Zia, although situated to the west of the forty-ninth meridian, is included within the sphere of Italian influence.

By the agreement of 7 June, 1902, the Chinese Government recognized the concession of Tien-tsin, in China, a small territory that is situated on the right of the Pei-ho River, which constitutes the southern boundary for nearly a mile. From the 18th century, this territory was in the hands of the Austrian and the Russian, and is conterminous with the Russian concession, and is on the west with the Austrian concession, while the lands of the Imperial Chinese Railroad Company form its northern boundary; its area is nearly 18 sq. miles and it contains a village and some salt mines; its native inhabitants number about 17,000. The concession is in charge of the consul, who is assisted by an administrator.

For the history of Italy see the medieval annals, best collected in the monumental work of Muratori, Scriptores Romanorum, etc. (200–1600) in folio with modern notes. In the new ed., small 8°, Citra di Castello, 1900; see also his valuable Annali d'Italia—from the beginning of the Christian era to 1749—(12 vols., Milan, 1744–49); RIGORDI, Histoire du drapeau italien, 1700–1800; Balian, Storia d'Italia (2nd ed., Modena, 1894); Heid, Storia della constituzione dello Stato italiano, 1870–1902; SIMONI, Histoires des républiques italiennes du moyen âge (Paris, 1817–18), non-Catholic and often prejudiced; LANZANI, I contenuti dei privilegi regolanti la polizia civile ecclesiastica, 1715–1900, and his Romanische Forschungen zur Reichs- und Reichsstaatschichte Italiens (Innsbruck, 1894); MANN, History of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages (St. Louis, 1894, etc.), and Pأنشأ, History of the Popes since the End of the Middle Ages, tr. Anthorbus (London and St. Louis, 1902); VAN DUEREN, Pouvoir temporel des Papes (Lille, 1890); PERTILE, Storia del diritto italiano (Padua, 1887–88); LITTA, Famiglie celebri italiane (Milan, 1815–69); COPPI, Le università in Italia nel medio evo, 2nd ed. (Milan, 1868); SIMONI, Storia della politica degli Stati uniti d'Italia, and his L'Italia (3 vols., 1855–69); AMORE, L' italo cattolica (1885–95); DEZON, Monds., V, 1856, 45–51. Histories of Italy should be read with caution, as writers are frequently moved by anti-papal or anti-Catholic prejudice or passion.

LUIGI TACCHI VENTURI.

ITALIAN LITERATURE.—Origins and Development.—The modern language of Italy is naturally derived from Latin, a continuation and development of the Latin actually spoken among the inhabitants of the peninsula after the downfall of the Roman Empire. It is still disputed how far this spoken Latin was identical with the classical literary language of Rome, the Latinus toquus, and how far it was a mixture of the two—the latter, owing to the changed social conditions, predominating. A small number of words derived from Greek are in part relics of the epoch of Byzantine domination, in part words introduced later through the Greek commerce: the Saracen invasions have left traces in a very few Arabic words, chiefly in Sicily: a certain number of words have come indirectly from the Latin through French or Provençal; even the long centuries of Teutonic conquests and inroads caused a comparatively slight influx of words of Germanic origin.

In the "De Vulgari Eloquentia" (i, 10–16), Dante speaks of the "many discordant varieties of the Italian vernacular", and rejects them all in favour of the "illustrious, cardinal, courtly, and curial vernacular in Italy", the standard and ideal national
language, "which belongs to every city of Italy, and seems to belong to none, and by which all the municipal dialects of the Italians are measured, weighed and compared. These dialects fall into three groups: (1) Ligurian, Piedmontese, Lombard and Emilian, and Sardinian, which form a Gallo-Italian group apart from the vernacular of the rest of the peninsula; (2) Venetian, Corsican, Sicilian, Neapolitan, Umbrian, and the dialects of the Marches and of Rome, which, though divergent from the true Italian, form one system with it; (3) Tuscan. But the national and literary language, the "illustrious vernacular", is one and the same throughout the land. This language is not an artificially formed Italian, stripped of the accidental peculiarities of place and race; but substantially the vernacular of Tuscany, and more particularly of Florence, as established by the great Florentine writers of the fourteenth century, adopted by those of other districts in the Renaissance, and formulated by the famous Accademia della Crusca, which was founded in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

From the seventh century onwards, we begin to find traces in extant documents of the use of the vernacular, in the shape of forms that are more or less Italian inserted into the corrupt Latin of the epoch. Italian familiar names of men and Italian names of places rapidly appear; and, in a document of 960 in the Archives of Montecassino, a whole sentence, four times repeated, is practically Italian: "Sao ko belle terre, per kelle fini que ki contene, trente anni le possette parte sancti Benediktii (I know that these lands, within these boundaries that are here contained, the party of St. Benedict has possessed them thirty years). A confessio, or formula of confession, from an abbey near Norcia, probably of the end of the eleventh century, shows passages still nearer to the Italian of to-day. Fifty years later we meet literary composition in the vernacular. The inscription formerly on the cathedral of Ferrara, of 1135, consists of two rhyming couplets of Italian verse. Four lines, known as the "Cantilena Bellunese", also in rhymed couplets, inserted in a fragment of a chronicle, allude to the treaty of Castelbarco by the people of Belluno in 1193. In a contrasto (a dialogue in verse between lover and lady) by Raimbaut de Vaqueiras (c. 1190), the lady answers in Genoese to the Provencal advances of the poet. The "Ritmo Laurenziano", a cantilena in praise of a bishop by a Tuscan, and the "Ritmo Caseinese", an obscure allegorical poem in the Apulian dialect, are both probably of the end of the twelfth century. To the same epoch belongs a series of twenty-two sermons in a northern Italian dialect mixed with French, published by Wendelin Foerster, which are the earliest extant specimens of vernacular preaching in Italy. The Thirteenth Century (Il Duecento).—The Italians naturally regarded the language and traditions of Rome as their own, and still clung to the use of Latin while a vernacular literature was already flourishing in France and Provence. Italian literature, strictly speaking, begins with the early years of the thirteenth century. Among the influences at work in its formation must first be mentioned the religious revival wrought by St. Francis of Assisi and his followers, bearing lyrical fruit in the lauda, the popular religious song, especially in Central Italy. St. Francis himself composed one of the earliest Italian poems, the famous "Cantica del Sole", or "Laudes Creaturarum" (1225), a "sublime improvisation" (as Paschal Robinson well calls it) rather than a strictly literary production. The growing self-consciousness of the individual states and cities later gave rise to the chronicles and local histories. Provencal troubadours, who settled at the petty Courts of Ferrara and Monferrato, or passed southwards into the Kingdom of Sicily, brought the conventions of their artificial love poetry with them. Equally influential was the Franciscan movement, though in a totally different spirit, was the impulse given to letters by the highly cultured, but immoral and irreligious court of the Emperor Frederick II and his son Manfred, whose Kingdom of Sicily included not only that island, but also Naples and all the south of the peninsula.

Dante wrote: From the fact that the royal throne in Sicily, it came to pass that whatever our predecessors wrote in the vulgar tongue was called Sicilian" (V. E., i, 12). The writers of this Sicilian school were drawn from all parts of Italy. They did not normally use the Sicilian dialect, but wrote in a vernacular practically identical with what became the literary language of the whole nation. Their productions are almost exclusively love poems derived from those of Provence. Frederick himself (d. 1250) and his chancellor, Pier delle Vigne (d. 1239), wrote in this fashion. Many of these poets, like Ruggiero de Amicis (d. 1246), Arrigo Tenta (d. 1247), and Percivalle Doria (d. 1264), were of high social position, notable for their historical knowledge of the epoch, dying on the scaffold or the battlefield; but their lyrics are lacking in individuality, conventional, and artificial in sentiment and treatment. Noteworthy poets of this school are Giacomo da Lcntino, "Il Notaro", who was one of the emperor's notaries in 1233; Rinaldo d'Aquino, a kinsman of St. Thomas, whose lament of a girl whose lover had gone on the Crusade was probably written in 1242; Giacomo Pugliese da Morra, in whom we find a trace of popular realism; and Cielo dal Camo, or d'Alcamo, whose contrasto, "Rosa fresca aulentissima", now held to have been written after 1231, is strongly tinged with the local dialect of Sicily. A personal note is struck in the pathetic poem of King Enzo of Sardinia (d. 1272), "S'evo trovasse", written from his prison at Bologna, which brings the Sicilian epoch to a dramatic close. The last poet of the Sicilian school is Guido delle Colonne (d. after 1288), who also wrote "Historia Trionfo" in Latin prose, and is mentioned with praise by both Dante and Chaucer.

The earlier Tuscan poets, such as Pannuccio dal Bagno, of Pisa, and Folcacincho de' Folcacincheri, of Siena (c. 1250), are closely associated with the Si-
cians. But from the outset the Tuscans did not restrict themselves to erotic poetry, but sang of religious, satirical, and political themes as well. Guittone del Viva (1230–94), known as Fra Giuntone d’Arezzo, shows how well he imitated the Provençal love lyric, but writes with vigour and sincerity in his religious and political poems, especially in his canzoniere on the defeat of the Florentines at Montaperti (1260). He is also the author of a collection of letters, one of the earliest achievements of Italian prose. By the middle of the century, in addition to the canzone, a new type of poetry—so-called dolce stil nuovo—evolved, which Dante speaks of as a new style, of which Guido Guinizelli of Bologna (d. 1276), who founded the school of Tuscan poetry, was the most notable. Of a far higher order, however, is the poet who inaugurated the “Vita Nuova,” Dante’s most personal work, the “Vita Nuova,” and thereby founded a school to which the poets of the last five centuries have belonged, even as their predecessors had adhered to that of Guittone. The chief of these is Guido Cavalcanti (d. 1300), the chosen friend of Dante. He composed an elaborate canzone on the philosophy of love, in which poetry is smothered by metaphysics; but in his minor lyrics, original in motive and personal in sentiment, he brought the “ballata” and the sonnet to a degree of perfection previously unattained. With him and Dante is associated another Florentine poet, Lapo Gianni (d. 1323), whose work belongs to this epoch although he outlived it. In another vein, we have the humorous and satirical pieces of Boccaccio (d. circa 1370) and the “Tesoretto” of Brunetto Latini (d. 1294), an allegorical didactic poem which influenced the external form of the “Divina Commedia.” The religious poetry of Umbria, developing under Franciscan influence, culminates in the mystical laudi of Jacopone da Todi (d. 1306), and珗is truly inspired sacred poetry that the world has seen.

In comparison with the poetry, the Italian prose literature of this century is insignificant. The chief chronicler of the epoch, Fra Salimbene di Parma (d. 1288), wrote in Latin; Brunetto Latini composed his encyclopedic work, the “Tesoro,” in French. Many of the literary productions formerly assigned to this period are now known to belong to a later epoch, and it is impossible to say with certainty whether those that are authentic should be placed at the end of the thirteenth or at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Among these are the “Cento Novelle Antiche,” a collection of stories drawn from various sources, and the “Tavola Ritonda,” an Italian version of the Romance of Tristram. Fra Ristoro of Arezzo, in 1282, completed an elaborate treatise on cosmography, “Della Composizione del Mondo.” Most of the prose of this epoch is simply translated from the Latin or French. To Bono Giamboni (d. after 1296), a Florentine who italized Brunetto Latini’s “Tesoro,” are ascribed three ethical treatises (possibly of a later date), based upon medieval Latin models, but not mere translations; the most important of these, the “Introduzione alle Virtü,” derived in part from Boethius and Prudentius, is a striking religious allegory in which the Soul is led by Philosophy to the palace of Faith to witness the triumph of the Church, and herself attain to spiritual freedom.

The Fourteenth Century (Il Trecento).—Through the triumph of the Guelfs, the chief place in Italian culture is now held by Florence instead of Sicily, which becomes mainly republican in temper (even when supposedly imperialist) and Italian literature has become more popular. The philosophical glory of St. Thomas causes even belles lettres to be deeply tinged with scholasticism; while the growing antagonism to the political actions of the popes, particularly during the Babylonian Captivity of Avignon, gives an anti-clerical tone to much of the poetry and prose of the century. At the close of the epoch, the revival of classical studies begins to make itself felt. In the hands of three great Tuscan writers—Dante Alighieri (1265–1321), Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374), and Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375)—the national literature and the national language appear in full maturity and artistic perfection.

In his “Vita Nuova” (c. 1295), Dante still belongs to the preceding century, while uplifting the ideals of love set forth by Guido Guinizelli to the heights of Catholic mysticism. His “Rime”, more particularly his “Convivio” (c. 1306—unfinished, but the earliest monumental work of Italian prose) he intended to bring down the scholastic learning of his age to the understanding of the general reader. The “Divina Commedia” (1314–21), the noblest expression of the Italian spirit in poetry and a landmark in the history of man, sums up the intellectual gain and the spiritual progress of the nine centuries since the fall of the Roman empire, while faithfully depicting the highest aspirations and whole moral atmosphere of the poet’s own epoch. In spiritual insight, dramatic intensity, sureness of touch, and terseness of expression, it has never been surpassed. In it modern Europe first produced a masterpiece to rival those of the classical world. Petrarca brings the canzone and the sonnet to their ultimate technical perfection in his lyrical poems, the “Canzoniere” or “Rime”, a series of miniature paintings of all the varying moods of the soul passing through earthly love and patriotic enthusiasm to find its rest in religion. His “Trionfi”, a poem in tercets, in ten cantos, deal with the same matters in allegorical fashion, giving a symbolic representation of his own life. In his voluminous Latin writings—letters, treatises, and poems—he appears as the first of
the Humanists, the precursor of the Renaissance. The worshipper of Dante and intimate friend of Petrarch, Boccaccio, in his "Filostrato" and "Teseide," established *ottava rima* (previously only used in popular verse) as the normal measure for Italian narrative poetry. In his "Ameto" he introduced the prose pastoral and the *verneale* elegy. His grossly immoral "Fiammetta" may be said to inaugurate the modern psychologica novel. In the hundred stories of the "Decameron," he gave perfect artistic form to the *novella*, or short story, imbuing it with modern life. Written in an ornate and poetical prose, lacking in simplicity and directness, the "Decameron" gives an unsurpassable picture of certain aspects of fourteenth century society, but is disfigured by obscenity, and permeated by a superficial and sensual ideal of life.

This century in Italy, as elsewhere, is the golden age of vernacular ascetical and mystical literature, producing a rich harvest of translations from the Scriptures and the Fathers, of spiritual letters, sermons, and religious treatises no less remarkable for their fervour and unctue than for their linguistic value. From the earliest years of the *Trecento* have come down the sermons of the Dominican, B. Giordano da Rivalto (d. 1311). The exquisite "Fioretti di San Francesco," now known to be a translation from the Latin, date from about 1328. Prominent among the spiritual writers, who thus set themselves to open the Church's treasury to the unlearned, are the Augustinians, B. Simone Fidati da Cascia (d. 1348) and Giovanni da Salerno (d. 1388), whose works have been edited by P. Nicola Mattioli; and the Dominicans, Domenico Cavala, a copious translator, and Jacopo Passavanti (d. 1357), whose "Speechio della Vera Pentenenza" is a model of style and language. The admirable letters of B. Giovanni Colombini (d. 1367) and the mystical poetry of his follower, Bianco dall' Anciolina (El Bianco di Siena), have the glowing fervour, the Divine madness, of the first Franciscans. In a less exalted vein, the epistles of the monk of Vallombrosa, B. Giovanni dalle Celle (d. 1396), extend from the forties to the nineties of the century. Supreme above them all, a figure worthy, from the mere literary point of view, to stand by Dante and Petrarch, is St. Catherine of Siena (1347-80), whose "Dialogo" is the greatest mystical work in prose in the Italian language, and whose "Letters" have hardly been surpassed in the annals of Christianity.

Minor poets are numerous. Cecco Angiolieri of Siena (d. circa 1312), the Italian Villon, wrote humorous and satirical sonnets of amazing vigour and originality on subjects mainly drawn from low life. Folgore da San Gimignano (d. after 1315) pictured the fashionable existence of the young nobles of Siena with the touch of a painter. Guittone d'Arezzo (d. 1337), also known as Cino da Pistoia (d. 1337), also won renown as a jurist; the friend of Dante, whose "Rime" he imitated, his best amatory and political lyrics are hardly unworthy of his master. Francesco da Barberino (d. 1348), who was influenced by French and Provencal models, is the author of two somewhat insipid allegorical didactic poems. A higher note is struck by the Florentine exile, Fazio degli Uberti (d. after 1368), whose "Dittamondi," a long poem in *terza rima," was intended as an earthy parallel to Dante's Sacred Poem, doing for this world what he did for the other" (Rossetti); he surpassed himself in splendid patriotic lyrics, which give spirited expression to the new national Ghibellinism of Italy. Antonio Pucci da Firenze (d. 1374) is the chief literary representative of the popular poetry of the age.

With the early years of the century begins the series of chronicles and diaries in the vernacular. Dino Compagni (d. 1324), to whom is also ascribed the "Intelligenza," an allegorical poem in *novella*, describes the factions of the Bianchi and Neri in Florence with patriotic indignation and impartiality. Giovanni Villani (d. 1348) and his brother Matteo (d. 1363) wrote the whole story of Florence from the legendary origins down to the year of the latter's death; their work, in addition to its supreme historical value, is a monument of the purest Tuscan prose. Minor chroniclers arose all over Italy; we will mention only the two Sienese, Agnolo di Tura and Neri di Donato, and the Benedicente Abbot Niccolò of Gavello, who wrote the "Libro del Polistore," a kind of unexcelled history (still only in part published) which ends in 1367. In fiction, the "Reali di Francia" of Andrea da Barberino, written at the end of the century, renders the chivalrous tales of Charlemagne and his Paladins from the French; the "Pecorone" of Ser Giovanni Fiorentino (c. 1378) is a collection of tales in imitation of Boccaccio. Franco Sacchetti (1335-1400), less artificial than Boccaccio, adapted the *novella* to a moral purpose; he also wrote evangelical sermons, and poems, both playful and serious, frequently of real lyrical beauty, in which the literature of the Florentine *Trecento* comes to a pleasant close.

**The Renaissance.**

There are two distinct epochs in the history of the Italian literature of the Renaissance: the earlier, including the greater part of the fifteenth century (Il Quattrocento), from the return of the popes from Avignon (1377) to the invasion of Charles VIII (1494); the later, comprising the sixteenth century (II Cinquecento), from the defeat of the French at Fornovo (1495) to the devolution of the Duchy of Ferrara to the Holy See (1597). Allowing for some necessary overlapping, the literature of the epoch falls into two corresponding periods.

The *Quattrocento* is an intermediate period between the mainly Tuscan movement of the fourteenth and the general Italian literature of the sixteenth century. It has developed under the auspices of the princes who were forming hereditary states on the ruins of the communes, and is at first marked by the continuance of the work (inaugurated by Petrarch):
of recovering classical writers and copying manuscripts, while the vernacular was despised, and authors attempted to write Latin verse and prose in the manner of the ancients. Greek scholars flocked to Italy, and the influence of Plato, translated into Latin by Leonardo Bruni (d. 1444) and Marsilio Ficino (d. 1499), became paramount. The latter, who was bent on harmonizing Plato with Christianity, and who also translated Plotinus, was instrumental in founding the Florentine neo-Platonic Academy. Some of these Humanists were purely pagan in spirit, like Poggio Bracciolini (d. 1459), Antonio Beccadelli, called Panormita (d. 1471), and Francesco Filelfo (d. 1481). But there were others, such as the Camaldolese monk, Ambrogio Traversari (d. 1439), Palla Strozzi (d. 1462), Giannozzo Manetti (d. 1459), Guarino Veronese (d. 1460), Vittorino da Feltre (d. 1446), and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (d. 1463-94), who attempted to reconcile their worship of antiquity with their living faith in the Catholic Church. Among these Christian Humanists were two popes, Nicholas V (d. 1455) and Pius II (d. 1464). A vivid picture of the literary life of the age is given in the Vite d’uomini illustri of the Florentine bookseller, Vespasiano da Bisticci (1421-98). In the earlier part of the century, vernacular literature is of minor importance. Leonardo Giustiniani of Venice (1388-1446) wrote popular love poetry and religious lyrics, some of which have been attributed to Jacopone da Todi. The Florentine architect, Leon Battista Alberti (1406-72), is the author of artistic treatises and moral dialogues, especially the four books of Della Famiglia, in a Tuscan tinged with Latinisms. Fco Belcari (1410-84) wrote mystery plays and religious poems, and also lives of B. Giovanni Colombini and his followers, with the devout simplicity of an earlier age. Also in religious literature we have the ascetical letters of B. Giovanni Dominici (d. 1419), a strenuous opponent of the pagan tendencies of the classical revival, and the vernacular sermons (1427) of St. Bernardine of Siena.

In the latter part of the century, mainly through the influence of Lorenzo de’ Medici and the dukes of Ferrara, Italian again triumphed. Three poets appear, almost of the first class: Lorenzo de’ Medici himself (1449-92), Angelo Poliziano (1454-94), and Matteo Maria Boiardo (1434-94). Of extraordi-inary versatility as a poet, print of his striking personality especially in his subjects drawn from country life, shows a keen feeling for nature. The ballate and sonette of Poliziano have the true lyrical note, while his Stanze per la Glostra are impregnated with the spirit of Florentine painting, and his Orfeo handles a mythological subject in the style of a religious mystery play. Boiardo’s Canzoniere, somewhat Petrarchan in tone, but largely original in form, is the finest collection of love poems of the century; his unfinished Orlando Innamorato, a poetic romance in ottava rima, gives fresh life to the Carlowingian legends by informing them with the spirit of the Arthurian cycle. Among later poets of the Medicean circle, Luigi Pulci (1432-1484), in his Morgante, treated the adventures of Orlando with a fantastic mingling of seriousness and japery; Girolamo Benivieni (1453-1542), a noble mystical and patriotic spirit who outlived his age, sang of celestial love “according to the mind and opinion of the Platonists” (1457), and became the lyrical interpreter of the aspirations of Savonarola. At the northern courts, the blind poet Francesco Bello followed in Boiardo’s footsteps with his Mambrìano (1496); the Ferrarese courtier Antonio Tebaldeo (1463-1537), whose poetry all belongs to the fifteenth century, exaggerated the defects of the age and versified the politics of his patron, Antonio Camelli, called II Pistoia (1440-1502), produced an extraordinarily vivid series of satirical sonnets which are historical documents of high importance. In the South, the two chief literary figures are the Neapolitans, Giovanni Pontormo (1429-1503) and Jacopo Sannazaro (1458-1539). The former, who gave his name to a famous academy, wrote only in Latin, which, alike in prose and verse, he used as though it were his own tongue. The latter owes his fame to his Latin “Elogio Piscatorum” and his Italian Arcadia, in prose and verse, which influenced the literature of Elizabethan England; his chief Latin poem, De Partu Virginis, was not published until 1526. The most important Italian historical work of the fifteenth century is the Storie di Milano of Bartar- dino Corio (1459-1510), of special value for its minute and vivid picture of the reigns of the dukes of the Sforza family.

The Cinquecento witnessed the Tuscan vernacular finally established as the literary language of Italy, and the classical studies of the past bearing fruit no longer in pedantic imitation, but in a national literature which is classical only in its perfection and in its adherence to the rules of the Latin language of ancient Rome. Machiavelli’s political and historical works, admirable in clarity, brevity, and efficiency of expression, penetrating in insight, and at times noble in patriotic aspiration, are among the masterpieces of the age. Machiavelli’s works are, therefore, a testimony to the vitality of Italian literature and the enduring power of the Renaissance spirit.
Stained with the licentiousness and lack of noble ideals that characterize the age. His "Satires", or epistles in verse, give a perfect portrait of the poet himself, and sketch the life of the times with a master's hand. In his "Rime", notwithstanding occasional Petrarchan imitations, we recognize a sincerity of utterance and an originality of thought which are rare in the lyrical poetry of that day. Next to these two giants stands Francesco Guicciardini (1483–1540), pitiless investigator of men's secret motives in his "Storia d'Italia" and his political writings, endowed with a rare power of historical portraiture, but devoid of enthusiasm and all lofty aspirations.

A higher ideal of life and conduct is expressed in the "Cortegiano" of Baldassare Castiglione (1478–1529), the picture of the perfect gentleman, which at the close rises on the wings of Platonic love to the mystical contemplation of celestial beauty. Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), the literary high-priest of the century, touched the latter theme, less nobly in his "Asolani"; his poetry is little more than a servile imitation of Petrarch; but his "Prose", in which he formulated the rules of the Italian language, and the zeal with which he set the example of editing the vernacular classics, were influential in creating a standard of good taste. To the same poetic school as Bembo belongs the Petrarchists, Francesco Maria Molza (1489–1544), Giovanni Guidiccioni (1500–41), Giovanni della Casa (1503–50), all noted for perfection of technic rather than for originality of thought; Vittoria Colonna (1490–1547), whose saintly life illumines her poetry, Gaspare Stampa (1523–54), in whose lyrics we find the faithful delineation of a profound and unhappy passion; and the great artist, Michelangelo Buonarroti (1475–1564), raised above the others by loftiness of thought and rugged vigour of style. A versatile Southern, Luigl Fusillo (1510–68), shows marked individuality alike in his lyrics and in his idyllic poems. Among burlesque poets are the witty but immoral Francesco Berni (1498–1533), and Teofilo Folengo (1492–1544), whose "Macaroni", or "Baldus", is a burlesque epic written in an extrava- gant but subtle blend of Latin and Italian, the poesia maccheronica, of which he was the perfecter but not the inventor.

Didactic poems in blank verse, in imitation of Virgil's Georgics, were composed by Giovanni Rucellai (1475–1526) and Luigi Alamanni (1495–1556), while Gian Giorgio Trissino (1478–1550), one of the chief literary critics of the age, employed the heroic metre in his "Italia liberata dai Goti". Numerous writers strove to tread in Ariosto's footsteps with romantic epics, of which the "Amadigi" of Bernardo Tasso (1493–1569), the father of Torquato, is the most successful. In the religious poetry of Celso Magno (1536–1602), we find the renovation of spiritual ideals caused by the Catholic reaction, and this is no less marked in Torquato Tasso (1544–95), with whom the poetry of the Italian Renaissance ends. Modelled upon classical rules, Tasso's "Gerusalemme Liberata" is at once a heroic and a religious epic, stately and musical, in which the minor charms of romance and sentiment are not lacking. He likewise won a high place as lyrist and dramatist, and, at the end of his life, composed a didactic poem, "Il mondo della cura"; the merits of which are theological rather than poetical.

The Renaissance in Italy produced no great national drama. The Italian comedy of the Cinquecento is directly imitated from Plautus and Terence, but attempts to adapt the plots and characters of the Latin in playwrights to the conditions of life in the sixteenth century. Here, as in the romantic epic, Ariosto stands supreme. His earlier comedies (1508–1509) are written in prose, his later (1520–1531) in verso sdrucciolo, blank verse ending in a daicty, intended to reproduce the trimeter iambic of the Latin comedians. They give us vivid pictures of the times; the dialogue is natural and brilliant, the characterization superficial but clever; but they are disfigured by deplorable obscenity. Between Ariosto's earlier and later comedies come the "Calandr" of Bernardo da Bibiena (1513) and the "Mandr agola" of Machiavelli (after 1512), both in prose; the latter is a work of real dramatic power, but for its immorality to the last degree. This, unfortunately, applies to much of the comedy of the century, and is found at its worst in the plays of the infamous Pietro Aretino (1492–1556). The tragedies are poorer, and have no relation with the life of the age; they are mere rhetorical imitations of the Greek tragedians and of Seneca, the "Torrismond" of Torquato Tasso (1587) alone rising above mediocrity. Far more attractive are the pastoral lyric dramas, Tasso's "Aminta" (1573) and its worthy rival, the "Pastor Fido" of Battista Guarini (1585), masterpieces of their kind, in which what is artificial and conventional in sentiment is idealized and made acceptable by the melodiousness of the poetry with which it is clothed.

Besides Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Florence produced a number of admirable historians, especially Jacopo Nardi (1476–1555), Donato Giansotti (1492–1572), and Benedetto Varchi (1526–65). At Venice, beside the official histories of Bembo and Paolo Paruta (d. 1598), we have the voluminous "Diarii" of Marino Sanudo (1466–1536), which enable us to reconstruct the public and private life of the republic day by day. Angelo di Costanzo (1507–91) wrote the history of Naples, with simplicity. The autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini (1500–71) and the series of "Vite" of the painters, sculptors, and architects, by Giorgio Vasari (1531–74) bring the artistic side of the Renaissance vividly before our eyes. Bernardino Baldi (1533–1617), also an idyllic and didactic poet of an austere spirit, composed admirable monographs on the lives and times of the first two dukes of Urbino. Two novelists, Matteo Ban-
dello (1480–1560) and Giambattista Giraldi (1504–75), have the merit of being less immoral than Boccaccio. Among minor prose treatises the “Galateo” of Giovanni della Casa, a manual of good breeding, has made its title proverbial. The translation of Tacitus by Bernardo Davanzati (1529–1608) is a model of style. Among grammarians and literary critics, besides Bembo, Trissino, and Varchi, should be mentioned Leonardo Salvisti, who played a leading part in the foundation of the “Accademia della Crusca” in 1582. The spiritual element in vernacular literature is represented by the “Vita e Transito della beata Osanna da Carpi” by Girolamo Montolivetano (1505); the “Trattato del Purgatorio” of St. Catherine of Genoa (d. 1510); the mystical writings of her godchild, the Carmelite nun, Battista Vernazza (d. 1587); the Letters of St. Catherine de’ Ricci (d. 1590); and the “Combattimento Spirituale” (circa 1385) of Lorenzo Scoppa, still so widely used among us for purposes of devotion.

The Decadence.—The creative genius of the Italians had been exhausted by the Renaissance, and the life of the nation crushed down by the foreign yoke of Spain, imposed on the peninsula by the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559). Already in the latter part of the sixteenth century the decline had set in; it lasted through the whole of the seventeenth (II Seicento), and the first half of the eighteenth century (II Settecento), which together form the least fruitful epoch in the history of Italian literature. Exaggeration and extravagance, with corrupted taste and frantic striving after novelty (in part a reaction against the rigid classicism in which the Renaissance ended), are the characteristics of earlier seventeenth-century poetry, of which the most typical work is the “Adone” of the Neapolitan poet, Giovannibattista Marini (1569–1628), a profoundly serious poet with a pretended ethical intention. Alessandro Tassoni (1565–1635) parodied the heroic poem in his comic epic, “La Scaccia Rapita,” and assailed the Spanish oppressors of his country in his prose “Filippiche.”

A new school of lyrical poetry was inaugurated by Gabriello Chiabrers (1552–1637), who attempted, with only partial success, to adopt the metres of the Greek and Roman poets for Italian verse. He was followed, with less refined taste and more virility, by Fulvio Testi (1593–1646), whose patriotic poems strike a higher note. Among satirical poets, natural fruit of a corrupt age, is the Neapolitan painter, Salvatore Rosa (1615–73). The inevitable reaction against the inflated manners of the Marinisti led to a movement for reforming Italian poetry by a return to nature and simpler ideas. To this latter school belong Vincenzo Ficaja (1642–1707), a deeply religious poet, the best of whose sonnets are the poetic gems of his age, Benedetto Menenzi (1649–1716), a Florentine priest, who was also successful as a writer of satires; and Alessandro Guidi (1650–1712), called “the Italian Pindar,” who introduced greater freedom into the rhythmical structure of the canzone. This movement culminated in the famous “Accademia dell’Arcadia,” inaugurated at Rome in 1690, which soon sank into an affected pastoralism and artificial simplicity, as false to nature and to true poetry as the mannerisms which it was intended to combat.

Although the greatest Italian of the epoch, Galilei Galilei (1564–1642), belongs to science rather than to literature, his writings are distinguished by his highest literary excellences. Francesco Redi (1626–1698), a distinguished physician, was also a poet and philologist. Three Jesuits are among the chief prose writers of the century, combining devotion and learning with a literary style which, though far less free than Galilei’s from the faults of the age, is unsurpassed by any of their contemporaries: Father Orazio Pallavicino (1607–1667) composed the official history of the Council of Trent, in refutation of that of Fra Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623), and ethical and religious treatises, of which the “Arte della Perfezione Cristiana” and the four books “Del Bene”, philosophical dialogues held in the villa of Cardinal Alessandro Orsini at Bracciano, are still read; Father Daniele Bartoli (1608–83), a prolific and brilliant author, wrote the history of the Society of Jesus in a style which is typical of the Seicento at its best; Father Paolo Segneri (1624–94) reformed the art of religious oratory and freed it from the corruptions of the times. Prominent among historians is Cardinal Guido Benvenuto Enrico Caterino Davila (1576–1631), who wrote on the Civil Wars of France. A little later, the study of history was set upon a scientific basis by Giambattista Vico (1668–1744) and Lodovico Antonio Muratori (1672–1750). Vico showed how history is illumined by the application of jurisprudence and philosophy; Muratori, that worthy priest to whom the student of the Middle Ages owes more than to any other man, taught by his own example that history must be founded in documentary research, and prepared the ground for subsequent scholars. In philology and literary criticism much was mentioned Carlo Dati (1619–76), who is associated with the Accademia della Crusca (of which the first Dictionary had been published in 1612); Gianvincenzo Gravina (1664–1718), who was one of the founders of the Academia; and the Sienese, Girolamo Gigli (1660–1722), the zealous editor of St. Catherine. Jesuit Girolamo Tiraboschi (1731–94) compiled the voluminous history of Italian literature which is still indispensable.

By the middle of the eighteenth century dynastic changes had swept away most of the old decendants of the reigning houses, and by the Peace of Aachen (1748) the reactionary yoke of Spain was forever lifted from Italy. The latter half of the century shows a moral and intellectual awakening, but at the same time the growth of a sceptical and irreligious spirit, due in part to French influence. It is an epoch of scientists and political economists, among the latter Cesare Beccaria (1738–94) winning the most permanent fame. In poetry, Pietro Trapassi (1698–1782), better known as Metastasio, brought the melodrama to the ultimate
perfection of which it is capable, investing it with tragic dignity and lyrical beauty. Carlo Goldoni (1707–93) reformed Italian comedy, withdrawing it from pedantry and buffoonery to the representation of real life and character. With Giuseppe Baretti (1736–1808), who landed literary affections and pleaded for virile sincerity in letters, Piedmont made a significant entry into Italian literature. Finally, two great poets arose, a Lombard priest and a Piedmontese nobleman, who anticipated the new age and used poetry as an instrument for social progress: Giuseppe Parini (1720–90) and Vittorio Alfieri (1749–1803). Parini’s chief poem, “Il Giorno”, satirizes the corrupt and effeminate life of the aristocracy, and protests against the injustice of class; his “Odi”, no less admirable in style, bring the same virile note into lyrical poetry. Alfieri, besides composing robust sonnets and satires, produced a long series of austere and powerful tragedies which are in the main a protest against every kind of tyranny and oppression, and a trumpet-call to the nation to put on the armour of manliness and endurance.

Modern Literature.—At the beginning of the nineteenth century the ideals of the French Revolution had penetrated into Italy, while the establishment first of the Cisalpine Republic and then of the short-lived Napoleonic Italian kingdom inspired national feeling and gave hope of ultimate independence. These events had naturally a profound influence upon Italian literature, which, for the next fifty years, is divided between the Classic and the Romantic schools; the former attempting to accomplish the work of renovation by adapting classical models to the new conditions, the latter appealing less to form than to the picturesque aspects of history (particularly of the Middle Ages), to popular sentiment, and to nature.

Daniele Barberi (1754–1828) is the head of the Classical school in poetry, though his earlier works belonged to the preceding century. With no great originality, no stability of thought or constancy of ideals, he has inexcusable fertility and a vigour of style that is frequently impressive. Ugo Foscolo (1778–1827) is, like Monti, a literary critic as well as poet, but a consistent patriot. His masterpiece, “I Sepolcri”, is a poetical epistle in blank verse, classical in thought, lofty in style, and rich in imagery; the “Ultima lettiera di Jacopo Ortis”, his best known prose work, is an unwholesome and morbid production. Among minor writers of the Classical school are the poet Ugo Foscolo (1773–1828), the translator of the Odyssey, who answered Foscolo’s “Sepolcri” from the religious standpoint; Antonio Cesari (1769–1828), a priest of Verona, whose aim was to purify the language by the standard of the Tuscan writers of the Trecento; Giuilio Perticari (1777–1822), the son-in-law of Monti, with whose linguistic labours in connexion with the revision of the “Vocabolario della Crusca” he was closely associated; Carlo Botta (1766–1837), who attempted to follow in the footsteps of the Latin historians and the great Florentines of the sixteenth century. Belonging more to the Classic than the Romantic school, Gios-
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quited love, combined with loss of the Catholic Faith, in which he had been reared, drove him into crude pessimism. No Italian since Petrarch had reached the lyrical beauty of his “Canti”, in which the contrast between the past and present of his country, the worship of antiquity, and theMW discusion, hopeless love, and, at length, even the contemplation of nature find utterance in sheer despair.

The founder of the Romantic school is Giovanni Berchet (1783–1851), of Milan, who in 1816 characterized the Classical school as “poetry of the dead”, and the Romantic school as “poetry of the living”. His own patriotic lyrics, a little later, won him the title of “the Italian Tyttaeus”. To the Romanticists belongs the noblest figure in Italian literature of the nineteenth century, the great Catholic writer, Alessandro Manzoni (1785–1873), whose life was real, and his art inspired, by religion and patriotism alike. In his “I尼Sacri” (1815–22), he gives lyrical expression to the chief mysteries of the Faith; in his ode on the death of Napoleon, “Il Cenno Maggio”, he passes judgment on the mighty conqueror’s career in the light of religion. His lyrical dramas, “Il Conte di Carmagnola” (1820) and “L’Adelechi” (1822), are deficient in true dramatic qualities, but notable for the choral interludes, patriotic no less than religious in their aim. The same ideals form his masterpiece, “I Promessi Sposi” (1827), a realistic romance with a historical background, as admirable in characterization and description, in pathos and in humour, as it is lofty in its idealism. To the school of Manzoni, similarly combining fervent Catholicism with nationalistic enthusiasm, belong Tommaso Grossi (1790–1833), poet and novelist; Silvio Pellico (1789–1854), whose “Le Mie Prigioni” describes with pathetic detail and Christian resignation his cruel imprisonment at the hands of the Austrians; and Cesare Cantù (1804–95), better known for his later voluminous works on history. Political considerations colour most of the literature of the middle of the century, whether it be the historical writings of Cesare Balbo (1789–1853), the satirical and patriotic poems of Giuseppe Giusti (1800–50), the revolutionary lyrics of Gabriele Rossetti (1753–1854), the tragedies of Giovannibattista Niccolini (1782–1861), or the once admired romances of Francesco Domenico Guerraz (1804–73). The “Storia d’Italia nel Medio Evo” of Carlo Troya (1784–1838), the “Storia della Repubblica di Firenze” of Gino Capponi (1718–1839), and the “Storia dei Musulmani” of Sigismondo Amari (1806–89) are works of more permanent value. Niccolò Tommaso (1802–74), poet and patriot, who united the study of philology with that of philosophy, made his name dear to students of Dante and St. Catherine.

Midway between this epoch and our own, belonging by the character of his art to the old rather than to the new era, stands a true, though not a great, poet, Giacomo Zanella (1820–89), a learned professor and devout Catholic priest. In Zanella’s work the cult of science, the love of nature, an ardent patriotism, and profound religious convictions are nobly blended. He is at his best in his lyrics; and in the last of these, an ode to Leo XIII, he pleads for a reconciliation between Church and State, the wedding of the Cross.
of Christ with the Savoyard cross on the national banner. Since the unification of Italy, more has been accomplished in economics and in social science than in pure literature. One modern Italian, indeed, takes his place among the foremost European poets of the nineteenth century (for collectio, see p. 124). A bitter opponent of the Christian ideal and a strenuous democrat, Carducci has given poetic form to the anti-clerical side of the Revolution that has made Italy one, and has expressed the paganism that is latent in the Italian genius. In his masterpiece, the "Ora" (b. 1867) is noticed by modern musicologists (e.g., Durandus, IV, 57—cf. "Micrologus", xxxvi; etc.) since about the eleventh century. The three Roman Ordines before the tenth century know only the form *Ite missa est*. The explanation is that originally the people were not dismissed on such days, but stayed in church for further prayers after Mass, suitable to fasting days (so Boni, *Rerum liturg. libri duo*, II, xx, n. 3). This is confirmed by a now extinct medieval custom of singing *Benedicamus Domino* at the end of midnight Mass at Christmas, because Lauda follow at once (Durandus, op. cit., IV, 57, §7). So the idea obtained its fi nale est immediately after the text continues: "Then the seven candles are carried before the pontiff to the sacristry" (ed. Atchley, p. 146). It was not till the sixteenth century (Missa of Pius V) that the accretions to the Mass that had gradually been introduced (Placent, blessing, last Gospel—all originally private prayers) were definitely recognised as part of the liturgy to be said at the altar.

The corresponding dismissals in the other Western rites are: at Milan, V, "Procedamus in pace," R. "In nomine Christi"; Mosarabic, "Solemnia commendationis"; Mozarabic, "Dies Iubilaeorum"; Latin, IV, 57—&c., "Cum sancto acceptum cum pace," R. "Deo gratias" ("Missa Mixtum", P. L., LXXXV, 120). Of the Eastern rites that of the "Apostolic Constitutions" dismisses the people with the form: "Go in peace" (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", p. 27). The Antiochene and Byzantine Liturgies end with the deacon’s announcement: "Let us go forth in peace," R. "In the name of the Lord"; and then a short "prayer of dismissal" said by the celebrant (op. cit., 67, 397); so also the Alexandrine Rite (ibid., 142); while the Nestorians have only a prayer and blessing by the celebrant (ibid., 303).

**Present Ritual.**—At high Mass, as soon as the last Post-Cummission is ended, the celebrant and ministers go to the middle of the altar and stand in line. The celebrant turning to the people sings, *Dominus vobiscum* (the usual introduction to any announcement), and remains facing them. Then, when the deacon has answered, the deacon turns round and, with hands joined, sings *Ite missa est* to its proper tone, the choir answering *Deo gratias* to the same notes. In the former Missal ten melodies were provided for various solemnities. The idea is to sing this last verse to one of the first three Kyrie melodies with the same chant as that with which it began. To carry this out more completely the new Vatican Missal provides nineteen tones, most of them very elaborate (for *Ite missa est* and *Benedicamus Domino*), corresponding to the various masses in the "Kyriale","
The tone of the first Kyrie should always be used. In figured masses the *Ite missa est* should be sung to the tone of the plain-song mass provided for the occasion. For the Feast of Corpus Christi, a feast day in Italy, and for the Holy Land and he also briefly notes the important events which he believes to be connected with the various places. In this he falls into some strange blunders, as when, for instance, he places the Transfiguration on Mount Olivet. Such errors, however, are also found in the subsequent writers. His description of Jerusalem, though short, contains information of great value for the topography of the city.

Very different from the above is the account of her pilgrimage written by a nun for the sisters of her community towards the end of the same century (c. 350). The Benedictine nun, Cambrennus, who became a nun in 1884, attributed it to Saint (? Silvia of Aquitaine, the sister of Rufinus, prefect of the prætorium under Theodosius the Great and his successor Arcadius, whence it became known as the "Peregrinatio Sancte Silvia". Dom M. Pérotin, however, later showed (Rev. des Questions Historiques, Oct. 1903) that the real author is a native of Galicia, Spain, whose name is variously given as Etheria, Echeria, and Egeria. She seems to have been a lady of importance with friends at court, possibly a relative of Theodosius himself (who was a Galician). Whatever her rank, the clergy, even bishops, addressed her as *Regina*atrice, and two imperial officers gave her a military escort where the road was unsafe. During her pilgrimage of over three years, she visited Western and Eastern Palestine, Ídumea, Sinai, Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia. She is a keen observer, and writes with a certain charm in spite of her crude, provincial Latin.

The work, unfortunately, exists only in a fragmentary state, though the lacunae at the beginning are partly filled up by extracts found in the treatise "De Locis Sanctis" of Peter the Deacon, a writer of the twelfth century (Geyer, pp. 107–21). While it furnishes very valuable topographical details it is the less useful. Her description of the churches and of the religious ceremonies then in use makes it of special interest to the liturgiologist. Its value in this respect is well brought out by Dom Cabrol in his work "La Peregrinatio Silvie: Les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie de la fin du IV siècle" (1935). Since the "Peregrinatio" has often been edited and studied. A study from a philological point of view was published in the United States by Professor Edw. A. Bechtel—"Silvia de Iesu Christo Peregrinatio: The Text and a Study of the Latin" (Chicago, 1902). The Spanish text, however, is useful. The "Peregrinatio" (in the modern form of the name) was followed in 386 by two other ladies of quality, the Roman matron St. Paula and her daughter Eustochium. The account of their pilgrimage through Palestine and Egypt, written by St. Jerome after Paula's death (Epist. civili ad Eustoch.), was intended to make known the virtues of the holy pilgrim, rather than to describe the places she visited; still it contains much useful matter.

No pilgrimage of the fifth century is extant.

The author of the "Epistola ad Faustum", or "Epistola de aliquibus locis sanctis", commonly ascribed to St. Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons (d. A.D. 450), obtained his information by reading the accounts of, and conversing with, pilgrims. The relation of Theodosius "De suiti Terrae Sancte", discovered in 1864, belongs to the first half of the sixth century (c. 530). It is written somewhat after the manner of the "Peregrinatio de Aquitana", and gives the distances between the different sites of the Holy City. Of Theodosius himself nothing certain is known. Little more is known of Antoninus of Piacenza, who made the pilgrimage about 570. In manuscript he is sometimes styled Antoninus the Martyr, through Ignatian confound of the writer with the martyr Arsenius who is venerated at Piacenza. He is the last
writer who saw Palestine before the Moslem conquest. Although he covered in his travels nearly the same extensive territory as the Spanish nun, his work contains but few details not found in other writers; it is, moreover, marred by omissions. He was also the first to describe the Holy Land which is now the most native credulity. A century later (c. 670) the French bishop Aureulf was wrecked on the western coast of Britain after visiting the Holy Land. To this accident we owe St. Adamnan’s “De locis sanctis libri tres.” Having been hospitably received at the court of the famous Monastery of Iona, Aureulf described to him his voyage and drew for him the plans of some of the churches of Jerusalem. Adamnan wrote down the narrative on vellum, and later edited it in three books, adding, however, matter derived from other sources. The work is important, as it contains the first description of Jerusalem after the changes wrought by the Persian conquest under Chosroes (614), and the Arab occupation under Omar (637). It was long accepted as the authority on Palestine. Venerable Bede’s “De Locis Sanctis” is mainly taken from Adamnan’s work St. Willibald, nephew of St. Boniface and Bishop of Eichstätt, and who occurred in his youth for about years (721–729), three of which he spent in the Holy Land. In his latter days he related his life and travels to the nuns of the monastery of Heidenheim. Two reports of his story have come down to us. The first, “Hodiernoicon Sancti Willibaldi,” was written (c. 755) by a relative of the writer, the author of the “Story of his life,” who notes which she took while he was speaking. The other, “Itineraireum Sancti Willibaldi,” was probably composed from memory, after Willibald’s death, by one of the two deacons who accompanied him in his visits to the monastery. Though better in style, it is less reliable than the first, and contains details which the writer obtained elsewhere. The last Itinerarium of any consequence before the Crusades is that of the French monk Bernard, who with two of his fellow-religious visited Egypt and Palestine (868–9). He is the first to make mention of the holy fire which is now such a conspicuous feature in the Greek celebration of Holy Saturday in the church of the Holy Sepulchre. Of the unimportant works of the next two centuries, the relation of Ingulf, Abbot of Croydon, may be mentioned, because it shows to what dangers pilgrims were exposed at that time. Of the seven thousand persons who accompanied him on his pilgrimage (1064) more than three thousand perished.

With the beginning of the Crusades the works on Palestine become very numerous, and after the loss of the country by the Latins they increase rather than diminish. Those which relate to the events of the crusading period do not concern us here. They may be found in such collections as Bongard, “Gesta Dei per Francos” (Hanau, 1611), “Recueil des historiens des croisades” (Paris, 1844–80), and “Publications de la Société de l’orient Latin, Série Historique” (Geneva, 1874–85). Of the others, a long list of which is given by Röhrs, only the most important can be noticed. The first of these is the relation of the Russian monk (hagimenos) Daniel, the earliest extant record of a Russian pilgrimage to the Holy Land. He came thither shortly after the Christian occupation (c. 1100), and visited most of the holy places and sanctuaries, not only the monastery of St. Sabas as guide. His description of what he himself saw is generally accurate, and he gives a fair picture of the country a few years after it was taken by the Crusaders. The Russian text with a French translation was published by Noroff (St. Petersburg, 1854); an English translation is in the monastery of St. Sabas. The “De locis sanctis libri tres” of the Blessed Rubruq (the Latin author Rubruck) is a work of importance. The first part of the text, “Itinerarium,” describes the author’s journey to the Holy Land, and contains a description of his adventures on his journey to Persia, and of the manners, customs, and religion of the Persians. It is owing to this second part that the work was soon translated into Italian and French. The Latin text of the “Itinerarium” was first published in 1837, and later by B. D. Laurens in “Itineraria” (Leipzig, 1864; 2nd ed., 1873). For an extensive notice of Rubruck, see “Rev. Bibl.”, II (1893), pp. 44, 182, 584. “De Itinere Terra Sancte” by Ludolph, pastor of Suchum in the Diocese of Paderborn, is considered the best relation of the fourteenth century. The author spent five years in Palestine (1336–41). John Polony—by some to be a German, by others a Pole—is, as far as we know, the first pilot who drew a map (now unfortunately lost) of the Holy Land. His “Peregrinatio ad Terram Sanctam” (1422) is in many places copied from Burchard de Monte Sion. The best work of the fifteenth century is the voluminous “Evagioratium in Terra Sancte, Arabic et Egypti peregrinacionem” of the Dominican Felix Faber, or Fabri. The author, who was twice in the East (1480 and 1483), is somewhat credulous, but reliable in what he himself observed. For travels to the Far East during the fourteenth century see Pordenone, Blessed; Rubruq, William of; Polo, Marco.


F. BRETTEL.

Itinerarium, a form of prayer used by monks and clerics before setting out on a journey, and for that reason usually printed at the end of the Breviary, where it can be conveniently found when required. Most probably the use of such prayers originated in monastic observance. The early rules of the Fathers of the Desert—St. Anthony and St. Pachomius—as well as that of St. Basil, legislate minutely as to the behaviour of monks when travelling, and impose various restrictions and duties upon them. St. Benedict, whose rule, more than any other, has exerted so great an influence over all ecclesiastical customs monastic and otherwise, in the Western Church, laid down (chap. lvii) that when any of the brethren were to be sent on a journey, they should, before setting out, commend themselves to the prayers of the abbot and community, by whom they were to send
be daily remembered during their absence from the monastery. According to monastic tradition, if the absence were to be only a short one, i.e. if they were to return the same or the following day, they merely asked the abbot for blessing, united to the conclusion of one of the canonical hours, and then requested the prayers of the community.

But if the journey was to occupy a longer time, a more solemn form of itinerarium was customary. Kneeling or lying prostrate at the altar steps, some venerables and pious persons were invited over them by the abbot, who then dismissed the travellers with his blessing and the kiss of peace. This was most likely the origin of the itinerarium as we have it at present. The constitutions of the various orders and congregations usually legated for the particular prayers to be used by their members before a journey, and the duty of a community to pray for those who may be travelling is fulfilled at the present day by the vespers “Divinum auxilium”, said for absent brethren at the end of each of the canonical hours. The inclusion of the itinerarium in the secular Roman Breviary indicates that its use is at least recommended to all clerics, though not obligatory. The “Ceremoniale Episcoporum” directs that a prelate ought to recite it with his chaplains or household before commencing a journey; and Gavanti mentions an ancient pontifical containing a longer form of itinerarium for eight years of prelates. The usual form consists of the canticle “Benedictus” with antiphon, certain versicles, and several collects. Two of these latter are very ancient, being found in the Gregorian Sacramentary. In some modern editions of the monastic Breviary a shorter form of itinerarium is also given, for use “ante ambulationem extra monasterium”.

DURAND, Rationale Divini Officii (Venice, 1568); HAEFTEN, Doctrinaliewerke (Amburgo, 1844); GAVANTI, Theoriam Sacrorum Rituum (Venice, 1744); MARTINE, De Antiquis Monachorum Ritualibus (Lyons, 1790).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Ittenbach, FRANZ, historical painter; b. at Königs-winter, at the foot of the Drachenfels, in 1813; d. at Düsseldorf, 1879. He was a pupil at the age of nineteen at the Academy of Düsseldorf, receiving also private lessons from his president, Schadow. He was an exceedingly religious man, and associated with himself three of his friends and fellow-students, Karl and Andreas Müller, and Ernst Deger, and the four men travelled about in Germany, studying and painting together. He persistently declined any commissions for mythological or pagan subjects, and as a rule devoted his energies exclusively to church decoration, preceding the execution of his greatest works by devout religious exercises, including confessions and communion. His finest paintings are to be found at Bonn, in the church of St. Remigius, and in Breslau in a church dedicated to the same saint. There is also a remarkable “Holy Family” dated 1861, painted for Prince Liechtenstein in his private chapel near Vienna, and many other works by him are in various Catholic churches in Germany. His only important fresco was painted in 1844 in a church at Remagen. He was a very popular painter in court circles, a member of most of the European academies, and the recipient of many medals and decorations. His colouring is correct and delicate, and yet of remarkable brilliance, and his pictures have a suave and attractive religious aspect and create a strong emotion in the minds of those who gaze at them. He painted a few portraits, but they were unimportant; his main work was in his altar-pieces.

See various numbers of the Zeitschrift für Bildende Kunst (1879 and later years).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Ives (Yves), SAINT, b. at Kerminster, near Tréguier, Brittany, 17 October, 1253; d. at Louanœ, 19 May, 1303, was the son of a notary of Kerminster, and Azu du Kenquis. In 1267 Ives was sent to the University of Paris, where he graduated in civil law. He went to Orleans in 1277 to study canon law. On his return to Brittany having received minor orders he was appointed "official", or ecclesiastical judge, of the archdeaconry of Renhes (1280); meanwhile he studied Scripture, and there are strong reasons for holding that he joined the Franciscan Tertiaries sometime later at Guingamp. He was soon invited by the Bishop of Tréguier to become his "official", and accepted the offer (1284). He displayed great zeal and rectitude in the discharge of his duty and did not hesitate to resist the unjust taxation of the clergy, which he considered an encroachment on the rights of the Church; by his charity he gained the title of advocate and patron of the poor. Having been ordained he was appointed to the parish of Tredres in 1293 and eight years later to Louanœ, where he died. He was buried in Tréguier, and was canonized in 1347 by Clement VI, his feast being kept on 19 May. He is the patron of lawyers, though not, it is said, their model, for—"Sanctus Ivo erat Brito, Advocatus et non latro, Res miranda populo."

Acta SS., May, V. 248: Life by de la Haye (Moriaux, 1833); and by Norbert (Paris, 1882); DANIEL, Montenez, 1897; ANTONIO (St. Bernard, N. Y., 1897), II. 324-40; VIII. 201-3; XVII. 259. A. A. MACÉBLEAU.

Ives, LEVI SILLMAN, b. at Meriden, Connecticut, U. S. A., 16 September, 1797; d. at New York, 13 October, 1867. He was one of the most distinguished converts to the Church made in the United States through the influence of the Tractarian Movement of 1848-49. The war of 1812 with England broke out while he was at school, and he joined the army, serving for a year. His further education he received at Hamilton College. In 1823 he was ordained a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and officiated at several charges in New York and Pennsylvania until 1831, when he was elected Bishop of North Carolina. Here he took great interest in the education and religious training of the coloured people of that section. Deeply impressed by the Oxford Movement, he founded at Valle Crucis in North Carolina a religious community, called the "Brotherhood of the Holy Cross". The members, a few clergyman and zealous laymen, observed a community rule and went about preaching Tractarian ideas. So warm was the advocacy of the Oxford theories by Bishop Ives that he was arraigned for them before the convention of the Episcopal Church. His explanations were accepted for a time, but then the "Brotherhood of the Holy Cross" was dissolved. In 1852 he went to Rome and made his submission to the pope, and thus, as he said himself, "abandoned a position in which he had acted as a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church for more than thirty years, and as a bishop of the
same for more than twenty, and sought late in life admission as a layman into the Holy Catholic Church, with no prospect before him, but simply peace of conscience and the expectation that Ivo gives with great confidence, that Ivo was a daughter of the Protestant Bishop Hobart, also became a convert. Returning to the United States he acted as professor of rhetoric at St. Joseph's Seminary, New York, and lectured to the pupils of several convents, concerning himself also in charity work. He was especially the Chatelaine of the Pearl Protectors in New York, and was the first president of that institution.

Ivra. See MAJORCA, DIACESIS OF.

Ivo of Chartres (Yvo, Yvès), Saint, one of the most notable bishops of France at the time of the Investiture struggles and the most important canonist before Gratian in the Occident, born of a noble family about 1040; died in 1118. From the neighborhood of Beauvais, his native country, he went for his studies first to Paris and thence to the Abbey of Bec in Normandy, at the same time as Anselm of Canterbury, to attend the lectures given by Lanfranc. About 1080 he became, at the desire of his bishop, prior of the canons of St. Quentin at Beauvais. He was then one of the best teachers in France, and so prepared himself to infuse a new life into the celebrated schools of Chartres, of which city he was appointed bishop in 1090, his predecessor, Geoffrey, having been deposed for simony. His episcopal government, at first opposed by the tenants of Geoffroy, ranged over a period of twenty-five years. No man, perhaps, is better portrayed in his writings than is Ivo in his letters and sermons; in both he appears as a man always faithful to his duties, high-minded, full of zeal and piety, sound in his judgments, a keen jurist, straightforward, mindful of others' rights, devoted to the papacy and to his country, at the same time openly disapproving of what he considered wrong. This explains why he has been sometimes quoted as a patron of Gallican Liberties and looked upon by Placeus Illyricus as one of the "witnesses to the truth" in his "Catalogue". Very often Ivo was invited to preside over judicial, political, and especially canonical matters. Of his life little more is known than may be gathered from his letters. As bishop he strongly opposed Philip the First, who wished to desert Bertha, his legitimate wife, and marry Bertrade of Anjou (1092); his opposition gained the day. In the Investiture struggle then raging in France, and especially in Germany, Ivo represented the moderate party. Though he died too early to witness the final triumph of his ideas with the Concordat of Worms (1122), his endeavours and his doctrines may be said to have paved the way for an agreement satisfactory to both sides. His views on the subject are fully expressed in several of his letters, especially those of the years 1099, 1106, and 1111 (Epistle, ix, cxlvii, cxxxi, cxxvii, cxxxvii, etc.); these letters are still of interest as to the question of the relationship between Church and State, the efficacy of sacraments administered by heretics, the sin of simony, etc.

The printed works of Ivo of Chartres may be arranged into three categories: canonical writings letters, and sermons. For the canonical works see CANONS, COLLECTIONS OF ANCIENT, sub-title Collection of Yvo de Chartres. Notice it to mention here the "Decretum" in seventeen books and the "Panormia" in eight books, the latter being undoubtedly the work of Ivo himself, with material taken from the Decretals. Both of these were composed before 1096, but the "Panormia" enjoyed a far greater success than the "Decretum"; we immediately find it at Durham and elsewhere in England, at Naumburg in Germany, etc. One of the improvements of this collection on the works of Burchard of Worms (d. 1025) consists in its being written in the French language, and in adding to those of Burchard canons taken from Italian sources. As may be easily seen, theology and canon law are not yet precisely marked off from one another—a defect which holds also for previous collections; the chapters on the Trinity, Incarnation, especially the Council of the Lateran, are in this connexion. But the most important feature of Ivo's work is perhaps his preface, "Prologus", which gives new rules for solving the old problem of the discrepancies occurring in the texts of the Fathers and the councils. The letters of Ivo, 288 in number (Merlet has added 40 more), from which we gather nearly all that we know of his life, are in the edition of Migne together with those of his correspondents. Many are of a special interest as to the political and religious questions of the time; not a few are answers to difficulties referring to moral, liturgical, or canonical matters; some discuss problems of dogmatics. The popularity of these letters was very great, as may be gathered from the fact that they appear in the catalogues of many monastic libraries; numerous manuscripts are still extant. The twenty-five sermons are sometimes treatises on liturgical, dogmatic or moral questions, but are especially used as tools of the great art and science of Bishop Ivo. The "Microcosm", which has been attributed to him belongs to Berndolf of Constance. Other works, such as the "Tripartita" (collection of canons), "Commentary on the Psalms", etc., are still unprinted. The influence of Ivo's works may be seen in the writings of nearly all the theologians and canonists of his day and for some time afterwards: Alber of Liège and Hugh of St. Victor, not to mention others, depend largely on the materials put together in the "Decretum" and "Panormia"; and Hugh has also borrowed from Ivo's sermons on Holy orders, dedication of churches, etc. The connexion of ideas between the "Prologus" and the scheme of Abelard's "Sie et Non" or Gratian's "Concordantia" is obvious. The saint's feast is kept, since 1570, on 20 May; it is not known when he was canonized.

Ivory (Fr. ivoire; It. avorio; Lat. ebur), dentine, the tusks of the elephant, hippopotamus, walrus, and other animals: a tough and elastic substance, of a creamy white, taking a high and lasting polish, largely employed in the arts since prehistoric times, and used extensively in making or adorning ecclesiastical objects by the primitive and medieval Christians. In the museums of Europe there are examples of pre-historic incised and carved ivories, and also many specimens of Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, and Roman bas-reliefs, statues, diptychs, plaques, and caskets. Many authors frequently allude to ivory, and the Old Testament teems with references to its employment, even using its attributes as poetic qualifications, in the same way as the Church does to-day in the Litany of Loreto ("Tower of ivory"). As soon as the Christians were free to display the symbols of their faith, the classical art then in vogue for this purpose, and among their first aesthetic expressions, carved ivory diptychs were the most important; they followed closely the designs used in consular diptychs, excepting that symbolism and poetic imagery took the place of representations of mythological subjects. They consisted of
two plates of ivory, hinged so as to fold together like a book; the inside of each leaf was slightly countersunk, with a narrow raised margin, so as to hold the wax that received the writing, while the outside of the leaves was profusely adorned with carvings. They were used for various purposes, such as listing the names of the baptized, bishops, martyrs, saints, and between them the names of the living and the dead who were to be prayed for.

That these dipycths suggested ivory plaques for book covers, reliquary doors and triptych shrines, is obvious; hundreds of plaques are in existence, dating from the time of Constantine to the sixteenth century, some of them of exquisite works of art; in the British Museum there is one, six inches by four, divided into thirty panels, less than an inch square, and each compartment contains a scene from the life of the Blessed Virgin, all being beautiful examples of ivory sculpture. Another use the early Christians found for ivory was the making of cylindrical pyxzes from a cross section of the elephant tusk: upon the covers, they carved figures of Our Lord, St. Peter, and St. Paul, and on the side the Apostles and Biblical subjects. Again, somewhat later, no doubt remembering that Solomon made “a great throne of ivory” (111 Kings x. 18), they overlaid their episcopal chairs with ivory tablets, as seen at Ravenna, in the chair of St. Maximian, archbishop of that city (546). After the fifth century, possibly before, ivory crosses were in use; eighty or more of them are now in existence, including those said to have belonged to a number of the saints. At the same time liturgical combs of ivory were in use. A beautiful example, the comb of St. Lupus (623), is in the treasury of St. Etienne at Lens. Representations of the Crucifixion in ivory upon various objects, are common, but not the crucifix. Most of the crucifixes date from the seventeenth century, and of these there are many, but of the earlier ones, only five have survived the action of time and the fanaticism of the Reformers. During the whole of the Middle Ages ivory was extensively used for paxes (instrumenta pacis), tabernacles, portable altars, caskets, holy-water buckets, statuettes, rosary-beads, seals, and the decoration of ecclesiastical furniture.

**Marxell, The Ivories, Ancient and Medieval, in the South Kensington Museum (London, 1872); Westwood, Futility of Ivory (London, 1874); South Kensington, Romaine de Fleury, La Musee (Paris, 1883); Gori, Tesoro, Valorum Dipichorum (Florence, 1789); Charles, Revue de l'Arts et des Maitres d'oeuvre du XVI siècle; Sculpit (1855-7); Couronne, Crosse, Au crucifilm, Fouillies de dipichit (1853); Marxell, Ivories (London, 1905).**

**Cardy Coleman.**

**Ivrea, Diocese of, suffragan of Turin, Northern Italy. The city is situated on the right bank of the Dora Baltea and has a fine view of the Great St. Bernard. A city of the Etruscans, it received a Roman colony in 90 B.C. In the Lombard period it was the seat of a dukedom. In 870 Emperor Guy of Spoleto gave the Mark of Ivrea to his brother Anscaricus, whose descendants, especially Berengarius II (950) and Arduinus (1002), aspired to the title of King of Italy. Soon after 1002, Ivrea had to contend vigorously for its communal freedom against the marquesses of Montferrat. Finally, in 1248, Frederick II gave it to the Count of Savoy. During the war between France and Spain for the possession of Lombardy there was, for a long time, a Spanish garrison in the fortress of Ivrea. By the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559) it was restored to Savoy. In 1554, 1644, and 1796, Ivrea was besieged and taken by the French in 1554, 1644, 1796. In 1800 Lannes put the Austrians to flight at the pass of the Chiussella. There is a noteworthy festival at Ivrea, the burning of the scarf (a tree decked out with fireworks), the origin of which is unknown. Legend traces the tradition back to the middle of the fifth century, when the ancient temple of Apollo is said to have been consecrated to the service of the true God. It contains a valuable painting by Perugino. The episcopal see is said to have been established by St. Eusebius of Vercelli about the middle of the fourth century. The first historically certain bishop is Eulogius (c. 451). Among the other bishops were St. Veremundus (969); Hugo (1053), a son of King Arduinus; the Cistercian Abbot Eustace (1205); afterwards Gaetano Gonzaga (1288); Giuseppe di Ceva (1614), who restored the episcopal palace and adorned it with paintings; also the present (1909) Archbishop of Turin, Cardinal Richelmy, made Bishop of Ivrea in 1886. The diocese has 138 parishes, with 220,000 souls; 4 religious houses of men and 10 of women; 6 schools for boys, and 5 schools for girls; and a Catholic paper.

**Savio, Gli antichi esecovi d'Italia: Anno, Cenni storici sulla Chiesa d'Ivrea (1842); Balbi, Memorie sopra la data Chiesa d'Ivrea (Ivrea, 1881); Iudem, Eparodica sacra (Ivrea, 1887).**

**U. Benigni.**

**Ixtlilxochitl, Fernando de Alba; b. 1568; d. 1648. The most illustrious of the native Mexican historians and the great-grandson of Don Fernando Ixtlilxochitl, fifth son of Netzahualpilli, King of Texoco, and of his wife Doña Beatriz Papantzin, daughter of Cuauhtemoc, last of the Aztec emperors. He was educated in the college of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco, but, notwithstanding his illustrious birth, education, and ability, he lived for a long time in dire poverty, and the greater part of his works were written to relieve his wants. He gives a detailed account of the important part played by his great-grandfather Don Fernando in the conquest of Mexico and the pacification of the Indians of New Spain, praising him in every possible way, and blaming the ingratitude of the conquerors. “His descendants,” says the writer, “were poor and neglected, or rather they very disgracefully gradually being taken from them.” In “La Entrada de los Españoles en Texoco” he again remarks: “The sons, daughters, grandchildren, and relations of Netzahualcayotl and Netzahualpilli are ploughing and digging to earn their daily bread and to pay ten reales and half a measure of corn to his Majesty. And we, the descendants of a royal race, are being taxed beyond every lawful right.” Partly owing to the appeal made in his works, and partly to the favour of Fray Garcia Guerra, who afterwards became Archbishop and Vicerey of New Spain, some land concessions were granted Don Fernando, and he was appointed interpreter in the Indian court. The “Historia de la Nación Chichimeca” was his last work, but this he left unfinished, having reached only the period of the siege of Mexico. This is the best of his works. The facts are fairly well defined, the chronology is more exact, the editing much better, and more care is taken in the orthography of Texcoco names. His other works contain very important data for the history of Mexico, but they are written without order or method, the chronology is very faulty, and there is much repetition. For his writings he availed himself of the ancient Indian hieroglyphic paintings, and the traditions and songs of the Indians; he indicates those which he has consulted—all of them more than eighty years old. His works, recently published to commemorate the fourth centenary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, are: (1) A summary of all the events that occurred in New Spain and of many other events in the world, last but one of the creation of the world to their destruction, and from the coming of the third Chichimeca settlers up to the invasion of the Spaniards, taken from the original history “La Nueva España”; (2) History of the Chichimecas to the time of the coming of the Spaniards. (To this is added: (a) Part of the history of Netzahualcoyotl; (b) List of...**
154 names of the cities subject to the three kings of Mexico, Tlacopan, and Texcoco; (c) Another section of the history of Netzahualcoyotl; (d) The Ordinances or Laws of Netzahualcoyotl; (e) Account of Netzahualpilli, son of Netzahualcoyotl." (3) Order and ceremonial for the creation of a Lord, established by Topilte, Lord of Tula. (4) The coming of the Spaniards to New Spain. (5) Entrance of the Spaniards into Texcoco. (6) Accounts of the country and settlers of this part of America known as New Spain. (7) Brief account, in the form of a memorial, of the history of New Spain and its dependencies up to the time of the coming of the Spaniards. (To this are added (a) Account of the other Lords of New Spain; (b) Accounts of the origin of the Xochimilcas.) (8) Summary of the History of New Spain from the beginning of the world to the present era, collected and taken from the histories, paintings, written memorials, and folk songs of the natives. (9) History of the Chichemeca nation (95 chapters). (10) Songs of Netzahualcoyotl and historic fragments of the life of the same.—There seems, however, to be but little reason for attributing this last to Ixtlilxochilti.

CHAVEZ (ed.), Obras históricas de D. Fernando de Alba Ixtlilxochilti (Mexico, 1891-92); BOTURINI, Idea de una historia general de la América Septentrional (Madrid, 1749); Antiquities of Mexico in Collection of Lord Kingsborough, IX; Diccionario enciclopédico hispano-american, X.

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.
Jaca (JACCA), Diocese of (JACCENSA), in the Spanish province of Huesca. Jaca, the chief town of the mountain district of Sobrarbe, is situated on the left bank of the Aragon, a tributary of the Ebro, about 2400 feet above sea-level. The population in 1900 was 4934. It was once the capital of the Jaccetani, a tribe mentioned by Strabo. This territory was the scene of battles between Sertorius and Pompey and later between Pompey's son Sextus and Caesar's generals.

Ecclesiastically Jaca belonged originally to the Diocese of Huesca. When in 713 the town of Huesca was seized by the Moors, its prelates were replaced by itinerant bishops, sometimes called bishops of Aragon, sometimes bishops of Huesca or Jaca, who lived either at Jaca or in the adjacent province of San Pedro de Sires and San Pedro de Sires. A council held at Jaca in 1063 determined anew the boundaries of the Diocese of Huesca, which thereafter included the present dioceses of Huesca, Jaca, and Barbastro, as well as a part of the Diocese of Lérida. Jaca was then made the permanent seat of the diocese. At the same time Sancho II was appointed Bishop of Huesca, and hastened to request the pope to confirm the decisions of the council. Meanwhile, however, King Sancho Ramírez of Aragon (1003-94) had won back from the Moors the city of Barbastro, and had granted it to the Bishop of Roda. García, the new Bishop of Huesca (1076-86), regarded this as an infringement of the rights of jurisdiction granted the Bishop of Jaca by the Council of Jaca. He therefore renewed his petition to the new pope (Gregory VII) to have the decisions of the council confirmed, which request the pope granted (cf. Jaffé, "Reg. Pont. Romani," I, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1885, n. 5096). As, however, Bishop Raimundo of Roda also obtained the confirmation of all his privileges from Gregory, a violent dispute arose between the Bishops of Huesca and Roda as to jurisdiction over the churches of Barbastro, Biella, Gistau, and Alquezar, which in 1080 was decided by the king in favour of the Bishop of Roda. In November, 1096, King Pedro I of Aragon won back Huesca from the Moors, and Urban II now decreed (11 May, 1089) that, instead of Jaca, Huesca should again be the seat of the bishop (cf. Jaffé, op. cit., I, 5703). But Jaca itself had a separate existence under a vicar-general, independent of the Bishop of Huesca. It also retained its own cathedral chapter, which originally followed the Rule of St. Augustine, but in 1270 both this chapter and that of Huesca were secularized. Jaca was again erected into a separate diocese and was made suffragan to the Metropolitan See of Saragossa by a Bull of Pius V (18 July, 1571), which decision was carried into effect on 26 February, 1572. The first bishop was Pedro el Frago, whose forty-second successor is the present bishop, Antolín López y Péláez (consecrated on 4 April, 1905).

Statistics.—According to the diocesan statistics of 1907 Jaca possesses 72,659 inhabitants, 151 parishes, 151 parish churches, 236 public and 10 private oratories, 236 secular priests, 30 regulars, and 54 sisters. The religious orders and congregations in the diocese are: Augustinian Hermits, one monastery and novitiate; Franciscans, 2 houses for the training of boys; Benedictine Nuns, 1 convent with 31 professed sisters in the city of Jaca; Sisters of Mercy of St. Anne, in charge of the hospital at Jaca; Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary, 1 house at Jaca; Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul, with a school at Jaca, and the Little Sisters of the Aged Poor, with a home for the aged in a suburb of Jaca. The cathedral dedicated to the Most Blessed Virgin of Pillar is a three-aisled basilica in Byzantine style, belonging in the main to the eleventh century; it was consecrated in 1063 and altered in the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries. A religious and civil festival is still held on the first Friday of May; it is called "Primer Viernes de Mayo," in memory of a victory said to have been won over the Moors in the eighth century by Count Ansar aided by the women of Jaca. It is celebrated with a solemn procession in which the entire cathedral chapter takes part. In the environs of Jaca are many hermitages, notably that of San Juan de la Pena. La Vergen de la Cueva is the difficulty problem. and there were, in the twelfth century, three hundred nobles gathered at the time of the Arab invasion and proclaimed García Ximenex King of Sobrarbe.

BLANCO, Ház. de Jaca (JACA), 1855; RAMÓN DE HUESCA, Texto hist. de las iglesias del Regno de Aragón, VIII: De la Iglesia de Jaca (Pamplona, 1862); LEANTRY Y GARCÍA, Círculo de Historia en la diócesis de Jaca y sus Memorias históricas y religiosas de todos los Sacramentarios, Eremitas e Iglesias etc. en este Obispado (Lérida, 1889); PÉREZ BELLON, Anuario Eclesiástico de España, 1904 (Madrid), 383-9; Guatemala a la Catedral de Jaca por S. G. de P. A. (Valladolid, 1906); information given by the cathedral chapter.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

JACKSON, HENRY MOORE, knight, b. in Grenada, 1849; d. in London, 29 August, 1908. The youngest son of the Anglican Bishop of the Leeward Islands, he was educated in England at Marlborough and Clifton Colleges, and at the Royal Military Academy. He entered the Royal Artillery in 1870, retiring with the rank of captain in 1883. He entered the colonial service in 1880, when he was appointed commandant of the Sierra Leone Police. He was commissioner for Turks and Caicos Islands, 1885-90, and Colonial Secretary of the Bahama Islands, 1890-93. As Colonial Secretary of Gibraltar, 1894-1901, he fell to his lot to carry out the plans for the new harbour works, which had already received the approval of the Admiralty and of the War Office. His early scientific training enabled him to point out defects in the plans, and to suggest improvements which saved the Government much useless expenditure. In recognition of his efficiency he was made in 1899 a Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George. In 1901 he was appointed Governor of the Leeward Islands, and after holding this position for less than one year was appointed Governor of the Fiji Islands and High Commissioner of the Western Pacific. After a careful study of the history of the colony, and the current economic and political situation, and awaiting a solution, he drew up an exhaustive report, accompanied with a series of recommendations which were accepted almost without modification by the Colonial Office. In Fiji he showed a very remarkable power of inspiring the natives with a belief in the justice of English rule, and with personal attachment to himself. This power he exhibited also in Trinidad, to which he was appointed in 1904. When he landed the colony was still suffering from the consequences of the serious riots, which had recently occurred. After three years of untiring labour the state of feeling among the colourless population had entirely changed. He was appointed Bishop of Cathodic in 1880, and from the day of his reception into the Church he never willingly missed daily Mass. In recognition of his services to the Church in the
various colonies with which he was connected, he was made a member of the Order of St. Gregory the Great in 1904, and as recognition of his great services to the State, the king conferred on him, shortly before his death, the Grand Cross of St. Michael and St. George.

C. SCHREINER.

Jacob, (22 y.; Sept. 13th), the son of Isaac and Rebecca, third great patriarch of the chosen people, and the immediate ancestor of the twelve tribes of Israel. The incidents of his life are given in parts of Gen., xxx, 21–13, wherein the documents (J, E, P) are distinguished by scholars (see Abraham. I, 155). His Hebrew name is 텔(A)l-Babylonian: Ya'куb-כלu), with which compare Israel, Israel etc.—means "supplanter", and refers to a well-known circumstance of his birth (Gen., xxx, 25). His early years were marked by various efforts to get the birthright from his brother Esau. His struggle for it began before he was born (xxx, 22–5). Later, he took advantage of Esau's thoughtlessness and despair to buy from him for a pottage of lentils (xxx, 29–33). In virtue of this purchase, and through a ruse, he finally got it by securing the blessing which Isaac intended for Esau (xxxv, 1–37). Then it was that Jacob, near to death, and apparently also to obtain a wife from his parents' stock, he fled to Haran, the dwelling place of Laban, his maternal uncle (xxxi, 41–xxviii, 5). On his way thither, he had at Luz the vision of the angels ascending and descending by a mysterious ladder which reached from earth to heaven, and of Yahweh renewing to him the glorious promises which He had made to Abraham and to Isaac; in consequence of this, he called the place Beth-El, and vowed exclusive worship to Yahweh Should He accompany him on his way and bring him back safely home (xxviii, 11–22). Jacob's relations with Laban, who was the time of formative experience, and the details of which are perfectly true to Eastern life and need not be set forth here. Besides blessing him with eleven children, God granted to Jacob a great material prosperity, so that Laban was naturally desirous of detaining him. But Jacob, long wearied with Laban's frequent trickery, and also beset by fear of return, departed secretly, and, although overtaken and threatened by his angry father-in-law, he managed to appease him and to pursue his own way towards Chanaan (xxxix–xxx). He managed also—after a vision of angels at Mahanaim, and a whole night's wrestling with God at Phanuel, on which latter occasion he received a new blessing and the significant name of Israel—to appease his brother Esau, who had come to meet him with 400 men (xxxii–xxxiii, 16).

Passing through Socoth, Jacob first settled near Salem, a city of the Semities, and there raised an altar to the God of Israel (xxxiii, 17–20). Concluded to leave on account of the enmity of the Chanaanites—the precise occasion of which is uncertain—he went to Bethel, where he fulfilled the vow which he had made when on his way to Haran (xxxiv–xxxv, 15). Proceeding farther south, he came to Ephrata, where he buried Rachel, who died giving birth to Benjamin, and where he erected a pillar on the site of her grave. Thence, through Migdal-Eder, he came to Hebron, where he was joined by Esau for their father's burial (xxxv, 16–29). In Hebron, Jacob lived quietly as the head of a numerous pastoral family, received with imposing honors all who came to visit him, and was set to death, passed through the pressure of famine, and agreed most reluctantly to his separation from Benjamin (xxxvii, 1–4; xlii, 35–38; xliii, 1–14). The news that Joseph was still alive and invited him to come to Egypt revived the patriarch, who, passing through Bersabee, reached Egypt with his sons and grandchildren (xlv, 25–xlix). There it was given him to meet Joseph again, to enjoy the honours conferred upon him by Pharaoh, and to spend prosperously his last days in the services to the State, the king conferred on him, shortly before his death, the foretold future fortunes of the respective descendants of his sons, and passed away at the age of 147 (xlii, 29–xlix). According to his last wishes, he was buried in the land of Chanaan (I, 1–13). Despite the various difficulties met with in the examination of the Biblical narrative and dealt with in detail by commentators, it is quite certain that the history of Jacob is that of a real person whose actual deeds are recorded with substantial accuracy. Jacob's character is a mixture of good and evil, gradually chastened by the experience of a long life, and upon the whole unworthy of being compared with God, for he was a man of His mercy towards the chosen people. The Talmudic legends concerning Jacob are the acme of fancy.

See bibliography to Isaac.

Francis E. GIGOT.

Jacobellus von Mirens. See HUS AND HUSBITS.

Jacobites. See BARADEUS, JACOB; EASTERN CHURCHES.—A. Schismatical Churches.

Jacob of Juterborg (in the world Benedict Stolzenhagen), theologian and canonist, b. of poor parents near Juterborg, in East Frisland, Jan. 29, 1381; d. at Erfurt in 1465. In 1401 he entered the Cistercian monastery of Paradies, in Poland; hence his names Jacobus de Polonia, Jacobus de Paradiso, and Jacobus Cisterciensia. Being sent to the University of Krakow by his abbot, he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and thereafter became professor of theology and preacher at that university. Displeased at the loose discipline of his order, he entered the Carthusian monastery at Erfurt in 1441, taught canon law at the university of that place for many years, and was elected rector in 1450. He was an assistant to the grand master of his Order he is often called Jacobus Carthusianus, Jacobus de Clusa, and Jacobus de Erfordia. He was full of zeal for reform in the Church, and in some of his writings severely criticizes Italian ecclesiastics for bestowing responsible benefices upon incapable and unworthy persons. Like many other great men of his time, he advocated the so-called conciliar theory, that the general council is above the pope.

He is the author of about eighty treatises, mostly on theological and canonical subjects. The following twelve of his works have been printed: "Quodlibetum passuum humanarum," a work of theology explaining the obligations of men in the various states of life; "Tractatus de animabus erutis a corporibus," an interesting treatise on the condition of the human soul after death—seven editions of this work were published; "De valore Missarum pro defunctis celebratarum" (the preceding three incunabula contain neither place nor date of publication; the first came out at Esslingen in 1475, the second at Erfurt about 1463, the third in 1493 at an unknown place). "De causis multarum passionum," edited by Pez in "Bibliothea ascetica" (Ratisbon, 1835), VII, 389–444; "De indulgentia," a dogmatically correct treatise on indulgences, edited by Walch, "Monumenta inedita medii aevi" (Gottingen, 1764), II, 163 sq.; "Petitiones religionorum pro reformatione sui status," edited by Klüpel in "Vetus Bibliotheca eclesiastica" (Freiburg im Br., 1780), 146 sq.; "De negotii pontificii pro viribus ecclesiastic," edited by Walch, loc. cit., I, fasc. 4; "Avemirant Jacobus," a treatise on ecclesiastical music, a memorial addressed to Pope Nicholas V, in which the author urges a reform in the Church, edited by Klüpel, loc. cit., 134 sq.; "De septem statibus ecclesie," edited by Walch, loc. cit., II, fasc. 2; "Sermone monicae" (date and place of publication unknown); "De erroibus et moribus Christianorum" (Lobbeck, 1488); "Livorum consiliant"
to consecrate him bishop personally, and called him to Rome for that purpose; but shortly after the arrival of de Voragine the pope died, and the new bishop was consecrated at Rome during the succeeding interregnum, on 13 April, 1292. The episcopate of Jacopo de Voragine fell in a time when Genoa was a scene of continuous warfare between the Rampini and the Mascalari, the former of whom was styled the latter Gibellines. The archbishop, indeed, effected an apparent reconciliation between the two hostile parties in 1295; but the dissensions broke out anew, and all his efforts to restore peace were useless.

In 1292 he held a provincial synod at Genoa, chiefly for the purpose of removing one of the earliest bishops of Genoa (3247). The cult of Jacopo de Voragine, which seems to have begun soon after his death, was ratified by Pius VII in 1816. The same pope permitted the clergy of Genoa and Savona, and the whole Order of St. Dominic, to celebrate his feast as that of a saint.

Jacopo de Voragine is best known as the author of a collection of legendary lives of the saints, which was entitled "Legenda Sanctorum" by the author, but soon became universally known as "Legenda Aures" (Golden Legend), because the people of that time considered it as a book of the Holy Scriptures. In some of the earlier editions it is styled "Lombardica Historia,", which title gave rise to the false opinion that this was a different work from the "Golden Legend". The title "Lombardica Historia" originated in the fact that in the life of Pope Pelagius, which forms the second last chapter of the "Golden Legend", is contained an abstract of the history of the Lombards down to 1250 (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script., XXIV, 167 sq.). In the preface to the "Golden Legend" the author divides the ecclesiastical year into four periods, which he counts from four epochs in the history of the Church, with a time of devotion, renovation, reconciliation, and pilgrimage. The body of the work, which contains 177 chapters (according to others, 182), is divided into five sections, viz. from Advent to Christmas, from Christmas to Septuagesima, from Septuagesima to Easter, from Easter to the Octave of Pentecost, and from the Octave of Pentecost to Advent. If we are to judge the "Golden Legend" from an historical standpoint, we must condemn it as entirely uncritical and hence of no value, except in so far as it teaches us that the people of those times were an extremely naive, credulous, and religious people, permeated with an unshakable belief in God's omnipotence and His fatherly care for those who lead a saintly life.

If, on the other hand, we view the "Golden Legend" as an artistically composed book of devotion, we must admit that it is a complete success. It is admirably adapted to enhance our love and respect towards God, to foster our devotion towards His saints, and to animate us with a holy zeal to follow their example. The chief object of Jacopo de Voragine and of other medieval hagiographers was not to compose the Chronicle of the Saints. His scientific treatises for the learned, but to write books of devotion that were adapted to the simple manners of the common people. It is due to a wrong conception of the purpose of the "Golden Legend" that Luis Vives (De causis corrupturarum artium, c. ii), Melchior Canus (De locis theologici, xi, 6), and others have severely dismissed it. The conception that the Bollandists (Acta SS., January, I, 19) and many recent hagiographers have highly praised it. That the work made a deep impression on the people is evident from its immense popularity, and from the great influence it had on the prose and poetic literature of many nations. It became the basis of many passions of the Middle Ages and religious poems of later times. Longfellow's "Golden
Legend", which, with two other poems, forms the
tetralogy entitled "Christus". It was its name and many of its ideas to the "Golden Legend" of de Vogare.

Bernard Guiodis (d. 1331), also a Dominican,
made a vain attempt to supplant it by a more reliable
work of the same character, which he entitled "Spec-
ulum Sanctorum". In 1500 as many as seventy-
four Latin editions of the "Legenda Aurea" had been
published. For a long time the three transitions to
English, five French, eight Italian, fourteen Low Ger-
man, and three Bohemian. The first printed edition
was in Latin, and was produced at Baele in 1470.
Many succeeding editions contain additions of the
lives of later saints or of feasts introduced after the
translation. The best Latin edition was pre-
bred by Graesse (Dresden and Leipzig, 1846, 1850,
and Breslau, 1890). The first English edition was
printed by William Caxton at London in 1483 from
a version made about 1450. It was inscribed: "The
Golden Legend. Finysshed at Westmere the twenty-
day of November/ the yere of our Lord M./CCCC/ LXXXIII/. By me Wylyam Caxton." In this
edition some of the less credible legends of the
original are omitted. The publication was made at
the instance of the Earl of Arundel, who agreed to take "a reasonable number of copies", and to pay and provide a summer and a dormitory (see Putnam, "Books and their Makers in the Middle Ages", New York and London, II, 1897, 118). Cax-
ton's edition was re-edited and modernized by Ellis
(London and New York, 1900). The first French
version that appeared in print was made by Jean
Bataller, and printed at Lyons in 1476. A French
translation, made by Jean Belet de Vigny in the
fourteenth century, was first printed at Paris in 1488.
Recent French editions were prepared by Brunet,
signed M. G. B. (Paris, 1943 and 1965); by de Wysa-
wa (Paris, 1965); and by Rose (Paris, 1962). An
Italian translation by Nicolas Mameri was printed
in 1475, probably at Venice; a Bohemian one was
printed at Pilsen between 1475 and 1479, and another
at Prague in 1495; a Low German one at Delft in
1472, and at Gouda in 1478. A German reproduction
in poetry was made by Kralik (Munch, 1962).

Golden Legend. The Princeton Theological Review, I (1903),
267-81; I. Dm., Verapone as a Preacher, I. II (1904), 442-
64; The Golden Legend in the Church Quarterly Review, LVII
(London, 1902), 289-307. WATERKUI, De bestanden Jacobus de
Vogare at (Paris, 1902); BARTHELEMY, Les psychologies de la
Legende Dorte at Minerva, V (Strasbourg, 1902), 24-43; BROSSE-
LLE, La Legenda Aurea in La Universite Catholique, new series,
XXIV (Lyons, 1943), 321-57; PELASIA, Vita del beato Gio-
como da Varazze, dell'ordine de' frati Preclitori, arcivescovo di
Genova (Genoa, 1867).

MICHAEL OTT.

JACOPO DA TODI, properly Jacopo Benedetti or
Benedetti, Franciscan poet, b. at Todi in the first
half of the thirteenth century; d. at Collazzone about
1306. Very little is known with certainty about the
life of this extraliminary man. Although the oldest
lives go back only to the fifteenth century, yet a
few earlier records exist. The oldest and most
authentic document we have is Jacopone's signature
to the manifesto of Cardinals Jacopo and Pietro
Colonna against Boniface VIII (q. v.), dated Lun-
ghezza (between Rome and Tivoli), 10 May, 1297. [See
text in "Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengesch.", V
(1889), 500 sq.] Angelo Claimo in "Chronicon septem
Trubulationum", written about 1323 ("Archiv f. Litt.
und Kirchengesch.", II (1886), 306; Dollinger, "Be-
träge zur Sekten-
gesch.", II (Munich, 1890), 492),
mentions Jacobus Tuderus, an illegitimate friar who
served as aeron and his friars who, in 1294,
sent a deputation to Celestine V (q. v.),
to ask permission
to live separate from the
other friars and observe the Franciscan Rule in its
perfection—a request which was granted. The next
reference to the poet is found in Alvarus Pela-
gius's "De Planctu Ecclesiae", written principally
before 1239 and completed in 1274. About 1335 the
"Catalogus sanctorum Fratrum Minorum" (in "Spe-
culum Vitae beati Franciscii et Societarii eius", Venice,
1604, f. 200 r; cf. the separate reprint of the "Cat-
alogus" by Lemmens, Rome, 1903, 9) uses even
more emphatic words of praise. Some further de-
tails about Jacopone are given in "Summa totius histor-i
virtutum et vitiorum" (Basle, 1497), which is an
epitome of a work of the same title, written by
William Peraldu, a Dominican who died about
thirty years before Jacopo de Vogare. A theo-
lological work, entitled "De operibus et opusculis
Sancti Augustini", was also apparently to be
published but its authenticity has not yet been
estabhshed. It is known that he was a close student
of St. Augustine. Some, relying on the authority of
Sixtus of Sienna, ascribe to him also an Italian
translation of the Bible, but no manuscript or print of it
has ever been found.

BUTLER, Legenda Aurea—Legenda Dorte—Golden Legend
(Bakinson, 1899); RICHARDSON, Jacobus de Vogare and the

JACOPO DA TODI BEFORE THE BLESSED VIRGIN
AFTER GROMPEL IN THE "LAUDI"
(Florence, 1490)
in "Fanfulla della Domenica", Rome, 10 June, 1806), on the ground that this legend has too many points of resemblance with the "Legends of St. Francis". But these resemblances between the lives of saints have already become a commonplace, and in this case are not to be taken seriously. On the other hand, Bertoni is right in rejecting the description of the circumstances under which each of Jacopone's poems was written. This part of his life is rather to be considered as a commentary on the poems of Jacopone. As to the real sources of his life, the author himself, in the Tobler version (see bibliography), points out that he has collected the reminiscences and traditions of Jacopone's contemporaries and older friars in the Umbrian convents of his epoch. With the help of the aforesaid sources and of some allusions in Jacopone's poems, we can gather the following facts of his life. Born at Todi (12257), of the noble family of Benedetti, Jacopone took up the study of law—probably at Bologna, as might be inferred from the fact that this was the most famous school of law at the time, and from the manner in which he speaks of Bologna in the poem "Senno me pare e cortesia" (Modio, "I Cantici del B. Jacopone da Todi", Rome, 1535, 109). On returning home, he entered guiltily into the company of some'avare—-the profession of an advocate (procuratore). In course of time (1267?) he married a noblewoman, who in one version of the legend is called Vanna, daughter of Bernardino, Count of Collemedico (Coldi- mezzo near Todi) (La Verina, IV, 1906, 386). It was the great piety and the tragic death of his young spouse that brought about an entire change in Jacopone. A great feast was being celebrated at Todi—probably in 1268. Among the onlookers was Jacopone's wife in rich array. Suddenly the raised platform from which she was witnessing the spectacle gave way, crushing her fatally. When the poet reached her side, Vanna was lying on the floor. He tore off her dress, he found a hair cloth beneath the splendid robes. The terrible blow caused by his wife's death, together with the evidence of her secret penance for his sins, made such an impression on Jacopone that for many years he seemed to be no longer himself. Abandoning his profession, and wearing the habit of a Franciscan Tertiary (bizzone), he led a roaring life for a full decade (see the poem "Que farai fra Jacopone" in Modio, 73). During this period he was the terror of his friends and relations, and became a sort of Christian Diogenes. It was then probably published in former prospect or of law, Jacopone dei Benedetti, mocked and scoffed at by the boys in the streets of Todi, received the nickname of Jacopone. Once, saddled and bridled like an ass, he crawled on all fours in the public square of Todi; on another occasion, to the great confusion of his family, he appeared at a wedding in his brother's house, tarred and feathered from top to toe. When asked by a citizen to carry home a pair of capons for him, Jacopone brought them to the man's family tomb, saying that this was his true house. Jacopone's folly was however the folly of the Cross, as he says:—

Empaz per lo bel Messia.
A wise and courteous choice Le'd make
Who'd be a fool for the dear Lord's sake.

About 1278 he sought admission into the Order of Friars Minor at his native town, a request which after many refusals was granted. Out of humility, he chose to be a lay brother. In the great convent of S. Fortunato, at Todi, the so-called party of the "Community" of the Franciscan Order certainly prevailed. This party was strongly opposed to that of the more zealous friars, called the "Spirituals." The sympathies of Jacopone were with the latter. Boniface VIII, who had under unusual cir-

stances succeeded Celestine V, the friend of the Spirituals, having recou all privileges granted by his predecessor and thus subjected anew the zealous friars to their regular superiors, and having engaged in a struggle with the two Cardinals Colonna, Jacopone took sides with these two protectors of the Spirituals against the pope. Perhaps there were also personal reasons for enmity between Boniface and the Colonna family, who, according to a young man (1260), obtained an ecclesiastical benefice at Todi, where his uncle Peter was bishop from 1252 to 1276 (see Eubei, "Hierarchia cath. med. avi.", I, 530; Tosii, "Storia di Bonifazio VIII", Monte Cassino, I, 1846, 231; Finke, "Aus den Tagen des Papstes Felix IV", 1831, 127). Among the strongholds of the Colonnas, having been taken in 1298 by the papal troops, Jacopone was imprisoned in the fortress above the town, known to-day as Castel San Pietro. Some of Jacopone's most touching, and also most aggressive, poems were composed in this dungeon. Not even in the great Jubilee of 1300 did Jacopone obtain pardon, the Colonna and their partisans having been excluded from the Jubilee by a special Bull (see text in Tosii, l. c., II, 283). Boni-

face VIII was captured at Anagni on Sept., 1303, and upon his death, which occurred shortly afterwards (Oct. 1303), Jacopone was set free. He was restored to his monastery at Arpino, broken down, tried and purified by hardships, he withdrew first to Pantanelli, a hermitage on the Tiber, three hours distant from Orvieto (La Verina, I. c., 390), then to Collazzone, a small town situated on a hill between Perugia and Todi. There is no record of a Franciscan monastery at that place, but there was a Poor Clare Convent, S. Lorenzo, served as usual by Franciscan Friars (see Liviari Olinger, "Dove è morto il B. Jacopone da Todi?" in "Voce di S. Antonio", Quareacli, 13 Feb., 1907). It was here that Jacopone died on 25 Dec., 1306, just at the moment when the priest was intoning the Mass. His last moments were consolled by the presence of his faithful friend, Blessed John of La Verna, from whom he had especially desired to receive the Last Sacraments, and who really arrived just before the poet's death. His body was brought to Todi and buried in the church of the Poor Claire of Montecristo (Toby, the version of the legend) or Montesanto (Bartholomew of Pisa, Marianus Florentinus), outside the walls of Todi. In 1433 it was discovered in Montecristo and removed to the Franciscan church of S. Fortunato inside the town, where his tomb is still to be seen, both published in former and of law, Jacopone dei Benedetti, mocked and scoffed at by the boys in the streets of Todi, received the nickname of Jacopone. Once, saddled and bridled like an ass, he crawled on all fours in the public square of Todi; on another occasion, to the great confusion of his family, he appeared at a wedding in his brother's house, tarred and feathered from top to toe. When asked by a citizen to carry home a pair of capons for him, Jacopone brought them to the man's family tomb, saying that this was his true house. Jacopone's folly was however the folly of the Cross, as he says:—

Empaz per lo bel Messia.
A wise and courteous choice Le'd make
Who'd be a fool for the dear Lord's sake.

About 1278 he sought admission into the Order of Friars Minor at his native town, a request which after many refusals was granted. Out of humility, he chose to be a lay brother. In the great convent of S. Fortunato, at Todi, the so-called party of the "Community" of the Franciscan Order certainly prevailed. This party was strongly opposed to that of the more zealous friars, called the "Spirituals." The sympathies of Jacopone were with the latter. Boniface VIII, who had under unusual cir-

stances succeeded Celestine V, the friend of the
(Rome, 1869), in archives of the postulator general O.F.M.). The chief obstacle to the confirmation of this cultus lies in the part Jacopone took against Boniface VIII and the satires he wrote against this much calumniated pope.

The cultus of Jacopone is not very rich. In the cathedral of Prato is a beautiful fifteenth-century fresco, often reproduced [for instance by Thode (see bibliography), fig. 66; in "La Verna", IV (1906), 389]. The fourteenth-century Codex Strozzi 174 at the Laurentian Library, Florence, contains a miniature of the poet in the Vision antologica of the Roman (1364-1380, 465); another miniature (certainly conventional) is found in the "Franciscana" of the Portiuncula. The church of S. Fortunato of Todi is adorned by two pictures of Jacopone—one over his tomb (1398), another in a side chapel together with the portraits of four other saints (seventeenth century). Jacopone was believed to have died not so much from bodily ailment as from the excess of Divine love, which at last broke his heart. (Modio, prefacc. The chief interest attaching to Jacopone is derived from his literary works. Of his poems, written in the Umbrian dialect, the early editions exist but no modern critical one. (1) The first is printed at Florence, 1490. It is almost a critical edition and contains 102 Italian pieces. [See accurate description in "Miscellanea Franciscana", I (Foligno, 1886), 21-29.] The other edition, containing (in addition to compositions of other poets) 122 poems, of which seven are in Latin; (2) Venice, 1514—139 songs; (3) Venice, 1546—repetition of the preceding; (4) Rome, 1558—by Modio, with life of Jacopone in the preface, best edition after that of 1490, which it follows in the number of poems (they were 165 in the original), 1615—reprint of the Roman edition with slight alterations; (5) Venice, 1617—by Francesco Tressatti, O.F.M.—the best-known but least critical edition, containing 211 copiously annotated songs, many of which certainly do not belong to Jacopone. Alessandro de Mortiana published a few hitherto unedited poems of Jacopone (Lucca, 1819). Towards the middle of the nineteenth century, Oznam revived general interest in Jacopone by his "Poetes franciscains". Since then many have written on the subject and expressed their appreciation of these remarkable and tender souls, and have drawn so much from some of his productions, as In loco amor mi mi and Amor de caritate, have been attributed to St. Francis himself. Both are at the head of Umbrian poets. Jacopone’s rhymes, simple, at times even rough in expression, but profound and tender in sentiment, were less adapted to the cultured classes than the "Divina Commedia" of Dante, but were sung with enthusiasm by the people. How much Jacopone’s poetry was appreciated down to the seventeenth century is shown by the numberless manuscripts which contain them, often in the particular order of the poems (they were 165), written, and by the fact that almost every old Italian song has been ascribed to him. These laudi were especially in use among the so-called laudesi and the flagellants, who sang them in the towns, along the roads, in their confraternities, and in sacred dramatic representations. Even the "Stabat Mater Dolorosa", the authorship of which is still attributed to Jacopone with greater probability than to any other competitor (Ghir, was sung in the same way. (See, on this point, D’Ancona, "Origini del Teatro Italiano", I, Turin, 1891, 114, 155-62, 550-2.) Jacopone’s prose works are much less known. They consist of small spiritual treatises, somewhat resembling the well-known golden sayings of Blessed Giles (see Ergidius of Assisi), but they are more connected. The Latin text of these may be found in part in Bartholomew of Pisa (I.c.) and in many manuscripts. An Italian version, translated from Bartholomew of Pisa, is found in the "Franciscana" and some other versions of the life of Jacopone. Another fifteenth-century Italian version, ascribed to Feo Beleari, appeared at the beginning of the sixteenth century, together with the treatises of Ugo Panciera at Venice (ed.); ed. Parenti at Modena in 1832; and finally in "Prose di Feo Beleari edito ed inedito", III (Rome, 1843), by Gigli; cf. E. Böhm in "Romanske Studier", I (Halle, 1871), 123-32. Finke (I.c.) suspects that Jacopone wrote the "Stabat Mater" for the Diocesan Archives of Pisa, and directed to the King of France by "illitterus Jacob", belongs to Jacopone.

(1) LIVES.—In Franciscana, a manuscript chronicle by Jacopo Odo (d. 1488), of which four codices exist: two at Perugia, two at Portiuncula (Annales Ordinis Minorum Franciscanorum, in Il Propugnatore, XIX (Bologna, 1866), 151-212. Almost identical with this is the life edited by Tobler in Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, II (Halle, 1875), 58-90; cf. ibid., II (1879), 178-92; and another of Mariano Florentino (?), edited by Livanus in Luce e Amore, IV (1878), 644-655. (See also the shorter version: Fossettino, Via de’ Santi e Beati di Todi (Perugia, 1927), 98-113; Modio, I Cantici del B. Jacopone da Todi (Rome, 1899), see also: D’Ancona, I poemi, II, 150-9.) There is a shorter version: ROMANISTI, V et VI (1896), 101-4, 184-6. (2) MODERN LIVES.—MACDONnell, Sona di Francesco (London, 1902), 334-68. (3) MODERN VERSIONS OF TRANSLATIONS OF Jacopone’s poetry—see also, ibid., 39-42; Spera, Jacopone da Todi in Quarterly Review (London, Jan., 1910), 53-72; Hodgson, The Most Penitent of them All (a novel); OZANAM, Les Poètes franciscains en Italie au xivé siècle (Paris, 1832), 106-108. (See also: Böhm in Romanistische Studien, 1 (1894), 87-90; cf. ibid., 90-92.) There are also more recent editions—German tr. by Lutterwinkel (Münster, 1833), Italian tr. by Landley (Roma, 1843), D’Ancona, Jacopone da Todi, II, Giulia di Dio del secolo XIII (Pisa, 1883), 2nd series, 1-10 of the entire collection (Rome, 1880, 1883, 1887, 1907), 1904, 1906). (4) Inaccurate and inaccurate, Jacopone da Todi (Rome, 1897), 19-20; BRUGNOLI, Fra Jacopone da Todi, pubblicazione di Società internazionale di Studi Francescani in Assisi (Assisi, 1907). (5) ON WORKS AND PARTICULAR QUESTIONS.—BÖHM, Jacopone da Todi..., in Romanistische Studien, I, Halle, 1875, 123-61; MONCAGGETTI, I Codici Marciani contenenti lauda di Jacopone da Todi (Venezia, 1888); TENNENBOIN, I rari di antiche Poesie italiane religiose e morali con prospettiva dei Codici che concorrono alla produzione delle laudi spirituali (Florence, 1909), preparatory work for critical edition of Jacopone. Partial German translation of Jacopone’s poetry with extensive notes was published by Lutterwinkel and Struck, Augezliche Gedichte Jacopone’s da Todi (Münster, 1904); FELDER, Jacopone’s Bemerkungen über die Laudes in Einigen der Todes Jacopone da Todi in Studien Franciscaner (Covin, Belgium, March and April, 1904); LATTIN, Dante e Jacopone e loro contatti di persona (Berlin and Rome, 1900). On the Stabat Mater Dolorosa see JULLIARD, Dictionary of Hymnology (2nd impression of 2nd ed., London, 1908), 1081-84, where the numerous English translations, old and new, are indicated; see, ibid., 575 and passim; CHEVALIER, Repertorium Hymnologicum, II (Louisviill, 1823), 690-800, with copious bibliography, HENRY, The Two Stabat Matris in American Cath. Quarterly Review, XXVIII (1903), 625; GUE, Der Sogarunen der romanischen Mat (Freiburg in Br., 1892); TENNENBOIN, I Stabat Mater e Donna del Paradiso (Todi, 1887); CARULLI, La Sotia, "La Papa Boniface, molt’appezzato al mondo", La Stabat Mater da Fra Jacopone da Todi (Bologna, 1889); L’Estetica dello Stabat Mater (Siena, 1897); GIOIA, La Stabat Mater Esperiens (Verona, 1885); LATTIN, Il Stabat Mater e la sua prigionia in Luce e Amore, III (Florence, 1896), 931-36. LIVIANUS OLIGER.

Jacotot, Joseph, French educator, b. at Dijon, March, 1770; d. at Paris, 30 July, 1849. He studied in the college of his native city, where, at the age of nineteen, he was appointed professor of classical literature. Later he filled successively the chairs of the methods of sciences (1796), ancient languages (1797), higher mathematics (1803), Roman law (1806), and pure mathematics (1808). As a member of the Representatives during the Hundred Days, he expressed his preference for the Empire, and, at the time of the Second Restoration, his hostility to the Bourbons made it necessary for him to leave France.
Going to Belgium, he taught privately at Mons and Brussels, and in 1818 was appointed professor of the French language and literature in the University of Louvain. The Revolution of 1830 allowed him to return to France, where he founded the stilnous, and in 1838 to Paris, endeavouring to propagate his method of teaching, and working for "the intellectual emancipation" of his fellow-men. His works under the common title of "Enseignement Universel" are: "Langue maternelle" (Louvain, 1822); "Langues étrangères," (Paris, 1831); "Vocabulaire et Peinture" (Louvain, 1824); "Mathématiques" (Louvain, 1828); "Droit et philosophie pédagogique" (Paris, 1839). He also wrote many articles in the "Journal de l'émanicipation intellectuelle," published by his two sons (1829-42), who also edited his "Mélanges et mémorial" (Paris, 1841). When Jacquot began to teach at Louvain, he knew neither Flemish nor Dutch, while many of his pupils could not understand French. To overcome this difficulty he gave them both the French text and the Dutch translation of Fénelon's "Télémaque." They were to memorize these stories in French, and carefully compare them with the Dutch, every day repeating what they knew and adding a little more. After some time Jacquot was surprised at their progress, for with no other help they had mastered the rules of spelling and grammar and could apply them correctly. Encouraged by this success, Jacquot thought he had found a universal method, by which he applied it to a thing which he had never seen: the Arabic language. This method rightly recognizes the necessity of the student's own efforts and mental work, and it also endeavors to apply the principle that all knowledge is so connected that to know one thing well, i.e. to know it in all its connections, supplies the key to a more perfect effort and understanding of the knowledge of the part. Hence it matters little where the student begins, or what book he uses, provided he proceeds rightly. Generally, instead of starting with the first elements, Jacquot would have begun with something complex, which the student himself would analyze into its elements—comparing these, noting their similarities and differences, and thus finding the rules for himself. Among the number of principles which sum up Jacquot's method, we may mention the following: "Know something well, and always refer everything else to that." "Everything can be his own master." "Everything can be learned and taught, whatever he does not know." More paradoxical are the two axioms which are given as the bases of the whole method: "All men are of equal intelligence," that is, are equally capable of learning; "All is in all," that is, the same general ideas are found in every work, and consequently man should start to master them, that is, the whole mind, he must know already. However exaggerated such principles, and even the whole method, may seem, and however vehement at times Jacquot may have been in defending them, it must be conceded that they emphasize a few vital points, the necessity of personal effort and appreciation of the whole, the connection more or less immediate of all ideas, the need of order and method, and the importance of thoroughness in knowledge.

GUILLEMY in Nouvelle Biographie générale (Paris, 1888), v.; KUHN in France, Francod毱sche Lebensbilder der Philosophen, n. (Lananesh, 1905), 507; PERRE in BIBLIOTHEQUE, Dictionnaire de pédagogie, II. (1, Paris, 1856), 1309; QUICKE in Enseignements, III (Gutmann, 1897), 74.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Jacques de Vitry, historian of the crusades, cardinal, Bishop of Acre, later of Toulouse, b. at Vitry-sur-Seine, near Paris, probably about 1160; d. at Rome, 1240. After attending the University of Paris, then in its infancy, he visited Marie d'Oignies, a mystic of the Diocese of Liége, attracted by her reputation for holiness. On her advice he became a canon regular, returned to Paris for ordination to the priesthood, and thereafter devoted himself to preaching; from 1210 to 1213 he was one of the most noted preachers of the crusade against the Albigenses. In fact so great was his success that the Latin clergy of St. John of Acre chose him as their bishop. He accepted the episcopal dignity with the approbation of Honorius III. From Palestine he went to Egypt and was present at the capture of Damietta (1218-20), an account of which he wrote to Pope Honorius, the leaders of the crusading movement attributed his imperious temper and attributed their reverses to his stubbornness. In 1227 he returned to Rome but soon resumed the offensive against the heretics of the Diocese of Liége. In 1229 Gregory IX allowed him to resign the See of Acre, created him a cardinal and gave him a later legate in France and in Germany. He did not long survive his refusal of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem; at his request his body was conveyed to Oignies.

Among his works are letters to Pope Honorius, which form an important source of the history of the crusades, and a series of five books (De senectute, De virtutibus, De vita Christiana, De vita ecclesiastica, De vita mundana) for the use of preachers; a "Liber de mulliibus Leidienibus," the most celebrated of these being Marie d'Oignies, whose wonderful visions the author relates (ed. Acta SS., June, IV, 565, 666), finally the "Historia Orientalis seu itinerarium," his principal work, an account of his journeys, and of the crusades in the Holy Land in the thirteenth century. He was an inquiring and observant mind and conceived the plan—a remarkable one for the age in which he lived—of writing a geographical description of Palestine. The first book is wholly devoted to that land and gives the history from the time of Moses; describing the expansion of Islam, he gives many picturesque details concerning Oriental idolaters, the Turcomans, the Bedouins, and especially the Assassins, subjects of the Old Man of the Mountain. His account of the crusades is followed by praise for the fertility of Palestine under Christian domination, and for the efforts of the Italians, French, Germans, Bretons, and English to colonize it. He likewise dwells upon the characteristics of the various indigenous nations and of the "Pullani," half-breeds, to whose vices he attributes the reverses of the Christians. The writer then undertakes to give a complete history of the geography of the country, and gives a great many particulars, half real and half fabulous, regarding its climate, flora, fauna, minerals, its barbarous and extraordinary nations, the Amazons, etc. The honey gathered from the reeds (ex calaminthus) was, of course, only cane sugar. A striking feature of the account is that which he gives of the magnetic compass: "Acus ferrea postquam ad damnamum contigerit, ad stelam septentrionalis quam velut axis firmamenti alis versentibus non movetur, semper convertitur. Unde valde necessaria est navigantium in mari." (Bon- garde: "Gesta Dei," 1, 1168.) The remainder of the book is a history of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Book II, a dimly painted picture of the Christians of the East, closes with an account of the monastic orders and the hierarchy of Palestine. A third book, the story of the Egyptian crusade, is not from Jacques de Vitry, but from the pen of Oliver the Scholastic, Bishop of Paderborn.

Historia orientalis, ed. BONGARE, Gesta Dei per Francos, I, 1047-1145; French tr. in Guizot's Collection des mémoires. Book I: DAUVIV (Histoire des croisades) (2 Vols., French), XVIII (1835); BARRUE, Jacques de Vitry (Paris, 1885).

LOUIS BREHIER.

Jacquier, FRANCOIS, French mathematician and physicist, b. at Vitry-le-François, 7 June, 1711; d. at Rome, 3 July, 1758. His early education was entrusted to an ecclesiastic, who soon recognized in
him an inclination to science and mathematics, and endeavoured to cultivate it. When sixteen years old, François entered the Order of Friars Minor, and after profession was sent to Rome, to complete his studies in the French convent of the order, La Trinité du Mont. With the permission of his superiors he returned to the Nieuwe Alberoni as a sort of mental diversion, devoted himself to the study of the ancient languages. He became very proficient in Hebrew, and spoke Greek as though it were his mother-tongue. His labours and learning gained for him the patronage of Cardinals Alberoni and Portocarrero. He accompanied Cardinal Alberoni on his legation to Ravenna, and was appointed to inspect the work begun by Manfredi to prevent the repeated inundations of that territory. On his return he was given the chair of Sacred Scripture at the College of the Propaganda, and was also detailed by the general chapter of the Friars Minor, assembled at Marseilles, to work upon the annals of the order. The King of Sardinia named him professor of physics at the University of Turin in 1745, but Cardinal Valenti, prime minister of Benedict XIV, eager to retain so learned a man in Rome, had him assigned to the Collegio Clementino, then in the college. Here he was in continual demand for consultation upon scientific matters. In 1763 he was appointed instructor in physics and mathematics to the young Prince Ferdinand at Parma. He was appointed in 1773 to the chair of mathematics at the Roman College, in the occasion of the suppression of the Jesuits. At his death he was connected with nearly all the great scientific and literary societies of Europe. The most important of his works are: (1) "Isaac Newtoni philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica, perpetuis commentariis illustrata" (4 parts in 3 vols., Rome, 1738-42), in collaboration with P. Leclerc; (2) "Per una nuova formula si calcolano i danni della cupola di San Pietro" (4to, Rome, 1743); (3) "Elementi di perspettiva secondo i principi di Taylor" (8vo, Rome, 1745); (4) "Institutiones Philosophiae ad studia theologica potissimum accommodata" (6 vols. in 12mo, Rome, 1757), reprinted many times at Rome, Venice, and in Germany, and later translated into Spanish; (5) "Elementos del calculo integral" (4to, Parma, 1768), a work highly esteemed and more complete than any that had been published up to that time.

E. P. TITMAN.

JEÃŒN, DIOCESE OF (GIENNESIA), in Southern Spain. The city of Jaén, capital of the province of the same name, is situated in north-eastern Andalusia on the lower part of the north-eastern slope of Monte Jabal-ecus about 100 feet above sea-level, in 1884 the population was 28,434. During the period 1013-90 the city of Jaén, the Romans' Aurgi, was the capital of the independent Moorish Kingdom of Djarwan, and was reconquered from the Moors by St. Ferdinand III of Castile and Leon in April, 1249. According to local tradition, the first bishop was supposed to be one of the seventy disciples. He is said to have been sent to Southern Spain, together with St. Torquatus and five other pupils of the Apostles, by Sts. Peter and Paul, and to have settled at Ilturgis (now Andújar), where he is reputed to have suffered martyr- dom. According to the Chronicle of Herrera, the Hispanizm Sanetorum Torquati etc., in "Acta SS.", III, May (Brussels, 1680), 442-4; Terrones y Robres, "Vida, martirio, transición y milagros de S. Eufrasio, obispo y patron de Andújar" (Granada, 1657). Other predecessors of the bishops of Jaén are, according to local tradition, the bishops of Carakan (Episcopi Carakani), who lived in the period 258-656, and finally four of the bishops of Baena (Episcopi Beataiensis), flourishing between the seventh and the thirteenth centuries. The list of the bishops proper of Jaén does not begin until 1248, when the see was transferred from Baena to Jaén. The last Bishop of Baena was Fray Domingo, O.F. (1227-45); the first Bishop of Jaén was Pedro I Martinez (1249-50). The most notable among the sixty-four bishops who have governed the Diocese of Jaén are: St. Pascual de Jesús (1290-1300) and Gonzalo de Zuñiga (1422-56), who both died as martyrs in Moorish prisons; the sixty-fourth bishop, Juan José Laguarda y Fe- nollers (1906-9), was appointed Bishop of Barcelona at the consistory of 29 April, 1909, since which date to the See of Jaén has been suffragan of Granada.

Statistics.—The Diocese of Jaén is suffragan of Granada: it is bounded on the north by the Diocese of Ciudad Real, on the east by the Archdiocese of Toledo, on the south by the Archdiocese of Granada and the Diocese of Guadix, on the west by the Diocese of Cordova. According to the latest official diocesan statistics (1 January, 1905) it contains about 395,000 inhabitants, 12 deaneries (arciprestazgos) divided into 136 parishes, 136 parish churches, and 6 dependent churches. There are four male religious congregations with 4 monasteries, 10 cloistered female congregations with 27 houses, and 11 enclosed religious of both sexes. The chapter of the cathedral at Jaén has 12 canons, besides which the old chapter (6 canons) still exists at Baena. There is also the theological seminary of San Felipe Neri at Baena in addition to the diocesan seminary (Seminario Conciliar) at Jaén. Other educational institutions are the Colegio del Santísimo Sacramento for theological studies, and the Colegio de San Eufrasio for the education of choir-boys, both at Jaén. The massive Cathedral of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin stands in the highest part of the city of Jaén. It was begun in 1532 by Pedro de Valdelvira, and is a fine specimen of early Spanish Renaissance. In a name of the main façade stands the statue of the Virgin, Rostro or Santa Faç, a handkerchief of Saint Veronica, which is annually exhibited to the people on Good Friday and on the Feast of the Assumption.

Die Eximia Jurado, Catalogo de los obispados de las iglesias de la diocesis de Jaen (Madrid, 1854); De Ruyte, Historia eclesiastica del reino y obispado de Jaen (Jaen, 1854), the first part of which is alone printed, the second part being in the National Library at Madrid (M.S. Q. 88); del Bicho, Santos y santuarios del obispado de Jaen y Baena (Madrid, 1858); Gams, Kirchens. von Spanien, III (Ratis- bon, 1876), i, 48 sq., 160, 420 sq.

GREGOR REINHOLD.

Jaenbert (JANBERHT, JANBRHHT, JANBERT, LAMBERT, JANBRHT, GENGEBERT), thirteenth Archbishop of Canterbury; d. at Canterbury 11 or 12 Aug., 791: the exact date is uncertain; Flaw- ence of Worcester and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle place it in 790; Symeon of Durham, the better authori- ty, in 791. Nothing is known of his life till 780, when he was elected Abbot of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, and blessed by Archbishop Bregwin. When the archbishop died he was buried at Christ Church, and Jaenbert asserted the rights of his own abbey as the traditional burying-place with such vigour that ac- cording to a late tradition the monks of Christ Church elected him archbishop to avoid the appeal to Rome. He was consecrated on 2 Feb., 766, and received the pallium from Pope Paul I in 767. During his pontifi- cate the struggle of Kent against the growing power of Offa of Mercia ended in the defeat of the former and the recognition of the latter as suzerain. For the aggrandizement of Mercia involved the creation of a separate Anglo-Saxon independent of Canterbury, and though Jaenbert opposed this vigorously, Offa obtained the pope's consent, and the papal legates George and Theophylact held a council at Chelsea in 787 where Jaenbert was forced to surrender much of the jurisdiction of Canterbury to King Eadberht of Mercia. He moved the see of Canterbury to Lichfield. The extent of the territory transferred is not recorded. Silver coins were minted by Jaenbert,
he being the earliest Archbishop of Canterbury of whose coinage specimens have been preserved.


EDWIN BURTON.

Jaffa, a titular see in the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. The city of Jaffa is very ancient. Even before the arrival of Josue in Palestine it is mentioned on the pylon of Karnak and the cuneiform tablets of Tell-el-Amarna. Several Greek authors, relying on native legends, traced its foundation to Joppe (Cassiopeia), daughter of Æolus, and made it the scene of the fable of Andromeda exposed on a rock.

b. c.) his brothers Jonathas and Simon Machabeus took final possession of the city (I Mach., x, 74-6). Pompey captured it from the Jews in 63 b. c., and during the period of more than a century, until it became entirely Roman, the city changed masters several times.

Jaffa, which had now become Joppe, soon counted Christians among its inhabitants. It was there that St. Peter raised to life the widow Tabitha, a name interpreted Dorcas (Acts, ix, 36-42), whose tomb is still the object of a popular pilgrimage; there, too, in the house of Simon the Tanner, he had the symbolic vision of the unclean animals (Acts, x, 1-23). At the time of the great Jewish revolt against the Romans, Joppe was taken by Cestius Gallus, Governor of Syria, and its inhabitants slaughtered to the number of 8400. The fugitives from the city and vicinity afterwards reassembled there, and turned to piracy, which brought about a second interven-

and delivered by Perseus. Assigned to the tribe of Dan (Jos, xix, 46), Japho, or Jaffa, seems not to have belonged to the Jews before the reign of David, who conquered the maritime region (Judges, i, 34; xviii, 1; II Kings, viii, 1; Eccles., xlviii, 8). In the time of Solomon it served as the port of landing for the cedars sent by Hiram for the construction of the Temple of Jerusalem (II Par., ii, 16). After the death of Solomon it probably recovered its independence or fell into the power of the kings of Israel. The Prophet Jonas took ship there for Tharsis (Jonas, i, 3), and King Ezchiahs brought it once more under the power of the Kingdom of Judah (IV Kings, xviii, 8). In this condition it is several times mentioned in the inscriptions of the kings of Assyria, whose domination passed later to the Chaldeans and Persians. In the reign of Cyrus Jaffa again served as a landing-port for the materials destined for the reconstruction of the Temple (I Esd., iii, 7). After the expedition of Alexander the Great (333 b. c.) the city passed into the power alternately of Syria and Egypt. In consequence of violent wrong done the Jewish population, Judas Machabeus attacked the harbour at night and burned all the vessels (II Mach., xii, 3-7). Shortly afterwards (about 142

tion of the Romans and the violent death of 4200 persons. The city was then razed to the ground. Being without importance during the first centuries of Christianity, Joppe did not possess a bishop until the fifth century (Lequien, "Oriens Christianus", III, 627); a very small number of its Greek or Latin bishops are known (ibid., III, 625-30, 1291; Eubel, "Hierarchia catholica mediæ ævi", Munich, I, 297; II, 186). After the Arab conquest and the destruction of Cesarea Maritima in the seventh century, Jaffa acquired some importance and became the chief seaport of Palestine. Captured by the crusaders, it became, under Godfrey of Bouillon, the County of Jaffa and Ascalon, feudatory to the King of Jerusalem. One of its counts, John of Ibelin, wrote the principal book of the Assizes of the Kingdom of Jerusalem (see ASSIZES OF JERUSALEM). Taken by Saladin in 1187, and surrendered to Richard Coeur de Lion in 1192, Jaffa was reconquered in 1197 by the Sultan Malek-el-Adel, who had 20,000 Christians massacred there. In 1204 it fell once more into the power of the Christians, who held it until 1268, when Sultan Bibars of Egypt took possession of it and completely destroyed it. Bonaparte took it by assault in 1799, and was accused, perhaps
wrongfully, of having poisoned the Ottoman garrison and his own soldiers infected with the pest. Ibrahim Pasha, the son of Mehmet Ali, captured the city in 1831, and seven years later it was destroyed by earthquake.

Jaffa is connected by railroad with Jerusalem; its harbor and docks are of great importance, and shipping vessels are numerous. The city is surrounded by magnificent orange groves, and has now entirely recovered from all its misfortunes, the desolation and desolation of anti-Christian population being more than 40,000 souls. Among these are 5000 Jews, 1000 Protestants (mostly foreigners), 3350 Orthodox Greeks, 100 schismatic Armenians, 1770 Catholics (of whom 1010 are Latins, 215 Maronites, 510 Melchites, and 35 Syrians). The remainder of the population (about 30,000) is Musulman. Franciscan Fathers direct the parish church and a school for boys. The Brothers of the Christian Schools have a boarding-school, two day-schools, and a commercial school. Italian Catholics also have a school for boys. The Sisters of St. Joseph and the Franciscan nuns have each a boarding and a day school. There is also a French high school. The other (non-Catholic) Christian communities, especially the Protzestants, also have schools, hospitals, and orphanages.

S. Vailhé.

Jaffa, Diocese of (Jaffennise), situated in the northern portion of Ceylon, comprises the northern and north-central provinces of the island. Christianity in Jaffa dates back as far as the time of St. Francis Xavier. In 1548 St. Francis visited Mannar and came to Jaffa to persuade the king to cease his persecutions against the Christians. In 1580, under the protection of the Portuguese, the first Catholic church was built at Jaffa. The whole peninsula surrendered in 1591 to Andrea Furtado de Mendoza. Almost the entire population subsequently abjured idolatry and embraced Christianity. The fort of Jaffa capitulated to the Dutch in 1658. At that time there were in the peninsula 50 priests, 1 Jesuit college, 1 Franciscan and 1 Dominican convent, and 4 churches. The Dutch immediately manifested the most hostile disposition towards the Catholics. The parish priests and monks were banished, and giving shelter was declared a capital offence. From that time dates the long persecution which ended only with the surrender of Ceylon to the British in 1796. To this diocese belongs the Island of Mannar rendered famous by the apostolic labours of St. Francis Xavier and by the martyrdom of from 600 to 700 Christians, who were executed by order of the King of Jaffa. Madhu, though a solitary spot in the middle of the jungle, has also its historical fame. For a long time during the Dutch persecution it was the refuge of native Christians. To this spot they had transported a statue of Our Lady which is now enshrined in the new church. Madhu has developed into an important pilgrimage, where more than 40,000 pilgrims congregate every year for the feast of the Visitatio. In 1845 Ceylon was divided into the two vicariates of Colombo and Jaffna, with Bishop Orazio Bettachini as vicar apostolic of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate arrived in Ceylon. In 1857 the Jaffna vicariate was handed over to the Oblates, and on the death of Bishop Bettachini, Bishop Semeria, O.M.I., was appointed vicar apostolic. In 1888 Bishop Christopher Bonjean, O.M.I., succeeded Semeria for nine years in India and in 1856 had crossed over to Ceylon to join the Oblate Congregation.

During his administration a great impulse was given to primary education. The pernicious effects of the Protestant and Hindu schools were more than counterbalanced by the activity of the bishop and the missionaries. Subsequently Bishop Bonjean was transferred to the metropolitan See of Colombo. Bishop Theophile Meluish, O.M.I., who succeeded at Jaffa and, following in his footsteps, was named Archbishop of Colombo in 1893. In the same year Henri Jouilain, O.M.I., was appointed Bishop of Jaffa.

The entire population of the diocese is 499,200; the Catholic numbering 45,600. The diocese is in the hands of the Oblates; 3 secular priests help in the parochial ministry. The total number of missionaries is 46. Attached to the cathedral is St. Martin's seminary for the education of junior students aspiring to the priesthood. St. Patrick's college and boarding school is the most flourishing institution of the northern province. It has a staff of 6 European fathers, 1 native father, 2 brothers, and 15 native professors. The average number of students is 450. It is especially devoted to higher English education, and prepares its students for the Cambridge Junior and Senior examinations and for the London University Intermediate and University degrees. The Board of Education is competent to come into closer contact with non-Catholics and especially with the higher classes of Hindus. For this purpose a Hindu boarding school was attached to St. Patrick's college. The boarders number 100, with good prospects for the future. Jaffa convent, conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Family of Bordeaux, follows the same junior and senior courses, for the education of girls, as St. Patrick's. To the convent is attached a girls' orphanage. The native Brothers of St. Joseph are occupied in teaching at Jaffa, Kayts, Manaar, and Mullaitivu. The native Brothers of St. Peter conduct for the two schools and important stations of the diocese. There are 127 schools under the control of the missionaries, for the vernacular and primary English education. At the two industrial schools of Colombo and Mullaitivu 125 orphan boys are taught agriculture and useful trades. The diocese has conferences of St. Vincent de Paul and young men's associations for the working classes. St. Joseph's Catholic Church is the home of the Jaffa Catholic Guardian, a weekly paper devoted to the interests of the diocese. A Catholic Club has just been founded for the purpose of defending the interests of Catholic youth. See Catholic Directory (Madura, 1908); Bonjean, Jaffna Directory.

J. F. Albert Longe.

Jäger. See Agria.

Jager of Dornheim. See Crotus, Johann.

Jahveh. See Jehovah.

Jainism, a form of religion intermediate between Brahminism and Buddhism, originated in India in pre-Christian times, and has maintained its heretical attitude towards Brahminism down to the present day. The name is derived from jina, conqueror. The historical development of Jainism is not clearly understood. The Jainas are one of the six most important religions in India. It is a purely Indian religion and has spread to Ceylon, the Maldives, and Java, and has been carried to the West by mission work. Jainism is a form of self-denial and asceticism.

Jaffa, See Agria.

Jager of Dornheim. See Crotus, Johann.

Jahveh. See Jehovah.
monastic Brahminism. Of the reputed founder of Jainism we have but few details, and most of these are so like what we read of the beginnings of Buddhism that one is strongly led to suspect that here at least one is dealing with a variation of the Buddha-legend. According to Jainist tradition, the founder lived in the same period as Buddha, being either the younger or the precursor of Buddha. His family name was Jnatriputra (in Prakrit, Nattaputta), but, like Gotama, he was honoured with the laudatory names of Buddha, the enlightened, Mahavira, the great hero, and Jina, the conqueror. These last two epithets came to be held in common by all teachers, while the name Buddha was associated almost exclusively with Gotama. Like Buddha, Jina was the son of a local raja who held sway over a small district in the neighbourhood of Benares. While still a young man he felt the emptiness of a life of pleasure, and gave up his home and princely station to become an ardent follower of the Brahman ascetics. If we may trust the Jainist scriptures, he carried the principle of self-mortification to the extent that he went about naked, unsheltered from the sun, rain, and winds, and lived on the rudest vegetarian fare, practising incredible fasts. Accepting the principle of the Brahmin ascetics, that salvation lay in the cessation of desire, he passed into the step of rejecting as useless the Vedas and the Vedic rites. For this attitude towards the Brahman traditions he was repudiated as a heretic. He gathered eleven disciples around him, and went about preaching his doctrine of salvation. Like Buddha he made many converts, whom he organized under a monastic rule of life. Associated with them were many who accepted his teaching in theory, but who in practice stopped short of the monastic life of extreme asceticism. These were the lay Jainists, who, like the lay Buddhists, contributed to the support of the monks.

As in the case of the Buddhists, the Jain monks have for ages been split into two sects. The White-Robed Sect, whose monks are clothed in white garments, is the more numerous, flourishing chiefly in N. W. India. To this sect belong a few communities of Jainist nuns. The naked ascetics, forming the other sect, are strongest in the South of India, but even here they have become less numerous in the last century from the evil of eating. As the Buddhist creed is summed up in three words, Buddha, the Law, the Order, so the Jain creed consists of the so-called three jewels, Right Belief, Right Knowledge, Right Conduct. Right Belief embraces faith in Jina as the true teacher of salvation and the acceptance of the Jainist scriptures as his authoritative teaching. These scriptures are less extensive, less varied, than the Buddhist, and, while resembling the latter to a large degree, lay great stress on bodily mortification. The canon of the White-robed Sect consists of forty-five Agamas, or sacred texts, in the Prakrit tongue. Jacobst, who has collated some of these texts in the "Sacred Books of the East", is of the opinion that they cannot be older than 300 B.C. According to Jainist tradition, they were preceded by an ancient canon of fourteen so-called Purvas, which have totally disappeared. With the Jainists, "Right Knowledge" embraces the religious view of life and of the end of man, while "Right Conduct" is concerned with the main ethical precepts and with the ascetic, monastic system.

The Jainist, like the Buddhist and the pantheistic Brahmin, takes for granted the doctrine of Karma and its implied re-births. He, too, views every form of existence, bodily or spiritual, as a cause and effect. Freedom from rebirth is thus the goal after which he aspires. But, while the pantheistic Brahmin and the primitive Buddhist looked for the realization of the end in the extinction of conscious, individual existence (absorption in Brahma, Nirvana), the Jainist has always tenaciously held to the primitive traditional belief in a final abode of bliss, where the soul, liberated from the necessity of rebirth on earth, enjoys forever a spiritual life. To attain this end, the Jainist, like the Buddhist and the pantheistic Brahmin, holds that the traditional gods can aid but little. The existence of the gods is not denied, but their worship is held to be of no avail and is thus abandoned. Salvation is to be obtained by personal effort alone. To reach the longest of the three "paths" it is necessary to purify the soul of all that binds it to a bodily existence, so that it shall aspire purely and solely after a spiritual life in heaven. This is accomplished by the life of severe mortification which Jina set the example. Twelve years of ascetic life as a Jainist monk and eight re-births are necessary to constitute the purgatorial preparation for the Jainist heaven. While the Jains are not worshippers of the Hindu gods, they erect imposing temples to Jina and other venerated teachers. The images of these Jainist saints are adorned with lights and flowers, and the faithful walk around them while reciting sacred mantras. Jainist asceticism is a little more than a veneration of a few saints and heroes of the past.

On its ethical side—the sphere of Right Conduct—Jainism is largely at one with Brahminism and Buddhism. There are, however, a few differences in the application of the principle of non-killing. The sacredness of all kinds of life implied in the doctrine of metempsychosis has been more scrupulously observed in practice by the Jain than by the Brahmin or the Buddhist. The Brahmin tolerates the slaughter of animals for food, to provide offerings for the sacrificial fire, or to show hospitality to a guest; the Buddhist does not scruple so nervous a life, but the Jain reprobrates meat-food without exception as involving the unlawful taking of life. For similar reasons the Jain does not content himself with straining his drinking water and with remaining at home during the rainy season, when the ground is swarming with lower forms of life, but when he goes forth, he wears a veil before his mouth, and carries a broom with which he sweeps the ground before him to avoid destruction of insect life. The Jainist ascetic allows himself to be bitten by gnats and mosquitoes rather than risk their destruction by brushing them away. Hospitals for animals have been founded in the United States by Jain benevolence, bordering at times on absurdity. For example, in 1834 there existed in Kutch a temple hospital which supported 5000 rats. With all this scrupulous regard for animal life, the Jain differs from the Buddhist in his view of the lawfulness of religious suicide. According to Jainist ethics a monk who has practised twelve years of severe asceticism, or who has found after long trial that he cannot keep his lower nature in control, may hasten his end by self-destruction.

See also **Buddhism**.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY.**— *The Jainina Sutras*, vol. XXII and XLV of the Sacred Books of the East: HOPKINS, The Religions of India (Boston, 1895); HARDY, Der Brahmadharma nach älteren Paliwerken (Münster, 1890); MOON, Writings of the Buddha (London, 1880); BARTHI, The Religions of India (London, 1891).

**CHARLES F. AILEN.**

**JALAPA.** See Vera Cruz, Diocese of.

**Jamaica,** the largest of the British West Indian islands, is situated in the Caribbean Sea, between latitude 17° 43' and 18° 32' N., and longitude 76° 11' and 78° 30' W. It is 90 miles south of Cuba, 101 miles west of Haiti, and 554 miles from Colon. The nearest point of the continent of America is about 400 miles southwest of the island. The name Jamaica is derived from the Iroquois word *hamama,* meaning water and wood, signifying a fertile land. The island is 144 miles long, and from 21 to 49 miles broad. Its area is...
Two of them possess very remarkable curative properties: the hot sulphurous springs of Bath, and the warm saline spring at Milk River.

### Population and Vital Statistics

**Population** and *Vital Statistics.—The first recorded attempt at enumerating the population of Jamaica was in 1650, when "the reliefs of the army" were stated to be 2200, and the planters, merchants, and others about the same number. In 1775, there were 13,737 whites, free coloured 4093, slaves 19278. In 1834—the year of negro emancipation—it was computed that there were 15,000 whites, 5000 free blacks, 40,000 coloured, 311,070 slaves, making a total of 371,070. In June, 1844, the census gave whites 13,816, coloured 81,074, and blacks 346,374; total 441,264. The population in 1891 was 639,493, of whom 14,692 were white, 121,755 were coloured, 498,724 black, 10,116 coolies (East Indians), 481 Chinas, and 3025 not described. The total estimated population in 1907 was 830,261. The Registrar-General’s statistics show that upwards of 65 per cent of births were those of illegitimate children. Many of these are the offspring of consent or permanent concubinage rather than of promiscuity. In this connection it may be remarked that the number were not for the accommodation of the majority of this people some two generations ago were permitted and encouraged to breed like cattle, and were denied admission to the marriage state. In 1881 there were over 10,000 Catholics in Jamaica; in 1891 there were 12,000; and at the present day (1907) there are 14,000. The annual birth rate for ten years, 1896-7 to 1906-7, was 36.5 per 1000 of the estimated mean population. For the same period the mean average death-rate of population per 1000 was 23.2. The population of Kingston is some 50,000, Spanish Town 5090, Montego Bay 4760, Port Antonio 2500, Falmouth 3100, Mandeville 1500.

### Climate and Meteorology

**Intimately associated with vital statistics comes the question of climate. Jamaica, being a tropical island, was formerly looked on as injurious as a residence to the inhabitants of northern latitudes. This theory has been completely refuted, and for many years past the invalid and tourist is resorting in increasing numbers to the "Riviera of the West", which is an ideal sojourn for the health-seeker. The diversity of surface, from the plains to the plateaux and mountain slopes, affords a variety of climate suitable to any requirement. The table given in the next column will illustrate this fact, at various altitudes.**

**Meteoralogical records are wanting for Manchester and St. Elizabeth highlands, which are much drier than other hill districts of the island. There are many mineral springs valuable for the cure of acute and chronic diseases, especially gout and rheumatism.**

### History

Jamaica was discovered by Columbus on 3 May, 1494. He landed probably at or near St. Ann's Bay, called by him Sancta Gloria, owing to the great beauty of the environs. Nine years later his caravels were wrecked at Puerto Bueno—the present Dry Harbour. He gave the name Santiago to the island, which was but partially colonised by the Spaniards, and was never popular with them. They first introduced horses, cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, and domestic poultry. To the Spaniards Jamaica is also indebted for the orange, lemon, lime, and other fruit trees; the coffee tree is due however to British initiative about the year 1721. From the constituents of the shell mounds throughout the island and the absence therefrom of all objects of a European character, it would appear that these accumulations represent the kitchen middens of the pre-Columbian aboriginal inhabitants. These remains, found principally in caves, comprise: (a) cranial and other bones (human), (b) stone implements (sella, etc.,) (c) objects of pottery (various), (d) ornamental beads (chaledony); kitchen middens containing shells (principally marine), broken pottery, fish and bone tools, stone implements, and ashes. Their cottages were built on stockade posts set vertically in the ground; for natural food was depended principally on the sea, and on their festivals or barbecues the entire village went out on marine or river excursions. Their gardens yielded arrow-root, beans, cassava, cucumbers, melons, maize, and yams; for fruit they had the guava, mammea, papaw, and star-apple. They cultivated cotton and woollen it for cordage and twisted it into yarn for making garments. The only domestic animals were probably the mussels, duck and the alia, a small dog. The aborigines were most probably a tribe of the Arawaks, and not Caribs, who were cannibals. The Arawaks were a gentle and inoffensive people as their name (meal-esters) signifies. They believed in a Supreme Being (Jocahuna), in a future state, and had a tradition about a deluge. Their form of government was patriarchal. They smoked tobacco and played a football game called bato, in which both men and women joined.

### Spanish Occupation

A review of the period of Spanish occupation is one which reflects very little credit on Spanish colonial administration in those days. Their treatment of the aboriginal inhabitants, whom they are accused of having practically exterminated, is a grave charge, and if true, cannot be condoned on the plea that such conduct was characteristic of the age, and that as bad or worse was perpetrated by other nations even in later years. In the few places where the Spaniards settled, they invariably built a church, sometimes a monastery, and occasionally a theatre. Sevilla-Nueva (or Sevilla...
d'Oro) was the capital of the island from 1510 till 1520, when Diego Colombo founded a new capital, Santiago de la Vega, which is now known as Spanish Town. The town of 1521 was formed by the expulsion of the native Indians from the island. Soon after, Africans were imported into Jamaica as slaves. Las Casas, deservedly called "Protector-General of the Indians," was instrumental in inducing the pope to issue a Bull in 1542, restoring the Indians to freedom. Unhappily this concession came too late for the aborigines and was the end of the island. Soon after, Africans were imported into Jamaica as slaves. The discreditable failure to capture San Domingo by the expedition under Admiral Penn—father of the founder of Pennsylvania—and General Venables, described by Carlyle as "the unsuccessful enterprise Oliver Cromwell had conceived and ended in a successful descent on Jamaica, which was captured in May, 1655. Engish Occupation.—"To signalise the capture of St. Iago" by the English "a small leaven of Puritan feeling and a large amount of ruffianism led the troops' into a display of energy. . . . The abbey and the two churches were demolished and the bells melted down for shot." (Gardner.) The poet Milton, secretary to Cromwell, justified this invasion of the West Indies on the ground of "the most noble opportunities of promoting the glory of God, and enlarging the bounds of the Kingdom of Christ, which we do not doubt will abundantly reward all those who shall participate in the West Indies." The advent of the English adventurer gave a considerable impetus to trade with the outside world. The chief seaport of the island, now Port Royal, soon became "a nest of iniquity and a centre of rude luxury, the emporium of the loot of the buccaneer. . . . no form of vice was wanting, no indulgence too extravagant or too licentious to be permitted or enjoyed in total lawlessness. . . ." But it paid the penalty of its lawlessness, being wiped out by an earthquake on 7 June, 1692, after which event Kingston, the present capital, was established. As a means of repeopling the island, which was being depopulated by fever, a large number of Royalists in Ireland were seized and sent out as slaves by the English. "As a result of Cromwell's Irish policy one thousand young women and the same number of young men were by order of the Council of State arrested in Ireland and shipped to Jamaica, while the sheriffs of several counties of Scotland were instructed to proceed to the colonies with robbers and vagabonds, male and female, and transport them to the island." (Ellis.) In 1660 the population of Jamaica was about 4500 whites, and some 1500 negroes. Jamaica was ceded to England by the treaty of Madrid in 1670. On the accession of James I, Sir John Fenwick (who later became a Jesuit Monk), was appointed governor of Jamaica. One of his suite was Sir Hans Sloane, founder of the British Museum.

Slavery.—The war with the American colonies met with little sympathy in Jamaica. The assembly petitioned George III to grant more political autonomy to the struggling colonists. In 1778 France, which had recognized the independence of the new republic, was forced into war by England, and Jamaica, like the rest of the West Indies, suffered accordingly. Seven years later the maroons, or half-breed negroes, rose in rebellion, repulsed both the colonial militia and the regular troops, devastated large tracts of country, and were not finally overpowered till 1795. Some 600 of them, men, women, and children, were deported to Nova Scotia, and subsequently to Sierra Leone. In the eighteenth century 700,000 negro slaves were landed in Jamaica. When, in 1807, the slave trade was abolished in the British colonies, there were some 320,000 slaves in Jamaica. Slavery was destined to continue there for more than another quarter of a century. The local Government, which consisted almost entirely of slave holders and sympathizers with slavery, was a negrophobic plutocracy, and the Anglican, or Episcopal, clergy were in sympathy with the assembly, as they were dependent on it for their stipends. Ministers of other Protestant denominations were expelled for the education and enlightenment of the negroes, only to be reviled, hindered, and persecuted by the dominant party. A serious outbreak among the slaves occurred in 1831, property to the value of $3,600,000 being destroyed. The law emancipating the slaves passed by the British Parliament was the work of the Jamaica Assembly in 1833 under strong protests, and on 1 August, 1834, slavery was abolished in the island. The number of slaves for whom compensation was paid by the British Government was 225,990, the amount awarded having been $29,269,875. As an immediate result of the emancipation of the negroes, the want of labour was soon experienced. In 1844 immigration of hill-coolies from Hindustan was sanctioned by the Legislative Council. During the past sixty years, some 30,000 Hindu agricultural labourers have been imported into the island, of whom over 10,000 have, during the last twenty years, returned to India, taking back with them more than $350,000 in government bills of exchange.

Catholic Revival.—From the time of the expulsion of the Spaniards in 1655, and especially after the adoption of the Toleration Act of 1688, which "afforded the Catholic minority of society an opportunity of combating the encroachments of the British power in the West Indies." (Gardner), Catholic revival in the island was debarked. It was not until 1792 that the first instalment of freedom of worship was granted to them. Dr. Douglass, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and ecclesiastical superior of the Catholics in the British West Indies, sent out an Irish Franciscan, Father Quigley, in 1798, who did pioneer work for seven years, and died in 1805. He was succeeded by Fathers Rodrigues d'Arango and Campos Benito, both Franciscans. By a Brief of Gregory XVI dated 10 January, 1837, the British West Indies were divided into three vicariates Apostolic: the Windward Islands, British Guiana, and Jamaica. Father Benito was appointed first vicar Apostolic of this island in 1837. The same year two Jesuits, Fathers Gotham, an Englishman, and Dupeyron, a Frenchman, arrived. They, with the vicar Apostolic and Father Duquesmay, the first native of Jamaica raised to the priesthood, formed the whole ecclesiastical establishment of the Archdiocese. After an outbreak in Jamaica in October, 1850, claiming over 300,000 victims; the Catholic clergy won the highest praise for their self-sacrifice and heroism during the plague. In 1855 the vicar Apostolic, Benito, died and was succeeded by Father Dupeyron, S.J., the first Jesuit to act as Vicar Apostolic of Jamaica.

Jesuit Administration.—We have now to deal with the mature development of the mission in the nineteenth century. Numerically it was small, but it had attracted public attention by its philanthropic and religious work. With the accession of Father Dupeyron the mission mission formed formally under the control of the Society of Jesus, and has remained so ever since. The new vicar Apostolic, hampered like his predecessors by a paucity of labourers and scantiness of resources, could continue only to watch over and safeguard that which had already been effected. In 1857 four Sisters of the Third Order Regular of St. Francis arrived in Jamaica from Glasgow, to instruct the coloured children. In a short time they opened a poor school and subsequently a high school for young ladies, both destined to do excellent work. In 1866 Father Joseph Sidney Woollett, S.J., of the English province, received sub-deacon's order. In 1869 Father Patrick Francis Fearon, S.J., arrived from England. He was a distinguished graduate of the University of Oxford, and had been a Fellow of Worcester College, and subsequently dean and bursar. In 1849 he accepted the incumbency of Shadwell, near Leeds. Becoming a Catholic in 1851,
he joined the Society of Jesus at the age of thirty-eight. He was a most zealous, self-denying, hard-working priest, an eloquent and persuasive preacher, and a cultured scholar; yet for years he taught the poor school for boys (St. Joseph’s), until his health broke down. He died in 1891. The number of Catholics in Jamaica in 1872 did not exceed 6,000; a greater portion of them lived in Kingston, where there were two churches. Seven chapels supplied the wants of the sparsely scattered rural Catholic population. There were about 400 children, boys and girls, attending the convent schools and St. Joseph’s in the capital. In 1878 these buildings were destroyed by fire, and the property of the congregation was burned. In 1888 the Right Reverend Charles Gordon, S.J., D.D., who succeeded Father Porter as vicar Apostolic, had been consecrated Bishop of Thatta in partibus infidelium. He set about supplying the most pressing needs of the mission. Efficient elementary schools were started. In 1891 Holy Trinity Church was improved, a tower, the Lady chapel, a sacristy, and baptistery being added at a cost of $12,500. Finally a hall to afford recreation and instruction for Catholic men, and for the meetings of the church guilds and sodalities, was completed in 1905 and named “Gordon Hall” after its founder. The hall and church were destroyed by the earthquake of 1907. Dr. Gordon also brought the Salesians into Jamaica, placing at their disposal a large property, Reading Pen, near Montego Bay, to be used for an agricultural college. In 1894 the care of the Jamaica mission was transferred to the Maryland-New York province of the Society, from the English province which had served it from the year 1855. In 1906 Father John Joseph Collins, S.J., was appointed administrator Apostolic of the vicariate, and in 1907 he was raised to the episcopacy as Bishop of Antiphilus in partibus infidelium and Vicar Apostolic of Jamaica.

Education—One of the first subjects to which the friends of emancipation turned their attention after the abolition of slavery was the education of the freed population of the West Indies. In Jamaica, however, there had been very little progress. The grant which had been made by the imperial Parliament was not paid before 1844, and all that was done for elementary education in Jamaica was the grant of $15,000 per annum by the legislature for the next twenty years. A training college for educating teachers was established in 1870. In 1890 some Spanish Jesuits, who had been banished from New Granada by the liberal revolutionist party, arrived at Kingston and opened what was called the Spanish College and what is now St. George’s College, a school of higher education for boys of the middle and upper classes. Most of the refugee priests left Jamaica shortly afterwards for Guatemala, but the work they inaugurated could not be destroyed. In 1884 St. Boniface College was founded. The college was closed about 1895, and opened again in 1898. Many prominent men in the island of all denominations have been educated there. In 1870 it ceased to be a boarding establishment. On the coming of the American Jesuits, the college was transferred to the site of the former Seminary of St. Boniface. Elementary education for Catholics had been left very much in abeyance up to Bishop Gordon’s arrival in 1889. The convent primary school had not more than 150 children, St. Joseph’s school for boys not as many, and some half-dozen schools in various parts of the island, with a fluctuating attendance of under one hundred, were all that represented Catholic elementary education in Jamaica. The advent of the Sisters of Mercy from the parental house in Ballyvarty, in December, 1896, brought a new and vital impetus to Catholic education. Fifteen years later there were in all some two thousand children attending the various schools of the Sisters of St. Francis, and considerably over one thousand in the schools of the Sisters of Mercy. In addition, there are two Roman Catholic convent schools (in the same way as in the past) at the Government industrial schools (under Government), and a high school for girls. A house of mercy has also been established for the protection of young women.

Recent Events.—The history of the colony from 1850 to 1865 might be described as a political tempest in a teapot. The Assembly and the Executive were at a dead-lock. Trouble was brewing in the country. During 1864 a severe drought had greatly impoverished the people, and the American Civil War had increased the price of imported bread-stuffs. Agitators had called on the coloured population to support themselves by a complete boycott of the work of the white planters, and “bread and blood for freedom” was raised. A partial rebellion, limited to the parish of St. Thomas, broke out among the black population in 1865. Some magistrates and officials were butchered at the beginning of the outbreak, but martial law was proclaimed, and the rebellion was quickly suppressed by methods which a Royal Commission pronounced later to have been unnecessarily severe. The chief agitators were hanged, after which Governor Eyre was recalled by the British authorities and was succeeded by Sir John Peter Grant, during whose term of office (1865–72) a number of important reforms were introduced. He brought an order in council abolishing the Legislative Assembly and establishing Crown government. The new legislature was designated the “Legislative Council of Jamaica” consisting of the Governor, six official members, and three non-official members. A privy council was also provided; a new revenue system was established; the police were re-arranged or founded. In 1871 the State, or Anglican, Church in Jamaica was disestablished. The seat of the civil government was transferred from Spanish Town to Kingston during the same year. The Koli sugar estates were completed at a cost of $650,000 have in recent years converted the lowlands of the parish of St. Catherine into a huge banana plantation. In 1868 the cultivation of cinchona as an economic industry was started by Government; and the rapidly increasing banana trade between Port Antonio and the United States has been the salvation of the island financially during the last twenty-five years.

In Nov., 1875, a cyclone occurred, followed by another in Aug., 1880. The advent of Sir Henry Norman as governor to the colony in Dec., 1883, was accompanied by the establishment of a revised constitution (promulgated by an order in council of Queen Victoria), consisting of a governor, a privy council, and a legislative council. The first is appointed by the sovereign for five years, and holds office during the sovereign’s pleasure. The privy council consists of the governor (as senior magistrate being, with some few exceptions, the chief judge of the court of lieutenant-colonel), the colonial secretary, the attorney-general; and such other persons, not to exceed eight, provisionally appointed by the governor, subject to the approval of the sovereign. The legislative council consists of the president (the governor), five ex-officio members, ten nominated members, and fourteen elected members (one for each of the fourteen parishes).

In 1890 the Jamaica Government Railway was sold.
to an American syndicate for $500,000 in cash, and $3,500,000 in second mortgage debentures. An international exhibition was opened (27 Jan., 1891), by the then Prince George of Wales. The guarantee fund was $120,000; total visitors, 302,830. Sir Henry Blake was then administering the affairs of the colony as Governor.

In 1893 a board of education was formed. The abolition of fees in elementary schools was provided for by a house tax. In 1896 a scheme for the sale of Crown lands to small settlers was instituted. In 1898 direct cable service between Jamaica and England was established. The Imperial Direct Line of steamers was inaugurated with $200,000 annual subsidy—half from Jamaica, and half from the Imperial Government. Port Royal was created a separate parish in the same year.

Agriculture and Commerce.—There is an agricultural society with some fifty affiliated branches in the various parishes of the island. Lectures and practical demonstrations have been organized by the society. Of the 2,500,000 acres of land in Jamaica, 1,310,000 are in wood and ruinate, and 775,000 under cultivation (560,000 grazing land, and 215,000 under tillage). There are 145,000 acres of government or Crown land unoccupied. The following table shows the area under cultivation the last year of each of the three decades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cane</th>
<th>Coffee</th>
<th>Cocoa</th>
<th>Ginger</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Tobacco</th>
<th>Bananas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-90</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>32,040</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>18,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-07</td>
<td>24,420</td>
<td>21,480</td>
<td>6,532</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>32,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1902-3 over 14,000,000 bunches of bananas valued at $5,673,750 were exported. Over 95 per cent of these went to America. It was officially estimated that the loss to the island by the cyclone the following year, through destruction and damage to crops and buildings and loss of trade, was $12,500,000. The estimated number of cattle, horses, etc., in the island in 1904-5 was: horned stock, 107,695; horses, 57,905; asses, 18,500.

Shipping.—Number and tonnage of vessels that entered in the ports of the island for the year 1907—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sail:</th>
<th>British ships, 182; tonnage 15,974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steam:</td>
<td>British &quot; 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign &quot; 332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantity and value of the chief exports in 1907—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sugar</th>
<th>15,499 hhd. value $592,710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>14,630 puns. &quot; 670,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>54,961 cwt. &quot; 442,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimento</td>
<td>85,284 cwt. &quot; 394,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyewood</td>
<td>34,004 cwt. &quot; 417,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>&quot; 5,053,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>134,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor products</td>
<td>1,675,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the relative importance of the island’s exports that year was: sugar 6:3, rum 7:1, coffee 4:7, dyewood 4:4, pimento 4:2, fruit 53:8, tobacco 1:4, minor products 17:8. Of the exports, 57:2 per cent in value went to the United States of America, and 29:8 per cent to the United Kingdom.

Governor—Gold and silver coins current in Great Britain and Ireland are legal tender to any extent, and local nickel pennies, half pennies, and farthings are legal tender to the extent of twelve pence (one shilling) in one payment. Paper money consists of the notes of the Colonial Bank, and of the Bank of Nova Scotia, of £1 to £5 and upwards. The other coins here are American gold coins. English weights and measures are in use in the colony. There are three daily newspapers published at Kingston and twelve others (six weekly, four monthly, and two quarterly) at Kingston and other parts of the island.

Means of Communication.—The whole length of main roads on the island aggregates close on 2000 miles; they are sufficiently broad almost everywhere for a double line of traffic, and are generally maintained in excellent condition. The best railway in Jamaica was opened between Kingston and Spanish Town in 1845. It was extended to Old Harbour in 1887, and from there to Porus in 1885, as well as the branch line to Ewarton from Spanish Town in the same year. In 1890 American capitalists extended the line to Almonte Bay, a distance of 115 miles, and to Port Antonio, a distance of 54 miles. The electric tram line, some 24 miles in extent, serves Kingston and its suburbs. The first steamship communication between Jamaica (Kingston) and the United States (New York) was begun in 1890. Jamaica joined the Universal Postal Union in 1887. There is a fortnightly mail service to and from England direct, also one via New York, a weekly service to the United States. There are 160 post and 64 telegraph offices in the island; and two lines of cables connect Jamaica with America.

The Earthquake of 1907.—A shock of earthquake of great severity occurred about 3:30 p.m. on Monday, 14 January, 1907. It lasted for upwards of twenty seconds; its greatest intensity was experienced along the foreshore of Kingston harbour. A large proportion of the buildings of the capital were either destroyed or badly damaged. The injuries to the submarine cables indicate that the gravamen of the shock was experienced at a depth of about a mile. The greater part of the business area of the city was destroyed, most of it by fire. The loss of life and property was estimated at about 800 persons and about $10,000,000 (handbook of Jamaica, 1907). Most of the churches in the city were wrecked or damaged beyond repair, and the majority of the public buildings, institutions, and the two convents, and their schools suffered equally. The cataclysm was one of the most calamitous events which has occurred in the history of the colony. Generous offers of pecuniary aid were made by most of the large cities of the United States, but were declined by the local Government. Some of the ships of the United States Atlantic fleet landed a party of medical officers, and equipment for the temporary field hospital at the Jesuits’ college at Winchester Park. These surgeons did excellent work. A body of American marines was landed at the request of the authorities to quell an uprising among the prisoners at the general penitentiary. This action was subsequently taken exception to by the governor, and consequently the American admiral had no alternative but to withdraw his squadron, leaving, however, supplies, medicines, etc., for the use of the sufferers. Subsequently the Imperial Government expressed regret at the action of its representative, who shortly afterwards resigned. A Mansion House (London) fund to relieve the distress was promptly started, and realised some $277,000. A free grant was made by the Imperial Parliament of $750,000 and a temporary loan of $4,000,000 at 3 per cent. The funds subscribed from all sources were distributed by a relief committee. Up to 31 Dec., 1908, loans to the value of $1,317,150 had been made. Thanks to the energy of J. Collins, the vicar Apostolic, most of the damaged Catholic schools were repaired in a few months. A new Catholic church dedicated to the Holy Trinity is being erected near Winchester Park, in place of the former one which was ruined by the earthquake.

Dependencies.—The Turks and Caicos Islands, which geographically form part of the Bahama group, are dependencies of Jamaica. They have an area of 162½ square miles and a population of some 5300.
The exports are salt and sponges. The seat of government is at Grand Turk, the town containing 1750 inhabitants. The Cayman Islands, having an area of about 225 square miles, are situated some 180 miles to the W. N. W. of Negril Point, Jamaica. They were discovered by Christopher Columbus and named by him in 1503. Until the 19th century the coast swarmed. The estimated population of the three islands, Grand Cayman, Cayman Brac, and Little Cayman, is 5000 for the largest island, and about 1000 between the two smaller islands. The exports are coco-nuts, turtles, phosphates, ropes, copra, etc., made from the palm-thatch which grows in abundance. Shipbuilding to a limited extent goes on; sloops and schooners of from 40 to 70 tons register are built from native woods, mahogany, cedar, calabash, cashew, etc., and sold in Cuba. The Cayman group has an administrator and local justices and forms a dependency under the jurisdiction of Jamaica.

J. F. DONOVAN.

James, Deme, French missionary, date and place of birth unknown; d. in France, 1625; an important figure in the early history of the Church in Canada. In 1615 he was chosen by his superiors in France as provincial commissioned and chief of the first band of Recollect friars, who were also the first missionaries of Canada. Leaving France on 24 April, 1615, he arrived at Tadoussac on 24 May, and went immediately with Champlain to meet the savages at Sault St. Louis. On 24 June, 1615, at Rivière des Prairies, he celebrated the first Mass said in the country by its first missionaries. In 1616 Father James returned to France with Champlain to urge before the king and the "Associates of Rouen" the material and spiritual interests of the colony. In 1620, again elected provincial provincial, he returned to Canada with Champlain and his wife. On reaching Quebec he exhorted the colonists to obey the vicar and his lieutenant, Champlain, having completed the first regular event of the Recollects at Quebec, he blessed it (a) and dedicated it to Our Lady of the Angels. He returned to France in 1621.

MISS. HIST. CHRONIC. DE LA PROV. DE SHAMPAING (1677) IN BIBLIOTHECA Ecurrum Convicament, ed. L.A. Chpendy (Quebec, 1870); GAGNAD. HISTOIRE DU CANADA (Paris, 1833); LACROIX, PREMIER ETABLISSEMENT DE LA FOSSE EN NOUVEAUX FRANK (Paris, 1903); DIONNE, SAMUEL CHAMPAIN (Quebec, 1808); BEAUBIEN, SAINT-AU-RECÖLLET (Montreal, 1898).

ODORIC-M. Jouve.

James, Edward, Venerable. See Ralph Crocken, Venerable.

James, Epistle of Saint.—The questions concerning the Epistle were treated in the following order: I. Author and Genuineness; II. Tradition as to the Canon; III. Analysis and Contents of the Epistle; IV. Occasion and Object; V. To whom addressed; VI. Style; VII. Time and Place of composition.

I. AUTHOR AND GENUINENESS.—The author is commonly identified with the Lord’s brother, the Bishop of Jerusalem. The evidence is in the turtles with which the Lord’s brother must be identified with James, the son of Alphaeus, (by far the most probable). Internal evidence (contents of the Epistle, its style, address, date, and place of composition) points unmistakably to James, the Lord’s brother, the Bishop of Jerusalem. James, has been, in the best texts, that fulfills the conditions required in the writer of the Epistle. External evidence begins at a comparatively late date. Some coincidences, or analogies, exist between the Epistle and the Apostle’s Fathers (Clement of Rome, the Pastor Hermas, St. Justin, St. Ireneus; see Miensert, “Der Jacobusbrief,” Freiburg im Br., 1905, p. 55 sqq.). The literary relation between the Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Romans is doubtful. Its later recognition in the Church, especially in the West, with which it is always associated, it was written for Jewish Christians, and therefore not widely circulated among the Gentile Churches. From the middle of the third century, ecclesiastical authors cite the Epistle as written by St. James, the brother of the Lord. See the testimonies in the section following. The greater part of the Church in the West Church identify the author with James the Apostle. In the Eastern Church, however, the authority of Eusebius and St. Epiphanius may explain some ecclesiastical doubts about the Apostle origin of the Epistle, and consequently about its canonicality.

II. TRADITION AS TO CANONICITY.—In the first centuries of the Church the authenticity of the Epistle was doubted by some, and amongst others by Theodoret of Mopsuestia; it is therefore deuterocanonical. It is wanting in the Muratorian Canon, and because of the silence of several of the Western Churches regarding it, Eusebius classed it as "apocryphal" or "contested writings" (Hisp. eccle., III, xxv; II, xxiii). St. Jerome gives the like information (De vir. ill., ii), but adds that with time its authenticity became universally admitted. In the sixteenth century its inspired character was contested by Erasmus and Cajetan; Luther strongly repudiated the Epistle as "a letter of straw." and "unworthy of the apostolic Spirit," and this solely for dogmatic reasons, and owing to his preconceived notions, for the Epistle refutes his heretical doctrine that Faith alone is necessary for salvation. The Council of Trent dogmatically defined the Epistle of St. James as canonical. As the solution of this question of the history of the canon of the Epistle of the Church depends chiefly on the testimony of the ancient Fathers, it remains to be seen whether it is quoted by them as Scripture. (a) In the Latin Church it was known by St. Clement of Rome (before A.D. 100), the Pastor Hermas (about A.D. 150), St. Irenæus (125-2027, 208), Tertullian (d. about 240), St. Hilary (d. 366), St. Philaster (d. 385), St. Ambrose (d. 397), Pope Damasus (in the canon of about A.D. 382), St. Jerome (346-420), Rufinus (d. 410), St. Augustine (430), and its canonicity is unquestioned by them. (b) In the Greek Church of Alexandria (d. 217), Origen (d. 254), St. Athanasius (d. 373), St. Dionysius the Areopagite (about A.D. 500), etc., considered it undoubtedly as a sacred writing. (c) In the Syrian Church, the Peshito, although omitting the minor Catholic Epistles, gives that of St. James; St. Ephraem uses it frequently in his writings. Moreover, the most notorious heretics of Syria recognized it as genuine. Thus we find that Nestorius ranked it in his Canon of Sacred Books, and James of Edessa adduces the testimony of James, v. 14. The Epistle is found in the Coptic, Sahidic, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian versions. Although, therefore, the canonicity of the Epistle of St. James was questioned by a few during the first centuries, there are to be found from the very earliest ages, in different parts of the Church, numerous testimonies in favour of its canonicity. From the end of the third century its acceptance as inspired, and as the work of St. James, is universal, as clearly appears from the various lists of the Sacred Books drawn up since the fourth century.

III. ANALYSIS AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISLLE.—The subjects treated of in the Epistle are many and various; moreover, St. James not infrequently, whilst elaborating a certain point, he also digresses. He presents his arguments and premises once more his former argument; hence it is difficult to give a precise division of the Epistle. It is doubtful whether the sacred writer
intended any systematic arrangement of subject; indeed, it is more probable that he did not, for in the Hebrew Sapiential Books of the Old Testament, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus, to which the present Epistle may in many ways be likened, the order in which the moral sentences stand does not seem to suggest any connexion between them. It will therefore be more expedient to give a simple enumeration of the subjects treated of in the Epistle:—Inscription (i, 1); persecutions are to be borne with patience and joy (2-4); wisdom must be asked of God with confidence (5-8); humility is recommended (9-11); God is not the author of evil but of good (12-18); we must be rich in good works (19-21); not only good works, but also good words are necessary (22-27). Against respect of persons (ii, 1-13); another exhortation to good works (14-26). Against the evils of the tongue (iii, 1-12); against envy and discord, 13-18. Against wars and contentions (iv, 1-3); against the spirit of this world and pride (4-10); against detraction (11-13a); against vain confidence in worldly things (13b-16). Against the rich that oppress the poor (v, 1-6); exhortation to patience in the time of oppression (7-11), and to avoid swearing (12); of the anointing of the sick (13-15); of prayer (16); we must have at heart the conversion of sinners (17-20); note (iv, 19-21); note (v, 18; 21); note (vi, 1-2). The Epistle is written to the Jewish Christians outside Palestine, who, for the greater part, were poor and oppressed. This we gather with certitude from the inscription (i, 1), and from various indications in the text. A. The words, i, 1, "to the twelve tribes" can mean the whole Jewish nation; but the words following, which are scattered national, designate clearly the Jews of the Dispersion. The Jews in Palestine, surrounded by Gentiles, were not considered as "scattered abroad." That he addressed the Jewish Christians only becomes evident by the fact that the author styles himself "the servant of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ," and by this he signifies that he wrote to the disciples of Christ only. B. That the readers were Jewish appears still more evidently from the Epistle itself. St. James takes for granted that those whom he addressed were well versed in the writings of the Old Testament. Moreover, he calls them not only his "brethren," which name taken by itself does not remove all doubt, but he so clearly shows them to be Christians that it is incomprehensible how any critics understand unconverted Jews to be the "brethren" to whom the Epistle was written. Thus in i, 18, he writes to those whom God "of his own will hath gotten by his own mercy, to a glorious, immortal life," and shows that St. James inclines especially: patience and perseverance in adversity, temptations, and persecutions; the necessity of good works, mercy, and charity. For the question of apparent opposition between St. James and St. Paul with regard to "faith and works" see Romans, Epistle to the. IV. OCCASION AND OBJECT.—A. Occasion.—St. James seems to have been moved to write his Epistle on witnessing that the first fervour of the Jewish Christians had grown cold, and that, owing to various causes, both external and internal, a certain spirit of persecution began to manifest itself: (1) External Causes.—The New Christian converts found themselves at first the object of the indifference only of their fellow townsfolk, the greater number of whom still remained in unbelief; but this attitude very soon changed to one of hostility and even of persecution. These early converts, belonging as they mostly did to the poorer classes, found themselves oppressed by the wealthy unbelievers; some were refused employment, others were denied their wages (v, 4); at other times they were mercilessly dragged before the tribunals (ii, 6); they were persecuted in the synagogues, where, besides, they were subjected to the "whipping" (v, 11-13). (2) Internal Causes.—In the midst of these trials the faith of many began to languish (ii, 14, 20, 26), and the evil ways they had abandoned at their conversion were gradually indulged in once more. Thus it came to pass that the poor were despised in the sacred assemblies (i, 1-9); there were breaches of brotherly charity (ii, 7): some arrogated to themselves the office of teacher who were unfitted (iii, 1, 13); many were guilty of detraction and other sins of the tongue (iii, 1-12; iv, 11-13); there were contentions and lawsuits (iv, 1-2); some indulged in swearing (v, 18); some refused to be reminded that patient prayer (v, 13, 17-18); pride and vainglory were yielded to (v, 6-10); even some of the sacred rites seem to have been overlooked (v, 14-16). Such were the evils that the Epistle sought to remedy. B. Ob ject.—St. James wrote his Epistle for a moral purpose, and he wrote in co-operation of Bishop of Jerusalem, in order: (1) to exhort them to constancy in the faith in spite of the persecutions and trials they were undergoing, and to give them comfort in their tribulations; (2) to correct the abuses and extirpate the evils amongst them, by urging them to make their conduct conformable to the faith, and by reminding them that faith alone would not save them unless they added good works. V. TO WHOM ADDRESSED.—St. James wrote his Epistle to the Jewish Christians outside Palestine, who, for the greater part, were poor and oppressed. We gather with certitude from the inscription (i, 1), and from various indications in the text. The words, i, 1, "to the twelve tribes" can mean the whole Jewish nation; but the words following, which are scattered national, designate clearly the Jews of the Dispersion. The Jews in Palestine, surrounded by Gentiles, were not considered as "scattered abroad." That he addressed the Jewish Christians only becomes evident by the fact that the author styles himself "the servant of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ," and by this he signifies that he wrote to the disciples of Christ only. B. That the readers were Jewish appears still more evidently from the Epistle itself. St. James takes for granted that those whom he addressed were well versed in the writings of the Old Testament. Moreover, he calls them not only his "brethren," which name taken by itself does not remove all doubt, but he so clearly shows them to be Christians that it is incomprehensible how any critics understand unconverted Jews to be the "brethren" to whom the Epistle was written. Thus in i, 18, he writes to those whom God "of his own will hath gotten by his own mercy, to a glorious, immortal life," and shows that St. James inclines especially: patience and perseverance in adversity, temptations, and persecutions; the necessity of good works, mercy, and charity. For the question of apparent opposition between St. James and St. Paul with regard to "faith and works" see Romans, Epistle to the. IV. OCCASION AND OBJECT.—A. Occasion.—St. James seems to have been moved to write his Epistle on witnessing that the first fervour of the Jewish Christians had grown cold, and that, owing to various causes, both external and internal, a certain spirit of persecution began to manifest itself: (1) External Causes.—The New Christian converts found themselves at first the object of the indifference only of their fellow townsfolk, the greater number of whom still remained in unbelief; but this attitude very soon changed to one of hostility and even of persecution. These early converts, belonging as they mostly did to the poorer classes, found themselves oppressed by the wealthy unbelievers; some were refused employment, others were denied their wages (v, 4); at other times they were mercilessly dragged before the tribunals (ii, 6); they were persecuted in the synagogues, where, besides, they were subjected to the "whipping" (v, 11-13). (2) Internal Causes.—In the midst of these trials the faith of many began to languish (ii, 14, 20, 26), and the evil ways they had abandoned at their conversion were gradually indulged in once more. Thus it came to pass that the poor were despised in the sacred assemblies (i, 1-9); there were breaches of brotherly charity (ii, 7): some arrogated to themselves the office of teacher who were unfitted (iii, 1, 13); many were guilty of detraction and other sins of the tongue (iii, 1-12; iv, 11-13); there were contentions and lawsuits (iv, 1-2); some indulged in swearing (v, 18); some refused to be reminded that patient prayer (v, 13, 17-18); pride and vainglory were yielded to (v, 6-10); even some of the sacred rites seem to have been overlooked (v, 14-16). Such were the evils that the Epistle sought to remedy. B. Object.—St. James wrote his Epistle for a moral purpose, and he wrote in co-operation of Bishop of Jerusalem, in order: (1) to exhort them to constancy in the faith in spite of the persecutions and trials they were undergoing, and to give them comfort in their tribulations; (2) to correct the abuses and extirpate the evils amongst them, by urging them to make their conduct conformable to the faith, and by reminding them that faith alone would not save them unless they added good works. V. To Whom Addressed.—St. James wrote his Epistle to the Jewish Christians outside Palestine, who, for the greater part, were poor and oppressed. This we gather with certitude from the inscription (i, 1), and from various indications in the text. A. The words, i, 1, "to the twelve tribes" can mean the whole Jewish nation; but the words following, which are scattered national, designate clearly the Jews of the Dispersion. The Jews in Palestine, surrounded by Gentiles, were not considered as "scattered abroad." That he addressed the Jewish Christians only becomes evident by the fact that the author styles himself "the servant of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ," and by this he signifies that he wrote to the disciples of Christ only. B. That the readers were Jewish appears still more evidently from the Epistle itself. St. James takes for granted that those whom he addressed were well versed in the writings of the Old Testament. Moreover, he calls them not only his "brethren," which name taken by itself does not remove all doubt, but he so clearly shows them to be Christians that it is incomprehensible how any critics understand unconverted Jews to be the "brethren" to whom the Epistle was written. Thus in i, 18, he writes to those whom God "of his own will hath gotten by his own mercy, to a glorious, immortal life," and shows that St. James inclines especially: patience and perseverance in adversity, temptations, and persecutions; the necessity of good works, mercy, and charity. For the question of apparent opposition between St. James and St. Paul with regard to "faith and works" see Romans, Epistle to the.
from the famine foretold by Agabus (Acts, xi, 28-30), and usually identified with one mentioned in Josephus (Antiq., XX, ii, 5), a. d. 45. B. Place of Composition.

—The Epistle was probably written by St. James in Jerusalem, where fellow-students of the Lord had assembled towards the close of his life (see James the Less, Saint), and this opinion finds favour with nearly all its critics. Consult Introductions to the New Testament. It will suffice to recall here its contents and special study, which the earlier bibliography is mentioned.

Catholic Works:—Ersmon in Vigourous, Dict. de la Bible, s. v. Jacques (Saint) le Majeur, Jacques (Saint) leFrançais, (Epître de Saints); J. B. J. B., Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament, (Aix, 1793); H. B. L., De Jacobitis und des Christen in der Verfassung in Schriften der älteren Kirche (Freiburg im Br., 1890); C. L., Epîtres catholiques, Apocalypse (Paris, 1696); V. S., Histoire des évêques et des premiers Conscrits de l'Épiscopat Catholique (Bruges, 1890). Non-Catholic Works:—L. J., Discours sur l'apostolat de Jacques le Majeur, (Paris, 1890); J. R., Histoire du concile de Nice (Bruges, 1898); J., St. James, Epistle of St. James (London, 1892).

A. CAMERLYNCK.

James of Brescia, theologian of the fifteenth century. He entered the Dominican Order at Brescia, his native city, in 1425, and was appointed to the office of inquisitor. He aided the papal auditor, Bernardo da Bruceo, in putting an end to the teaching of impious doctrines at Bergamo. He also took a prominent part in the controversy between the Dominicans and the Minorites with regard to the mode of celebrating Easter. On 29th March, 1462, St. James of the Marches, a celebrated Minorite preacher, maintained in a sermon at Brescia that the Blood separated from the Body of Christ during His Passion was thereby separated from His Divinity, and consequently was not entitled to adoration during the time that Christ remained in the sepulchre. As this doctrine had been proscribed by the Council of Constance in 1351, James of Brescia cited James of the Marches to appear before his tribunal in case he should not retract. A dispute at once arose between the Dominicans and Friars Minor. Shortly before, in a Bull written at Tivoli, Pius II had declared that it was not contrary to Christian Faith to hold that Christ did not reassemble a part of the Blood He shed in His Passion. This declaration narrowed down the controversy to the question: Whether the Blood which Christ shed in His Passion and reassembled was admissible as the Blood of the Son of God during the three days that it was separated from His Body. The affirmative was maintained by the Dominicans, the negative by the Minorites. The pope ordered a solemn disputation to be held before the pontifical court at Christmas, 1462 (1463, according to many). James of Brescia was one of the three theologians who represented the Dominicans. Among the Minorite champions was Francesco della Rovere, later Pope Sixtus IV. After a debate of three days, a consultation was held by the pope and the cardinals, but no definitive conclusion was reached. In a Constitution of 1 August, 1464, two weeks before his death, Pius forborne all further disputation on the subject. A full presentation of the Dominican side of this controversy is preserved in an unpublished treatise written by James of Brescia and his two colleagues. Other theological works attributed to James are no longer extant.


J. A. MCLYNN.

James of Edessa, a celebrated Syrian writer, b. most likely in A. D. 633; d. 5 June, 708. He was a native of the village of Ein-débbé, in the district of Gumyah, in the province of Antioch. During several years he studied Greek and Holy Writ at the famous convent of Kennessé, on the left bank of the Euphrates, opposite Europus (Carchemish). After his return to Syria he was appointed Bishop of Edessa, about A. D. 684, by the Patriarch Anastasius II, his cousin, whom he had assisted in his consecration. To enforce canonical rules and to confine at their infringement, he resigned his see after a four years' episcopate, and withdrew to the convent of Kaisum (near Samosata). The more lenient Habibih succeeded him as Bishop of Edessa. Shortly afterwards he accepted the invitation of the monks of the monastery of Deyr-e Antioch (then the See of Antioch) to reside at their convent, and there he commented for eleven years on the Sacred Scriptures in the Greek text, doing his utmost to promote the study of the Greek tongue. Owing to the opposition which he met on the part of some of the monks who did not like the Greeks, etc., he betook himself to the great convent of Tell-Adda (the modern Tell-Addi), where, for nine years more, he worked at his revision of the Old Testament. Upon Habibih's death he took possession again of the episcopal See of Edessa, resided in that city for four months, and then went to Tell-Adda to fetch his library and his pupils, but died there. James of Edessa is approved by the prominent part he took in the synod which the Jacobite patriarch Julian convened in 706, and by one of his letters in which he speaks of the orthodox Fathers of Chaledon as "the Chaledonian heretics." In the literature of his country he holds such the same part as St. John the Chalcedonian does among the Latins (Wright). For his time, his erudition was extensive. He was not only familiar with Greek and with older Syriac writers, but he also had some knowledge of Hebrew, and willingly availed himself of the works of Jewish scholars, whose views he often records. His writings, which are not all extant, are both varied and numerous. Among them may be noticed, first, his important revision of the Old Testament. This work was essentially Massoretic. James divided the Sacred Books into chapters, prefacing to each chapter a summary of its contents. He supplied the text with numerous marginal notes, of which one part gives readings from the Greek and the Syriac versions at his disposal, and the other part indicates the exact pronunciation of the words of the text. Some of the notes contain extracts from Severus of Antioch; while, at times, glosses are inserted in the text itself. Unfortunately, only a small portion of his writings have come down to us. These are: practically the whole Pentateuch and the Book of Daniel, preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Syr. nos. 26, 27); the two Books of Samuel with the beginning of King, and the prophecy of Isaiah, found in the British Museum (Add. 14229, 14231), and at different times, by Phillips, Wright, Schottler, and Nestle; (3) letters treating of questions relative to Holy Writ, and mostly yet unpublished. As a liturgical author, James of Edessa drew up an anaphora, or Liturgy, revised the Liturgy of St. James, wrote the celebrated "Book of Treasures," containing the baptism of the blessing of water on the eve of Epiphany, and of the celebration of Matrimony, which may be added his translation of Severus's order of Baptism, etc. He is also the author of numerous canons; of important homilies, a few of
which survive in MS.: of a valuable "Chronicle", which he composed in 692, and of which a few leaves only are extant; of an "Enchiridion", or tract on the "General Letter of James", a translation of his "Homilies Cathedrales", written in Greek by Severus of Antioc; and of the "Octoechos" by the same author; of a biography of James of Sarugh; of a translation from the Greek of the apocryphal "History of the Rechabites"; of a Syriac grammar, a few fragments of which are extant in the Libre du monde in which he advocated and illustrated a novel system of indicating the vocical element not found in the Syri- ian alphabet; and, finally, of an extensive correspondence with a large number of persons throughout Syria.


Francis E. Gigot.

James of the Marches, Saint, Franciscan, b. of a poor family named Gangala, at Monteprandone, March of Ancona, Italy, 1391; d. at Naples, 28 Nov., 1456. He is known for his translation of the "Homilies Cathedrales" into Greek by Severus of Antioch and of the "Octoechos" by the same author; for his biography of James of Sarugh; for a translation from the Greek of the apocryphal "History of the Rechabites"; for a Syriac grammar, a few fragments of which are extant in the Libre du monde in which he advocated and illustrated a novel system of indicating the vocical element not found in the Syri- ian alphabet; and, finally, of an extensive correspondence with a large number of persons throughout Syria.


Frances E. Gigot.

James of the Marches, Saint, Franciscan, b. of a poor family named Gangala, at Monteprandone, March of Ancona, Italy, 1391; d. at Naples, 28 Nov., 1456. He is known for his translation of the "Homilies Cathedrales" into Greek by Severus of Antioch and of the "Octoechos" by the same author; for his biography of James of Sarugh; for a translation from the Greek of the apocryphal "History of the Rechabites"; for a Syriac grammar, a few fragments of which are extant in the Libre du monde in which he advocated and illustrated a novel system of indicating the vocical element not found in the Syri- ian alphabet; and, finally, of an extensive correspondence with a large number of persons throughout Syria.


Frances E. Gigot.
people of means, as appears from the following facts. Zebecche was a fisherman of the Lake of Gullio, who probably lived in or near Bari, perhaps in Capernum; and had some boatsmen or hired men as his usual attendants (Mark, i, 20).

Salome was one of the pious women who afterwards followed Christ and "ministered unto him of his substance" (cf. Matt., xxvii, 55 sq.; Mark, xv, 40; Luke, viii, 2 sq.; xxiii, 55-56, 1 sq.). She was personally known to the high-priest (John, xvii, 10); and must have had wherewithal to provide for the Mother of Jesus (John, xix, 27). It is probable, according to Acts, iv, 13, that John (and consequently his brother James) had not received the technical training of the rabbinical schools in this learned and without an official position among the Jews. But, according to the social rank of their parents, they must have been men of ordinary education, in the common walks of Jewish life. They had frequent opportunity of coming in contact with Greek life and language, which were already widely spread along the shores of the Galilean Sea. Some authors, comparing John, xix, 25, with Matt., xxvii, 56, and Mark, xv, 40, identify, and probably rightly so, Mary the Mother of James the Less and of Joseph in Mark and Matthew with "Mary of Cleophas" in John. As the name of Mary Magdalene occurs in the Gospels, they identify further Salome in Mark with "the mother of the sons of Zebecche" in Matthew; finally they identify Salome with "his mother's sister" in John. They suppose, for this last identification, that four women are designated by John, xix, 25, the Syriac "Pesito" gives the reading: "his mother and his mother's sister, and Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene". If this last supposition is right, Salome was a sister of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and James the Greater and John were first cousins of the Lord; this may explain the discipleship of the two brothers, Salome's request and their own claim to the first place in His kingdom, and their commendation by the Blessed Virgin to her own nephew. But it is doubtful whether the Greek admits of this construction without the addition or the omission of sal (and). Thus the relationship of St. James to Jesus remains doubtful.

The Galilean origin of St. James in some degree explains the energy of temperament and the vehemence of character which earned for him and St. John the name of Boanerges, "sons of thunder" (Mark, iii, 17); the Galilean race was religious, hardy, industrious, brave, and the strongest defender of the Jewish nation. When John the Baptist proclaimed the kingdom of God among the Jews, St. John became one of His disciples and he was directed to "the Lamb of God" and afterwards brought his brother James to the Messias: the obvious meaning of John, i, 41, is that St. Andrew finds his brother (St. Peter) first and that afterwards St. John (who does not name himself, according to his habitual and characteristic silence about himself) finds his brother (St. James). The call of St. James to the discipleship of the Messias is reported in a parallel or identical narration by Matt., iv, 18-22; Mark, i, 19 sq.; and Luke, v, 1-11 (see Camerlynck-Coppieters: "Synopsis", Bruges, 1908, 13 sqq.). The two sons of Zebecche, as well as Simon (St. Peter) and his brother Andrew with whom they were in partnership (Luke, v, 10), were called by the Lord upon the Sea of Galilee, where all four with Zebedee and his hired servants were engaged in their ordinary occupation of fishing. The sons of Zebecche "forthwith left their nets and followed the Messias" (Matt., iv, 22), and became "fishers of men". St. James was afterwards with the other eleven called to the Apostleship (Matt., x, 1-4; Mark, iii, 13-19; Luke, vi, 12-16; Acts, i, 13). In all four lists the names of Peter and Andrew, James and John form the first group, a prominent and chosen group (cf. Matt., xiii, 3); especially Peter, James, and John.
three Apostles alone were admitted to be present at the miracle of the raising of Jairus’s daughter (Mark, v, 37; Luke, vii, 51), at the Transfiguration (Mark, ix, 1; Matt., xvii, 1; Luke, ix, 28), and the Agony in Gethsemanl (Matt., xxvi, 37; Mark, xvi, 33). It is remarkable that the name of James is not mentioned (except in Luke, viii, 51; ix, 28; Acts, i, 13—Gr. Text) before that of his brother seems to imply that James was the elder of the two. It is worthy of notice that James is never mentioned in the Gospel of St. John; this author observes a humble reserve not only with regard to himself, but also about the members of his family (cf. Camerlynck, “De quarto Evangelii auctore,” II, Bruges, 1900, p. 317).

Several incidents scattered through the Synoptics suggest that James and John had that particular character indicated by the name “Boanerges,” sons of thunder, given to them by the Lord (Mark, iii, 17): they were burning and impetuous in their evangelical zeal and severe in temper. The two brothers showed their fiery temperament against “a certain man casting out devils” in the name of the Christ; John, answering, said: “We [James is probably meant for John] forbade him because he followed us not” (Luke, ix, 49). When the Samaritans refused to receive Christ, James and John said: “Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?” (Luke, ix, 54; cf. v. 49). On the last journey to Jerusalem, their mother Salome came and said to Jesus: “Lo, my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left, in thy kingdom” (Matt., xx, 21). And the two brothers, still ignorant of the spiritual nature of the Messianic Kingdom, joined with their mother in this eager ambition (Mark, x, 37). And, on their assertion that they are willing to drink the chalice that He drinks of, and to be baptized with the baptism of His sufferings, Jesus assured them that they will share His sufferings (ibid., v. 38—39). James was the crown of martyrdom fourteen years after this prophecy. A. d. 44, Herod Agrippa I, son of Aristobulus and grandson of Herod the Great, reigned at that time as king over a wider dominion than that of his grandfather. His great object was to please the Jews in every way, and he showed great regard for the Mosaic Law and Jewish customs. In pursuance of this policy, he Bull of the Passover (Acts, xvi, 37; Acts, xii, 2; cf. Matt., xvi, 4), he perpetrated cruelties upon the Church, whose rapid growth incensed the Jews. The zealous temper of James and his leading part in the Jewish Christian communities probably led Agrippa to choose him as the first victim. He killed James, the brother of John, with the sword (Acts, xii, 1—2). According to a tradition, which, as we learn from Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., II, ix, 2, 3), was received from Clement of Alexandria (in the seventh book of his lost “Hypo- typoses”), the accuser who led the Apostle to judgment, moved by his confession, became himself a Christian, and they were beheld together. As Clement testifies expressly that the account was given him “by those who were before him,” this tradition has a better foundation than many other traditions and legends respecting the Apostolic labours and death of St. James, which are related in the Latin “Passio Jacobi Majores,” the Ethiopic Acts of James etc. (cf. Lipsius, “Apostrophén Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden”, Brunswick, II, 1884, 201 sqq.). The tradition asserting that James the Greater preached the Gospel in Spain, and that his body was translated to Compostela, claims more serious consideration.

According to this tradition St. James the Greater, having preached Christianity in Spain, returned to Judea and was put to death by order of Herod; his body was miraculously translated to Iria Flavia in the north-west of Spain, and later to Compostela, which town, especially during the Middle Ages, became one of the most famous places of pilgrimage in the world. The vow of making a pilgrimage to Compostela to honour the sepulchre of St. James is one to which many of his own or ordinary right can dispense from it (see Vow). In the twelfth century was founded the Order of Knights of St. James of Compostela (see Order of Knights of St. James of Compostela, Order of).

With regard to the preaching of the Gospel in Spain by St. James the Greater, we have raised: (1) St. James suffered martyrdom a. d. 44 (Acts, xii, 2); and, according to the tradition of the early Church, he had not yet left Jerusalem at this time (cf. Clement of Alexandria, “Strom.”, VI; Apollinius, quoted by Euseb., “Hist. Eccl.,” VI, xviii). (2) St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans (a. d. 58) expressed the intention to visit Spain (Rom., xv, 24) just after he had mentioned (xv, 20) that he did not “build upon another man’s foundation.” (3) The argument ex silentio: although the tradition that James founded an Apostolic see in Spain was current in the year 700, no certain mention of such a foundation is not with early writers nor in the early councils; the first certain mention we find in the ninth century, in Notker, a monk of St. Gall (Martyroly., 25 July), Walafred Strabo (Poema de XII Apost.), and others. (4) The tradition was not unanimously admitted afterwards (see Walafred Strabo). (5) The evidence is weak, while scholars like Baronius, Alexander Natalis, Etius, and Tillemont reject it. The Bollandists however defended it (see Acta Sanctorum, July, VI and VII, where other sources are given).

The authenticity of the sacred relics of Compostela has been questioned and is still doubted (see Ermoni in Vigouroux, “Dictionnaire de la Bible,” s. v. “Jacques (Saint) le Majeur”). Even if St. James the Greater did not preach the Christian religion in Spain, his body may have been brought to Compostela, and this was already the opinion of Notker. According to another tradition, the relics of the Apostle are kept in the church of St-Saturnin at Toulouse (France), but it is not improbable that such sacred relics should have been divided between two churches. A strong argument in favour of the authenticity of the sacred relics of Compostela is the Bull of the Pope, Dec. 28, 1884. (See Compostela; James, Epistle of; Saint; James the Less, Saint.) A. Camerlynck.

James the Less, Saint.—I.—The name “James” in the New Testament is borne by several:—(1) James, the son of Zebedee, Apostle, brother of John, Apostle (see James the Greater, Saint). (2) James, the son of Alpheus, Apostle: Matt., x, 3; Mark, iii, 18; Luke, vi, 15; Acts, i, 13. (3) James, the brother of the Lord: Matt., xii, 42; Mark, vi, 3; Gal., i, 19. Without a shadow of doubt, he is identified with the James of Gal., ii, 2; Acts, xii, 17; xv, 13 sqq.; xxi, 18; I Cor., xv, 7. (4) James, the son of Mary, brother of Joseph (or James): Mark, xv, 40 (where he is called δε τοῦ μαθητή “the little,” not the “less,” as in the D. V., nor the “lesser”); Matt., xxvii, 56; probably the son of Cleophas or Clopas: John, xix, 25, where Maria Cleophas is generally translated “Mary the wife of Cleophas,” as married women are commonly distinguished by the addition of their husband’s name. (5) James, the brother of Jude: Jude, i, 1. Most Catholic commentators identify Jude with the “Justus Judaeus” as “the brother of James” (Luke, vi, 14; Matt., i, 13), called thus because his brother was better known than himself in the primitive Church (see Jude, Epistle of Saint). The identity of the Apostle James (2), the son of Alpheus and James (3), the brother of the Lord and Bishop of the Church of Jeru-
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salem (Acts xv, xxii), although contested by many critics and, perhaps, not quite beyond doubt, is at least most highly probable, and by far the greater number of Catholic interpreters is considered as certai

tly the Apostle of St. James, the brother of the Lord, is to be found). The objection moved by Mader (Biblische Zeitschrift, 1908, p. 393 sqq.) against the common statement that "Apostles" in Gal., i, 19, is to be taken

strictly in the sense of "The Twelve" has been strongly

inspired by Steinheil (Der Katholik, 1909, p. 207 sqq.). The James (5) of Jude i, 1 must certainly be identified with James (3), the brother of the Lord and the Bishop of Jerusalem. The identification of James (3), the brother of the Lord and James (4), the son of Mary, and probably of Cleophas or Clopas offers some difficulty. This identification requires the identity of Mary, the mother of James (Matt., xxvii, 56; Mark, xv, 40), with Mary the wife of Cleophas (John, xii, xix), and, consequently, the identity of Alpheus (2) and Clopas (4). As Clopas and Alpheus are probably not two different transcriptions of the same Aramaic name "Alpheus" it is now how false the frequent supposition that different names have been borne by one man. Indeed, there are several examples of the use of two names (a Hebrew and a Greek or Latin name) to designate the same person (Simon-Petras; Saulus-Paulus), so that the identity of Alpheus and Cleophas is by no means impossible.

On the whole, although there is no full evidence for the identity of James (2), the son of Alpheus, and James (3), the brother of the Lord, and James (4), the son of Mary of Clopas, the view that one and

the same person is described in the New Testament in these three different ways, is far the most probable. There is, at any rate, very good ground (Gal., i, 19; ii, 9, 12) for believing that the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus is the same person as James, the brother of the Lord, the well-known Bishop of Jerusalem of the Acts.

As to the nature of the relationship which the name "brother of the Lord" is intended to express, see BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

II.—Had we not identified James, the son of Alpheus with the brother of the Lord, we should only know his name and his Apostleship. But the identity once admitted, we must consequently apply to him all the facts which we have by virtue of the New Testament. We may venture to assert that the training of James (and his brother Jude), had been that which prevailed in all pious Jewish homes and that it was therefore based upon the knowledge of the Holy Scripture and the rigorous observance of the Law. Many facts point to the diffusion of the Greek language and culture throughout Judea and Galilee, as early as the first century B.C.; we may suppose that the Apostles, at least most of them, read and spoke Greek as well as Aramaic, from their childhood.

James was called to the Apostolate with his brother Jude. In the third description of the Apostles, he stands in the head of the third group (Matt., xi, 3; Mark, x, 37; Luke, vi, 16; Acts, i, 13). Of James individually we hear no more until after the Resurrection. St. Paul (I Cor., xv, 5—7) mentions that the Lord appeared to him before the Ascension.

Then was the sight of James till St. Paul, three years after his conversion (A.D. 37), went up to Jerusalem. Of the Twelve Apostles he saw only Peter and James the brother of the Lord (Gal., i, 19; Acts, ix, 27).

When in the year 44 Peter escaped from prison, he desired that news of his release might be carried to James who held already a marked preeminence in the Christian church in the castle. On the 9th of September (A.D. 51) he gives his sentence after St. Peter, declaring as Peter had done, that the Gentile Christians are not bound to circumcision, nor to the observance of the ceremonial Mosaic Law, but at the same time, he urged the advisability of conforming to certain ceremonies and of respecting certain of the scruples of their Jewish fellow-Christians (Acts, xv, 13 sqq.). On the same occasion, the "pillars" of the Church, James, Peter and John, "Barnabas and Lucius, and Manaen and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal., ii, 9). He publicly commended the great charter of Gentile freedom from the Law, although he still continued the observance in his own life, no longer as a sine qua non, but as a matter of most venerable and national custom, trusting to "be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts, xv, 11).

When afterwards some came from James to Antioch and led Peter into dissimulation (Gal., ii, 12), his name was used by them, though he had given them no such commandment to enforce their interpretation of the concordat which, on his proposal, had been adopted at the Council of Jerusalem. When St. Paul after his third missionary journey paid a visit to St. James (A.D. 58), the Bishop of Jerusalem and "the elders" "glorified the Lord" and advised the Apostle to take part in the ceremonies of a Nazarene vow, in order to avoid how false the claim had become that the Law as no longer to be regarded. Paul consented to the advice of James and the elders (Acts, xxxi, 1 sqq.). The Epistle of St. James (see JAMES, EPISTLE OF SAINT) reveals a grave, meek, and calm mind, nourished with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, given to prayer, devoted to the poor, resigned in persecution, the type of a just and apostolic man.

III.—Traditions respecting James the Less are to be found in many extra-canonical documents, especially Josephus (Antiq., XX, ix, 1), the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (St. Jerome, De vir. ill., 11), Hegesippus (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl." II, xxiii), the pseudo-Clementine Homilies (Ep. of Peter) and Recognitions (I, 72, 73), Clement of Alexandria (Hypot., vi, quoted by Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", II, i). The universal testimony of Christian antiquity is entirely in accordance with the information derived from the canonical books as to the fact that James was Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem. Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian, who lived about the middle of the second century, relates (and his narrative is highly probable) that James was called the "Just", that he drank no wine nor strong drink, nor ate animal food, that no man touched his food unless he was bondservant himself or made for himself or make up the bath, and lastly that he was put to death by the Jews. The account of his death given by Josephus is somewhat different. Later traditions deserve less attention.

For bibliography see JAMES, EPISTLE OF SAINT; Protoevan- gelium Jacobs and Liturgy of St. James.

A. CAMERLYNCK.

JAMES THOMPSON (alias JAMES HUDSON), Blessed, martyr, b. in or near York; having lived nearly all his life in that city, d. there, 28 Nov., 1552. He arrived at Dr. Allen's college at Reims 19 September, 1550, and in May of the next year, by virtue of a new apos-
died in and for the Catholic Faith. While he was hanging, he first raised his hands to heaven, then beat his breast with his right hand, and finally made a great sign of the cross. In spite of his sentence, he was neither disembowelled nor quartered, but was buried under the gallows.


John B. Wainwright.

James Thorpe, Blessed. See Richard Whiting, Blessed.

Jamestown. See Fargo, Diocese of.

James Walworth, Blessed. See John Rochester, Blessed.

Janauschek, Leopold, Cistercian, b. at Brunn, Moravia, 13 October, 1827; d. 23 July, 1898, at Baden, near Vienna. In 1846 he received the religious habit at the Cistercian Abbey of Zwettl, Lower Austria, where he was professed in 1848. His superior then sent him to their house of studies at Heiligenkreuz near Vienna, where he studied philosophy and theology, and after his ordination to the priesthood was made professor of history and canon law. His learned works on these sciences soon attracted attention and won for him in 1858 the chair of ecclesiastical history at the University of Vienna. In 1859 he was recalled by his superiors to Heiligenkreuz, where he continued as professor until 1877. During this time he composed his first great work, "Originum Cisterciensium Liber Primus" (Vienna, 1877), in which he describes the foundation of the Order of Citeaux, its organization and extension, and mentions many of those who, under various titles, had honoured it. He gives a lengthy account of 742 ancient abbeys of monks, founded between the end of the eleventh and the end of the seventeenth centuries. Each of the genealogical and chronological tables, as well as the entire work itself, supposes colossal labour of research and compilation. He was unable to publish the second volume, which was to have been devoted to the monasteries of Cistercian nuns, and for which he had collected a great deal of material; but it will be utilized by the continuator of his work. He also published a work of less importance on the history of the Cistercian Order.

His second great work is entitled "Bibliographia Bernardina". In 1891, on the occasion of the eighth centenary of the birth of St. Bernard, the Cistercian Congregation of Austria prepared four volumes for the glory of this illustrious doctor, under the title of "Xenia Bernardina". Janauschek gave his assistance in the preparation of the first three volumes, but the fourth, "Bibliographia Bernardina" (Vienna, 1891), was entirely his own work. He there treats successively of the different editions of the works of St. Bernard and his translations, the essays on the life of the saint, various panegyrics, his biographers, the inscriptions in his honour, the opinions of ecclesiastical historians, etc. These great works of Janauschek exhibit profound research, unconquerable perseverance, and great skill in classification. For these works the author was obliged to search many libraries and consult numerous archives; the books noticed in the "Xenia Bernardina" amount to 2761 printed, and 119 manuscript volumes. The author was also obliged to communicate with many learned men. Despite weak health, which for many years permitted him to work only at rare intervals, he persevered at his great task until interrupted by death.

Edmond M. O'Rebrech.

Jandel, Alexandre Vincent, general of the Dominican Order, b. at Gerbevilliers (Lorraine), 18 July, 1810; d. at Rome, 11 December, 1872. He was remarkable from his earliest years for intelligence and resolution, qualities derived chiefly from his mother, a person of rare endowments, who did not fear to succour priests during the Revolution. After a brilliant collegiate course at Nancy, he entered the diocesan seminary in that city, where his success was equally great. Jandel was ordained priest 20 September, 1834, then appointed professor of Scripture, and soon afterwards rector of the seminary at Pont-à-Mousson. The young superior was regarded as a model of sanctity and learning. At this time he became acquainted with Bautain, Gerbet, Ratiabonne, and many other distinguished men, among them Lacordaire. Such was the impression made on him by Lacordaire, that he began to think of entering the Dominican Order, which the great preacher proposed to restore in France, where it had been destroyed by the Revolution. In 1839 he therefore went to Rome, consulted Gregory XVI on the matter, and finally received the habit on 15 May, 1841. Two years afterwards Jandel and Lacordaire commenced the great work of re-establishing their order in France. Lacordaire was an orator; Jandel was a ruler of men, calm, grave, sagacious, and consecrated to the missions of tradition and the practice of missions, and acting in collaboration. Though he had not the genius of his associate, he preached with great results. A sermon at Lyons on the power of the Cross led to his being challenged by a Freemason to prove the truth of his words in the lodge; he entered it, produced his crucifix, and made the sign of the cross; instantly the lights were extinguished, the furniture was thrown about, and all but he fled in terror from the scene of confusion.

Many holy persons in France placed themselves under his guidance. Pius IX, however, called him to Rome, and made him in 1855 abbot of the Dominican Order ad beneplacitum, and in 1855 general for six years. He was soon recognized as the greatest religious superior and one of the most enlightened spiritual directors in the city. Of those whom he instructed at this time, two may be mentioned: Cardinal Manning and Father Burke. A born administrator, he infused new life into the order. Several provinces were re-established, and houses opened everywhere. The Dominican nuns (second order) and tertiaries were also greatly indebted to his zeal. He also did much to promote devotion to the rosary, and tried to propagate the doctrine of purgatory. Such were the services he rendered to the Holy See especially as regarded the Zouaves, that Pius IX, who was warmly attached to him, intended to make him a cardinal; but Providence disposed otherwise, for he was elected general of the order, 7 June, 1862. He visited Ireland twice, and only weak health prevented him from visiting America. New editions of liturgical books and of the "constitutions" or legislation formed part of his characteristic work. He also paid great attention to foreign missions. During his term of office sixteen Dominicans were beatified or canonized. He possessed at two different times the order (Ghent, 1871), and he is justly considered as one of the greatest generals that the order has had during the seven centuries of its existence.

The standard authority is Correrie, Vie de l'Archevêque Père Jandel, ancien suprême des Prêtres-Fréres (Paris, 1890).

Reginald Walsh.

Jane Frances de Chantall, Saint, born at Dijon, France, 28 Jan., 1572; died at the Visitatio Convent, Moulins, 13 Dec., 1641. Her father was president of the Parliament of Burgundy, and leader of the royal party during the League that brought about the triumph of the cause of Henry of Navarre, afterwards called Baron de Chantall, and lived in the feudal castle of Bourilly. She restored order in the household, which was so
bravely, and yet she was exceedingly sensitive. Celse-Bénigne was an incorrigible duelist. She prayed so fervently that he was given the grace to die a Christian death on the battlefield, during the campaign against the Ile of Rë (1627). He left a daughter who became the famous Marie Thérèse de Chantal. After his death, the added interior crosses which, particularly during the last nine years of her life, kept her in an agony of soul from which she was not freed until three months before her death.

Her reputation for sanctity was widespread. Queens, princes, and prelates flocked to the reception from the Visitation. Wherever she went to establish foundations, the people gave her ovations. “These people,” she would say confused, “do not know me; they are mistaken.” Her body is venerated with that of St. Francis de Sales in the church of the Visitation at Annecy. She was beatified in 1751, canonized in 1767, and 21 August was appointed as her feast day.

The life of the saint was written in the seventeenth century, with inimitable charm, by her secretary, Mother de Chaussy. Mgr Bougaud, who died Bishop of Laval, published in 1863 a “Histoire de Sainte Chantal” which had a great and well-deserved success.

The works of the saint comprise instructions on the religious life, various minor works, among which is the admirable “Deposition for the Process of Beatification of St. Francis de Sales”, and a great many letters. The saint’s qualities are seen in her precise and peremptory style, void of any suppressed emotion, and bursting forth spontaneously from the heart, anticipating in its method the beautiful French of the seventeenth century. The book which may be called her masterpiece, “Réponses sur les Règles, Constitutions et Coutumes,” a truly profound and complete code of the religious life, is not in circulation.


RAFAEL FERNIN.

JANER, FERDINAND, theologian, b. at Hirschau, in the Upper Palatinate (Bavaria), 4 Feb., 1836; d. 1 November, 1895. He completed his studies at the Latin school of Amberg, taking his philosophical course at that lyceum, studied theology at Würzburg and Ratiburg, and was ordained priest 13 August, 1858. After devoting himself to parish work for a time, he again took up his studies at Würzburg, where he obtained the degree of Doctor of Theology, after which he was successively, chaplain at Weiden, in 1863 prefect of the Ratiburg seminary, 1886 professor of religion and history at the gymnasium of Speyer, 1867 professor of ecclesiastical history, Christian archeology, and history of art at the Ratiburg lyceum, 1883 diocesan consultant. He retired from active life in the year 1888.

Jamer’s principal work is “Geschichte der Bischöfe von Regensburg”, the three published volumes of which bring the history to the sixteenth century (Ratisbon, 1883–86). He also wrote: “De factis dogmaticis” (Würzburg, 1861); “Infallibilium ecclesiam Catholicam esse in diuidicandis factis dogmaticis” (Speyer, 1866); “Das officium unius martyris de communi in Zusammenhang erklärt.” (Speyer, 1867); “Das Heilige Land, und die heiligen Stätten, ein Pilgerbuch” (Ratisbon, 1839); “Missale parvum sive Missale Romanum in breviore mit commodiorum formam redactum” (Ratisbon, 1870); “Die Bauhütten des deutschen Mittelalters” (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1876); Nicolaus von Weiz, Bischof zu Speyer” (Würzburg, 1854); “Die Schotten in Regensburg, die Kirche zu St. Jacob und deren Nordportal” (Ratisbon, 1885); a translation of the Breviary “Das römische Brevier in deutscher Sprache” (4 vols., Ratisbon, 1890). He also wrote “Personen-und Sachregister zu Habs, Die Con-
vertigen seit der Reformation", I-X (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1872).

_Friedrich Lauchert._

**Janow.** See Lublin and Podlachia, Diocese of.

**Janow, Matthew of,** a medieval ecclesiastical author, b. in the fourteenth century in Bohemia; d. at Prague, 30 Nov., 1394. Son of Wenzel of Janow, a Bohemian knight, he began his studies at Prague and continued them at the University of Paris where he graduated after nine years. Hence his title of "Parishian-Master (Magister Parisionis)." In 1381 he was appointed canon and confessor in the cathedral of Prague, offices which he held until his death. He was never a preacher of the first rank, but was conspicuous for his great zeal in the confessional. Between the years 1388 and 1392 he composed several treatises which he later collected under the title "Regula Veteris et Novi Testamenti". The work has never been published in its entirety, nor is it to be found complete in any one manuscript. Parts of it were wrongly ascribed to John Hus and published with his works in parts I, 376-471.

Janow attributed the evils in the Church to the contemporary Papal Schism, the large number of papal exemptions and reservations, and the excessive importance attached by some Christians to adventitious external practices. Owing to the abuses which at times attended the vaccination of saints and relics, he ultimately advocated the removal of such special objects of piety from the churches. He was misled in this extreme view by his desire of promoting an intense interior devotion to the Blessed Eucharist. The frequent and even daily reception of Holy Communion by the laity was, according to him, not only desirable but almost necessary. At the Synod of Prague in 1389 such encouragement of daily Communion was prohibited, and the veneration of images defended. Janow's retraction of his erroneous views and his repeated protestations of never-failing loyalty to the Catholic Church are sufficient evidence that he cannot be styled, as is frequently done, a forerunner of Hus.


_N. A. Weber._

**Jansen (Jansens, Janssen, Janssenius of Jansenius Gandaviensis), Cornelius, the Elder, exegete, b. at Hulst, Flanders, 1510; d. at Ghent, 11 April, 1576.** He received his early education at Ghent from the Brethren of the Common Life (called at Ghent the Hieronymites), and later studied theology and Oriental languages at Louvain. After he had become a licentiate of theology in 1534, he lectured, at the request of the abbot of the Premonstratensian Abbey of Tongerlo, to the young monks on the Holy Scriptures until 1542, from which date until 1562 he discharged the duties of pastor of the parish of St. Martin at Courtrai (Courby) with great success. Having finally attained the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1562, he was immediately appointed professor of theology at the University of Louvain, became in the following year dean of the collegiate seminary of St. James, and at the request of the Council of Trent was delegate of the university. On his return, King Philip II appointed him first bishop of the newly founded See of Ghent, which dated only from 1559. For a long time he refused to assume the dignity, on account of the difficult conditions in the diocese, and was not consecrated until 1564. As Bishop of Ghent, he devoted himself especially to checking the advance of Protestantism, and to carrying out with the greatest earnestness the decrees of the Council of Trent. With this object in view, he founded a seminary for priests at Ghent in 1569, held diocesan synods in 1571 and 1574, and published a ritual for his diocese. He was entrusted with the compilation of a ritual to be used in the ecclesiastical province of Mechlin, but did not finish it. While at Tongerlo he made a great deal, and, as pastor at Courtrai, had already become widely known for his excededal work.

Among Jansen's writings is the "Concordia evangelica" (Louvain, 1549), which he later added to the "Commentarius in Concordiam et totam historiam evangelicam" (Louvain, 1572), and thus formed a whole work. He published also: "Commentarius in Proverbs Salomonis" (Louvain, 1567), and "Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum" (Louvain, 1569), both of which were republished in one work at Antwerp in 1589; "Commentarius in Omnis Psalmos Davidicuos" (Louvain, 1569), with an historical introduction to each psalm, an excellent paraphrase of the text, and explanation of the difficult passages; "Paraphrases in ea Veteris Testamenti Cantica, quex feria seconius totius annui uusae ecclesiasticus observat" (Louvain, 1569). After his death appeared: Annotaciones in Librum Sententiae (Louvain, 1577).

Cornelius Jansen was one of the most distinguished among the exegetes of the sixteenth century, and his master-piece, the aforesaid "Concordia Evangelica", was epoch-making in the history of Catholic exegesis, for he insisted on the literal interpretation, as against the mystical interpretation of his predecessors, emphasized also the importance of the original text, and of a profound study of Oriental languages as aids to a full comprehension of the Vulgate.

*Deutsche Bibliographie, XIII, 768 sq.; Hunte, Nomenclator, 1 (1893), 23 sq.; Anuario de l'Universite de Louvain (1871), 288-93.

_Patrickius Schlaeger._

**Jansen, Johann, historian, b. 10 April, 1829, at Xanten, Germany; d. 24 December, 1891, at Frankfort-on-the-Main.** He received his early education in a school of his native town, but his course was interrupted, however, from the early part of 1842 to the spring of 1844, during which time he worked as an apprentice to a coppermith. It soon became apparent, however, that he had no aptitude for this trade, and he was allowed to return to school. In 1846 he went to the gymnasium of Recklingshausen, from which he graduated in the autumn of 1849. In the spring of 1854 he entered the universities of Münster, Louvain, Bonn, and Berlin, where he devoted himself to the study of theology and history; in August, 1853, he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Bonn, in virtue of a Latin dissertation on the life of Wilibrord, Abbot of Stablo and Corvey (1098-1158); in August, 1854, he opened a course of history as Privatdozent at the Academy of Münster, but shortly afterwards, in September of the same year, he was asked to take the chair of history for the Catholic students of the gymnasium at Frankfort-on-the-Main. He retained this position up to the time of his death in 1891.

Not satisfied with attending to the ordinary duties of the class-room, Jansen devoted his spare time to historical research, the results of which were embodied in many learned volumes. At the same time he took every opportunity to visit centers of historical interest. From 1849 to 1854 he spent several months in Italy and Rome, where he consulted the archives of the Vatican on matters relating to the Thirty Years War and to the first partition of Poland. In 1875-76 he was a deputy to the Prussian Diet, joined the Centre party, and spent much time in Berlin. This service to the capital was not only to defend the interests of his constituency in Parliament, but also to widen the range of his knowledge by personal intercourse...
with learned and public men. From the days of his childhood he conceived the desire of serving God in the priesthood. The delicate state of his health prevented the execution of this intention; but finally he was ordained priest at Limburg, 26 March, 1860. In 1866 he was appointed spiritual counsellor by Archbishop Hermann von Vicari of Freiburg, and in 1880 Pope Leo XIII made him a prelate and a prothonotary Apostolic ad instar participiorum.

Janssen is the author of many valuable works on historical subjects. It was while he was at the University of Louvain that he resolved to make the study of history his principal work for the remainder of his life. His first work was a Latin biography of Abbot Wibald, which appeared in a revised form in C. Imann (1854). In 1856 he published a volume of historical documents relating to the Diocese of Münster (Die Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Münster, 3 vols.). In 1861 appeared the essay "Frankreichs Rheingebiete und deutschfeindliche Politik in früheren Jahrhunderten", in which he laid bare the traditional diplomacy of France hostile to Germany at interest upon extending the boundary line as far as the Rhine. In 1863 he published an essay upon Schiller as a historian (Schiller als Historiker), in which he made it plain that the great German poet, in his historical writings, indulged too much in his imagination. For many years afterwards he preserved a manuscript material found in the archives of Frankfort; and the result of these labours was the publication of "Frankfurts Reichsbriefe", 1376–1519 (2 vols., 1863–73). In the essay "Zur Genesis der ersten Theilung Polens" (1866) he explained the circumstances under which the former Kingdom of Poland was robbed of part of its dominions by neighbouring countries. A biography of the man who considered him his teacher and guide appeared in three volumes in 1868 under the title "Johann Friedrich Boehmers Leben, Briefe und kleinere Schriften". In 1876–77 appeared in two volumes another biography of a renowned scholar and convert to the Catholic Faith, Count Friedrich Leopold zu Stolberg. In the work "Zeit- und Lebensbilder" (1875) he published in book form a number of essays on the men and events of his time.

The most important work is his "History of the German people" (Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters). The first suggestion of such an undertaking was made by his master and friend, Johann Friedrich Boehmer, in 1853. At first he planned to write a complete history of Germany from its earliest times to his own day; but soon he saw his plan had to be abandoned, and he confined himself to the period beginning with the end of the Middle Ages. Eight volumes have appeared; six were given to the public by Janssen himself (1876–88), and two by his pupil and friend Ludwig Pastor (1893–94) from materials collected by Janssen; and they reach as far as the time of the Thirty Years War, which commenced in 1618. The great merit of this work is that Janssen treated not only of the political but also of the religious, social, and economic conditions of Germany, that he was very faithful to the sources of information and very impartial, that he made the authorities speak for themselves and that he destroyed the common conception, according to which the Middle Ages presented nothing but corruption and moral decay. Valuable additions to this work are found in two small volumes written in reply to adverse criticism ("An meiner Kritiker" 1881, "Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker" 1884). Most of the works of Janssen had a large sale, and appeared in several editions; this is particularly the case of the "History of the German People", which has been translated, partly, at least, into French and English. Janssen was a very prolific writer; to the works which have just been mentioned he added a number of articles written for reviews and other publications.

Owing to the literary and critical merits of his works, Janssen must be placed among the foremost Catholic historians of the last century. In his great work he deals much with the origin and the great leaders of the Protestant Reformation, yet he is always most moderate in tone, and never uses expressions which might give offence. The same attitude of reverence and respect was shown in his personal relations towards those who differed from him in faith; and in this manner he won the esteem and confidence of Protestants, among whom he found many friends.

Despite Janssen's great learning he remained humble; worldly honours and ecclesiastical dignities had no attraction for him. In 1864 efforts were made to win him for the diplomatic service of the Vatican; some time later he was mentioned for a vacant bishopric; in 1883 Pope Leo XIII contemplated summoning him to Rome for the direction of the Vatican Archives; in 1890 the cardinalate was to be conferred upon him; but he preferred in escaping all these honours. He gave often and abundantly to the poor, to the sick, to churches, and to institutions of mercy. An asylum for the poor and abandoned children of Frankfort, erected in 1894 in the town of Oberursel, owes its existence largely to his efforts. Janssen was a great scholar and an exemplary priest, though he never exercised the ecclesiastical ministry.

**Pastor, Johannes Janssen (Freiburg, 1864).**

**Francis J. Schafer.**

**Janssenius and Jansenism.**—Cornelius Janssen, Bishop of Ypres (Cornelius Janssenius Ypresensis), from whom Jansenism derives its origin and name, must not be confounded with another writer and bishop of the same name, Cornelius Janssenius Gandavenensis (1510–1575), of whom we possess several books on Scripture and a valuable "Concordia Evangelica".

I. LIFE AND WRITINGS.—The subject of this article lived three-quarters of a century later than his namesake. He was born 23 Oct., 1555, of a Catholic family, in the village of Accoi, near Leerdom, Holland; died at Ypres, 6 May, 1638. His parents, although in moderate circumstances, secured for him an excellent education; they sent him first to Utrecht. In 1602 we find him at the University of Louvain, who entered the Collège du Faucon to take up the study of philosophy. Here he passed two years, and at the solemn promotion of 1604 was proclaimed first of 118 competitors. To begin his theological studies he entered the Collège du Pape Adrien VI, whose president, Jacques Janson, imbued with the errors of Bavinus and eager to spread them, was to exert an influence on the subsequent course of his ideas and works. Having hitherto been on amicable terms with the Jesuits, he had even sought admission into their order. The refusal he experienced, the motives of which are known to us, seemed not to be altogether unrelated to the aversion he subsequently manifested for the celebrated society, and for the theories and practices it championed. He was also associated with a young and wealthy Frenchman, Jean du Verger de Haurnanne, who was completing his course of theology with the Jesuits, and who possessed a mind subtle and cultured, but restless and prone to innovations, and an ardent and intriguing character. Shortly after his return to Paris towards the end of 1604, du Verger was joined there by Janssenius, for whom he had secured a position as tutor. About two years later he attracted him to his home, his native town of Brou, making him appointed director of an episcopal college. There, during eleven or twelve years of studies ardently pursued in common, on the Fathers and principally on St. Augustine, the two friends had time to exchange thoughts and to conceive daring projects. In 1617,
while du Verger, who had returned to Paris, went to receive from the Bishop of Poitiers the dignity of Abbot of St-Cyrans, Jansenius returned to Louvain, where the presidency of the new Collège de Sainte-Pulchérie was confided to him. In 1619 he received the degree of Doctor of Theology, and afterwards obtained a chair of exegesis. The commentaries which he wrote, and the polemical writings of a polemical nature, brought him in a short time a deserved renown.

These writings of Jansenius were not at first intended for publication, in fact, they did not see the light until after his death. They are concise, clear and penetrative, orthodox in doctrine. The principal ones are "Pentateuchus, sive commentarius in quinque libros Mosis" (Louvain, 1639); "Synopsis in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Sapientiam, Habacuc et Sophoniam" (Louvain, 1644); "Tetrateuchus, seu commentarius in quatuor Evangelia" (Louvain, 1639). Some of these exegetical works have been printed more than once. Among his polemical works are: "Alexipharmacum civibus Sylvestriensis propinatum adversus ministrorum fascinum" (Louvain, 1630); then, in reply to the criticism of the Calvinist Gisbert Voet, "Spongia notarum quibus Alexipharmacum astutius ad Veritatem ducuit" (Louvain, 1631). Jansenius published in 1635, under the pseudonym of Armacanus, a volume entitled "Alexandri Patricii Armacani Theologi Opera Gallica seu de justitia armorum regis Galliae libri duo". This was a bitter and well-merited satire against the foreign policy of Richelieu, which was summed up in the odd fact of the "Most Christian" nation and monarchy constantly allying themselves with the Protestants, in Holland, Germany, and elsewhere, for the sole purpose of compassing the downfall of the House of Austria.

The same author has left us a series of letters addressed to the Abbot of St-Cyran, which were found among the papers of the person with whom they were sent and printed under the title: "Naisissant du jansénisme découverte, ou Lettres de Jansénius à l'abbé de St-Cyran depuis l'an 1617 jusqu'en 1635" (Louvain, 1654). It was also during the course of his professorate that Jansenius, who was a man of action as well as of study, journeyed twice to Spain, whither he went as the deputy of his colleagues to plead at the Court of Madrid the cause of the university against the Jesuits; and in fact, through his efforts their authorization to teach humanities and philosophy at Louvain was withdrawn. All this, however, did not prevent the correspondence from continuing, chiefly with a work of which the general aim, born of his intercourse with St-Cyran, was to restore to its place of honour the true doctrine of St. Augustine on grace, a doctrine supposedly obscured or abandoned in the Church for several centuries. He was still working on it when, on the recommendation of King Philip IV and Boonen, Archbishop of Mechlin, he was raised to the See of Ypres. His consecration took place in 1636, and, though at the same time putting the finishing touches to his theological work, he devoted himself with great zeal to the government of his diocese. Historians have remarked that the Jesuits had no more cause to complain of his administration than the other religious orders.

He succumbed to an epidemic which ravaged Ypres, and died, according to eyewitnesses, in dispositions of great piety. When on the point of death he dictated to his chaplain, Reginald Lameus, with the command to publish it after taking counsel with Libert Fromondus, a professor at Louvain, and Henri Calenus, a canon of the metropolitan church. He requested that this publication be made with the utmost fidelity; as, in his opinion, it was impossible to add anything new and changed. "If, however," he added, "the Holy See wishes any change, I am an obedient son, and I submit to that Church in which I have lived to my dying hour. This is my last wish." The editors of the "Augustinus" have been wrongly accused of having intentionally and disloyally suppressed this declaration; it appears plainly enough on the second page in the original edition. On the other hand its authenticity has been contested by means of internal and several arguments, founded notably on the discovery of another will, dated the previous day (5 May), which says nothing regarding the work on which he was to be published. But it is quite conceivable that the dying prelate was mindful of the opportunity to complete his first act by dictating to his chaplain and confirming with his seal this codicil, according to which, referring to the testamentary executors, was written only half an hour before his death. It has been vainly sought, a priori, to make the fact appear improbable by alleging that the author was in perfect good faith as to the orthodoxy of his views. Already, in 1619, 1620, and 1621, the authenticity of St-Cyran bore unmistakable traces of a quite opposite state of mind; in it he spoke of coming disputes for which there was need to prepare; of a doctrine of St. Augustine discovered by him, but little known among the learned, and which in time would astonish everybody; of opinions on grace and predestination which he dared not then reveal "lest like so many others I be tripped up by Rome before everything is ripe and seasonable". Later, in the "Augustinus" itself, (IV, xxv-xxvii), it is seen that he severely disguises the close connexion of several of his assertions with certain propositions of this Doctor, though he ascribes the condemnation of the latter to the contingent circumstances of time and place, and he believes them tenable in their obvious and natural sense.

Nothing, therefore, authorized the rejection of the famous declaration, or testament, of Jansenius as unauthentic. But neither is there any authorization for suspecting the sincerity of the explicit affirmation of submission to the Holy See which is therein contained. The author, at the time of his promotion to the doctorate in 1619, had defended the infallibility of the pope in a most categorical thesis, conceived as follows: "The Roman Pontiff is the supreme judge of all religious controversies; when he defines a thing and imposes it on the whole Church, under penalty of anathema, his decision is just, true, and infallible." The end of his work (III, x, Epilogus omnium) we find this protestation perfectly parallel with that of the Testament: "All whatsoever I have affirmed in these various and difficult points, not according to my own sentiment, but according to that of the holy Doctor, I submit to the judgment and sentence of the Apostolic See and the Roman Church, my mother, to be henceforth adhered to if she judges that it must be so; and I refuse to build anything on the contrary, and anathematize it if she decrees that it should be condemned and anathematized. For since my tenderest
childhood I have been reared in the beliefs of this Church; I imbibed them with my mother's milk; I have grown up and grown old while remaining attached to them; never to my knowledge have I swerved therefrom a hair's breadth in thought, action or word; and I am still firmly decided to keep this faith in order to present it to thee, before the judgment-seat of God." Thus Jansenius, although he gave his name to a heresy, was not himself a heretic, but lived and died in the bosom of the Church. In view of the fact that he consciously and deliberately aimed at innovation or reforming, it would be absurd to ascribe to him the guilt of heresy, or declare that his attitude was in no wise presumptuous and rash; but impartial history may and should take into account the peculiar atmosphere created about him by the still smouldering controversies on Calvinism and the widespread prejudices against the Roman Curia. To determine the extent to which these and similar circumstances, by deluding him, necessarily diminished his responsibility, is impossible; that is the secret of the text.

II. THE "AUGUSTINUS" AND ITS CONDEMNATION.—After the death of Jansenius, the internuncio Richard André appointed the state of Adam, must be divided into volumes of which the first, chiefly historical, is an exposition in eight books of Pelagianism; the second, after an introductory study on the limitations of human nature, devotes one book to the state of innocence or the grace of Adam and the angels, four books to the state of fall and the darkness of the state of pure nature; the third volume treats in ten books of "the grace of Christ the Saviour", and concludes with "a parallel to the error of the Semi-pelagians and that of certain moderns", who are no other than the Molinists. The author, if we are to accept his own statement, laboured for twenty years on this work, and to gather his materials he had ten times read the whole of St. Augustine and thirty times his treatise against the Pelagians. From these readings emerged a vast system, whose identity with Bal- lainism is not skilful arrangement nor subtle dialectic concealment.

His fundamental error consists in disregarding the supernatural order; for Jansenius, as for Baisius, the vision of God is the necessary end of human nature; hence it follows that all the primal endowments designated in theology as supernatural or prenatural, including exemption from concupiscence, were simply man's due. This first assertion is fraught with grave consequences regarding the original fall, grace, and justification. As a result of Adam's sin, our nature, stripped of elements essential to its integrity, is radically corrupted and depraved. Mastered by concupiscence, the will of Augustine, as to original sin, the will is powerless to resist; it has become purely passive. It cannot escape the attraction of evil except it be aided by a movement of grace superior to and triumphant over the force of concupiscence. Our soul, henceforth obedient to no motive save that of pleasure, is at the mercy of the delectation, earthly or heavenly, which for the time being attracts it with the greatest strength. At once inevitable and irresistible, this delectation, if it come from heaven or from grace, leads man to virtue; if it come from nature or concupiscence, it determines him to sin. In the one case existence of a return to the common impulse by the preponderant impulse. The two delectations, says Jansenius, are like the two arms of a balance, of which the one cannot rise unless the other be lowered, and vice versa. Thus man irresistibly, although voluntarily, does either good or evil, according as he is dominated by grace or by concupiscence; he never resists either the one or the other. In this system there is evidently no place for purely sufficient grace; on the other hand it is easy to discern the principles of the five condemned propositions (see below).

In order to present it to thee, before the judgment-seat of St. Augustine, Jansenius based his argument chiefly on two Augustinian conceptions: on the distinction between the auzilium sine quo non granted to Adam, and the auzilium quo, active in his descendants; and on the theory of the victorious "delectation" of grace, and of God's grace which he remarks "in sufficere to make clear the double mistake. In the first place the auzilium sine quo non is not, in the idea of Augustine, "a grace purely sufficient", since through it the angels persevered; it is on the contrary a grace which confers complete power in actus primo (i.e. the ability to act), in such a way that, this being granted, nothing further is needed for action. The auzilium quo, on the other hand, is a supernatural help which bears immediately on the actus secundus (i.e. the performance of the action) and in this grace, in so far as it is distinguished from the actus primo, included the efficacious graces by which man works out his salvation, or the gift of actual perseverance, which gift conducts man infallibly and invincibly to beatitude, not because it suppresses liberty, but because its very concept implies the consent of man. The delectation of grace is a deliberate and rational choice, which Hippo explicitly opposes to necessity (voluptas, non necessitas); but what we will and embrace with consenting pleasure, we cannot at the same time not will, and in this sense will we necessarily. In this sense also, it is correct to say, "Quod amplius nos delectat, secundum quoddam hosque necessitatem" (i.e. in acting we necessarily follow what gives us most pleasure). Finally, this delight is called victorious, not because it fatally subjugates the will, but because it triumphs over concupiscence, fortifying free will to the point of rendering it invincible to natural desire. It is thus clear that we can say of men sustained by and faithful to grace, "Invictissime quasi bonum est velint, et hoc deserere invictissime nonint." The success of the "Augustinus" was great, and it spread rapidly throughout Belgium, Holland, and France. A new edition, bearing the approbation of the doctors of the Sorbonne, soon appeared. On the other hand, on 1 August, 1641, a decree of the Holy Office condemned the work and prohibited its reading; and the following year Urban VIII renewed the condemnation and interdict in his Bull "In eminenti". The pope justified his sentence with two principal reasons: first, the violation of the decree forbidding Catholics to publish anything on the subject of grace without the authorization of the Holy See; second, the reproduction of several of the errors of Baisius. At the same time, and in the interests of peace, the sovereign pontiff interdicted several other works dedicated against the "Augustinus". Despite all these wise precautions the Bull, which some pretended was forged or interpolated, was not received everywhere without difficulty. In Belgium, where the Archbishop of Mechlin and the university were rather favourable to the new ideas, the controversy lasted for ten years. But it was France which henceforth became the chief centre of the agitation. At Paris, St-Cyran, who was powerful through his relations besides being very active, succeeded in spreading simultaneously the doctrines of the "Augustinus" and the principles of an exaggerated moral and disciplinary rigorism, all under the name of the "Augustinus", and succeeded especially in winning over to his ideas the influential and numerous family of Arnauld of Anilly, notably Mère Angélique Arnauld, Abbess of Port-Royal, and through her the religious of that im-
portant convent. When he died, in 1643, Doctor Antoine Arnauld quite naturally succeeded him in the direction of the movement which he had created. The new leader lost no time in asserting himself in startling fashion by the publication of his book "On Frequent Communion", which would have been more correctly entitled "Against Frequent Communion", but he projected such a vast show of erudition, and a great display of ingenuity, did not a little towards strengthening the party.

Although the Sorbonne had accepted the Bull "In eminenti", and the Archbishop of Paris had, in 1644, proscribed the work of Janseni, it continued to be read, and was recommended; and the pretext that authority had not rejected a single well-determined thesis. It was then (1649) that Cornet, syndic of the Sorbonne, took the initiative in a more radical measure; he extracted five propositions from the much-discussed work, two from the book "On Frequent Communion", and submitted them to the judgment of the faculty. This body, prevented by the Parlement from pursuing the examination it had begun, referred the affair to the general assembly of the clergy in 1650. The greater number considered it more fitting that Rome should pronounce, and eighty-five bishops wrote in this sense to the Pope, deeming it unwise to contain the first five propositions. Eleven other bishops addressed to the sovereign pontiff a protest against the idea of bringing the matter to trial elsewhere than in France. They demanded in any case the institution of a special tribunal, as in the "De auxillis" affair, and the opening of a debate in which the theologians of both sides should be allowed to submit their arguments. The decision of Innocent X was what might have been expected: he acceded to the request of the majority, keeping in view as far as possible the wishes of the minority. A commission was appointed, consisting of fifteen cardinals and thirteen theologians, some of whom were known to be distinctly against the Jansenists. Its laborious examination lasted two years: it held thirty-six long sessions, of which the last ten were presided over by the Pope in person. The "Augustinus" which, as has been said, had friends on the bench, was defended with skill and tenacity. Finally, its advocates presented a table of three columns, in which they distinguished as many interpretations of the five propositions: a Calvinistic interpretation, rejected as heretical; a Pelagian or Semipelagian interpretation, identified by them with the traditional doctrine, also to be cast aside; and lastly, their interpretation of the idea of St. Augustine himself, which could not but be approved. This plea, skilful as it was, could not avert the solemn condemnation, by the Bull "Cum occasione" (31 May, 1653), of the five propositions, which were as follows: (1) Some of God’s commandments are impossible to just men who wish and strive (to keep them), considering the powers they actually have; the grace by which these precepts may become possible is also wanting; (2) In the state of fallen nature no one ever resists interior grace; (3) To merit, or demerit, in the state of fallen nature we must be free from all external constraint, but not from interior constraint; (4) The circumstance which prevails is the necessity of interior preventing grace for all acts, even for the beginning of faith; but they fell into heresy in pretending that this grace is such that man may either follow or resist it; (5) To say that Christ died or shed His blood for all men, is Semipelagianism, which five propositions were rejected as heretical, the first four absolutely, the fifth if understood in the sense that Christ died only for the predestined. All are implicitly contained in the second, and through it, all are connected with the above-mentioned erroneous conception of the state of innocence and the original fall. If it is true that the fallen man never resists interior grace (second proposition), it follows that a just man violates a commandment of God did not have the grace to observe it, that he therefore transcends it through inability to fulfil it (first proposition). If, however, he has sinned and thus demerited, it is clear that, to demerit, the liberty of indifference is not requisite, and what is said of demerit must also be said of its correlative, merit (third proposition). On the other hand, if grace is often wanting to the just, since they fall, it is wanting still more to sinners; it is therefore impossible skill and a grace of erudition and assurance to every man, the grace necessary for salvation (fifth proposition). If this be so, the Semipelagians were in error in admitting the universal distribution of a grace which may be resisted (fourth proposition).

III. REVISION OF THE JANSENISTS.—Well received by the Sorbonne and the General Assembly of the Clergy, the Bull "Cum occasione" was proscribed with the royal sanction. This should have opened the eyes of the partisans of Jansensi. They were given the alternative of finally renouncing the errors, or of openly resisting the supreme authority. They were thrown for the moment into embarrassment and hesitation, from which Arnauld extricated them by a subtlety: they must, he said, accept the condemnation of the five propositions, and reject them, as did the pope; only, these propositions were not part of the body of the doctrine; of that the most skilled could not be found therein, it was in another sense than in the pontifical document; the idea of Janseni was the same as that of St. Augustine, which the Church neither could, nor wished to, censure. This interpretation was not tenable; it was contrary to the text of the Bull, so that less than to the minds of the resistance, which had preceded it, and throughout which these propositions were considered and presented as expressing the sense of the "Augustinus." In March, 1654, thirty-eight bishops rejected the interpretation, and communicated their decision to the sovereign pontiff, who thanked them, as 'a demonstration of the justice of the Church, and as nothing less in an attitude opposed alike to frankness and to logic. The occasion soon arrived for them to support this with a complete theory. The Due de Liancourt, one of the promoters of the party, was refused absolution until he should change his sentiments and accept purely and simply the condemnation of the "Augustinus." Arnauld took up his pen and in two successive letters protested against any such exaction. Ecclesiastical judgments, he said, are not all of equal value, and do not entail the same obligations; where there is question of the truth or falsity of a doctrine, a judges depending on his own conscience, the doctrine of St. Augustine itself, from the virtute of its Divine mission is qualified to decide; it is a matter of right; but if the doubt bears upon the presence of this doctrine in a book, it is a question of purely human fact, which as such does not fall under the jurisdiction of the supernatural teaching authority instituted in the Church by Jesus Christ. In the former case, the Church having pronounced sentence, we have no choice but to conform our belief to its decision; in the latter, its word should not be openly contradicted, it claims from us the homage of a respectful silence, but not that of an interior assent. Such is the famous argument, which Arnauld defends against criticism. The doctrine of the Reformed Church is the right and fact, which was not to be the basis of their resistance, although which the recalcitrants pretended to remain Catholics, united to the visible body of Christ despite all their obstinacy. This distinction is both logically and historically the denial of the doctrinal power of the Church. For how is it possible to teach and defend revealed doctrine in if its affirmation or denial cannot be disavowed in a book or a writing, whatever its form or its extent? In fact, from the beginning, councils and popes have approved and imposed as orthodox certain formulas and certain works, and from the beginning have proscribed others as being tainted with heresy or error.

The expedient contrived by Arnauld was so opposed to both fact and reason that a number of Jan-
It would be a mistake to believe that this direct intervention of the pope, sustained as it was by Louis XIV, completely ended the stubborn opposition. The religious, like the Jansenists under whose privilege of being acknowledged by the Court to have been condemned by the Council of Trent, had resented others or deceived themselves. All of them, moreover, through personal intercourse, preaching, or writing, displayed extraordinary activity in behalf of their ideas. They aimed especially, following the tactics inaugurated by St. Cyran, at introducing them into religious orders, and in this way they were in a measure successful, e.g., with the Oratory of the Good Jesus, and the Congregation Against the Jesuits, in whom from the first they had encountered capable and determined adversaries, they had vouched a profound antipathy and waged a war to the death. This inspired the "Provinciales" which appeared in 1656. These were letters supposedly addressed to a provincial correspondent. Their author, B. S. Pascal, abusing his admirable genius, therein lavished the resources of a captivating style and an inexhaustible sarcastic humour to taunt and decry the Society of Jesus, as favouring and propagating a relaxed and corrupt moral code. To this end the errors of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as well as the malicious exaggerations, were made to appear as the official doctrine of the whole order. The "Provinciales" were translated into elegant Latin by Nicole, dismissed for the occasion under the pseudonym of Wilhelmus Wendroochus. They did a great deal of harm. But the pope, listening to the Strozzi, against the faction, had, by 138 votes against 68, condemned the latest writings of Arnauld, and, on his refusal to submit, it dismissed him, together with sixty other doctors who made common cause with him. The assembly of bishops in 1656 branded as heretical the unfortunate theory of right and of fact, and reported its decision to Alexander VII, who had just succeeded Innocent X. On 16 October the pope replied to this communication by the Bull "Ad sanctam Beatam Petri sedem". He praised the clear-sighted firmness of the episcopate and confirmed in the following terms the condemnation pronounced by his predecessor: "We declare and define that the five propositions have been drawn from the book of Jansenius entitled 'Augustinus', and that they have been condemned in the sense of the same Jansenius, and we once more condemn them as such." Relying on the profound respect and esteem with which the following year (1657) drew up a formula of faith conformable thereto and made subscription to it obligatory. The Jansenists would not give in. They claimed that no one could exact a lying signature from those who were not convinced of the truth of the matter. The religious of Port-Royal were especially conspicuous for their obstinacy, and the Archbishop of Paris, after several fruitless admonitions, was forced to debar them from receiving the sacraments. Four bishops openly allied themselves with the rebellious party: they were Henri Arnauld of Angers, Buzenval de Beauvais, Caulet of Parniers, and Pavillon de Ath. Some claimed besides that the Roman pontiff alone had the right to exact such subscription. In order to silence them, Alexander VII, at the instance of several members of the episcopate, issued (16 February, 1657) a new Constitution, beginning with the words, "Regimini Apostolici". In this he enjoined, with threat of canonical penalties for disobedience, that all ecclesiastics, as well as all religious, men and women, should subscribe to the following very denounce formulary: "I, N——, submitting to the Apostolic constitutions of the sovereign pontiff, in consequence, therefore, of the fourth, fifth, and sixth, and 16 October, 1656, sincerely repudiates the five propositions extracted from the book of Jansenius entitled 'Augustinus', and I condemn them upon oath in the very sense expressed by that author, as the Apostolic See has condemned them by the two above-mentioned Constitutions" (Enchiridion, 1658).
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convened their synods, but, as later became known, all four gave oral explanations authorizing respectful silence on the question of fact, and it would seem that they acted thus with some connivance on the part of the mediators, unknown, however, to the nuncio and perhaps to d’Estrées. But this did not prevent them from affirming, in a common address to the sovereign pontiff, that they themselves and their priests had signed the formulary, as had been done in the other dioceses of France.

D’Estrées for his part wrote at the same time: “The four bishops have just conformed, by a new and sincere subscription, with the other bishops.” Both letters were sent by the nuncio to Rome, where Lyonne, also alleging that the signatures were absolutely regular, insisted that the affair should be brought to an end. For this reason the pope, who had received these documents 24 September, informed Louis XIV of the fact about 28 September, expressing his joy for the “subscription pure and simple” which had been obtained, announcing his intention to restore the bishops in question to favor and requesting the king to do the same. However, before the Briefs of reconciliation thus announced had been sent to each of the four prelates concerned, rumors which had at first been dismissed by the cardinals, and afterward with regard to their lack of sincerity, grew more definite, and took the shape of formal and repeated denunciations. Hence, by order of Clement IX, Bargellini had to make a new investigation at Paris. As the final result he sent to Rome a report drawn up by Violar. This report stated with regard to the four bishops: “They have condemned and caused to be condemned the five propositions with all manner of sincerity, without any exception or restriction whatsoever, in every sense in which the Church has condemned them”; but he then added explanations concerning the question of fact which were not altogether similar. The pope, not more perplexed than before, appointed a commission of twelve cardinals to obtain information. These secured, it seems, the proof of the language made use of by the bishops in their synods. Nevertheless, in consideration of the very grave difficulties which would result from opening up the whole case again, the majority of the commission held that they might and should abide practically by the testimony of the official documents and especially by that of the minister Lyonne regarding the reality of the “subscription pure and simple”, at the same time emphasizing anew this point as the essential basis and the condition sine qua non of peace.

The four Briefs of reconciliation were then drawn up and dispatched; they bear the date, 19 January, 1669. In them Clement IX recalls the testimony he had received “concerning the real and complete obedience with which they had sincerely subscribed to the formulary, condemning the five propositions without any exception or restriction, according to all the senses in which they had been condemned by the Holy See.” He remarks further that being “most firmly resolved to uphold the constitutions of his predecessors, he would not admit any violation of the principle of the restriction or exception”. These preambles were as explicit and formal as possible. They prove, especially when compared with the terms and object of the formulary of Alexander VII, how far wrong the Jansenists were in celebrating this termination of the affair as the triumph of their formula of 1662, and in conceiving themselves of the distinction between right and fact. On the other hand it is clear from the whole course of the negotiations that the loyalty of these champions of a stainless and unfaltering moral code was more than doubtful. At all events, the sect profited by the muddle which was called to extend it, and to press it still further and to get a stronger hold on several religious congregations. It was favoured by various circumstances. Among them must be included the growing infatuation in France for the so-called Gallican Liberties, and in consequence a certain attitude of defiance, or at least indolence, towards the supreme authority; then the Declaration of 1682, and finally the unfortunate affair of the Régale. It is worthy of remark that in this last conflict it was two Jansenist bishops of the deepest dye who had drawn up the formula, which upheld the rights of the Church and the Holy See, while the greater number of the others too readily bowed before the arrogant pretensions of the civil power.

V. JANSENISM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.—Despite the silence and equivocation which it allowed to continue, the “Peace of Clement IX” found a certain justification for its name in the period of relative calm which followed it, and which lasted until the end of the seventeenth century. Many minds were tired of the incessant strife, and this very weariness favoured the cessation of polemics. Moreover the Catholic world and the Holy See were at that time preoccupied with a multitude of grave questions, and through force of circumstances Jansenism was relegated to second place. Mention has already been made of the signs of a recrudescence of Gallicanism betrayed in the Four Articles of 1670 and the failures of which the Régale was the subject. To this period also belongs the sharp conflict regarding the franchises, or droit d’asile (right of asylum), the odious privilege concerning which Louis XIV showed an obstinacy and arrogance which passed all bounds (1687). Moreover, the Quietist doctrines spread by de Molinos, and which seduced for a brief period even the pious and learned Fénelon as well as the relaxed opinions of certain moralists, furnished matter for many condemnations on the part of Innocent XI, Alexander VIII, and Innocent XII (see Quietism). Finally, another impassioned debate has drawn into the controversy several groups of the most distinguished and best intentioned theologians, and which was only definitively closed by Benedict XIV, namely the controversy concerning the Chinese and Malabar Rites. All these combined causes had for a time distracted public attention from the contents and the partisans of the “Augustinus”. Besides, “Jansenism” was beginning to serve as a label for rather divergent tendencies, not all of which deserved equal reprobation. The out-and-out Jansenists, those who persisted in spite of everything in upholding the principle of necessitating grace, were the true leaders of the five propositions, had almost disappeared with Pascal. The remainder of the really Jansenist party, without committing itself to a submission pure and simple, assumed a far more cautious demeanour. The members rejected the expression “necessitating grace”, substituting for it that of a grace efficacious “in itself”, seeking thus to identify themselves with the Thomists and the Augustinians.

Abandoning the plainly heretical sense of the five propositions, and repudiating any intention to resist legitimate authority, they confined themselves to denying the infallibility of the Church, toifying on dogmatic facts. Then, too, they were still the fanatic presachers of a discouraging rigorism, which they adorned with the names of virtue and austerity, and, under pretext of combating abuses, openly antagonised the incontestable characteristics of Catholicism, especially its unity of government, the traditional comity of nations and the international character which heart and feeling play in its worship. With all their skilful extenuations they bore the mark of the levelling, innovating, and arid spirit of Calvinism. These were the Jansenists. They formed therefore the bulk of the sect, or rather in them the sect properly so-called was called to extend itself, side by side with them, though side by side with them, and bordering on their tendencies and beliefs, history points out two other well-defined groups known as the “duped Jansenists”
and the “quasi-Jansenists”. The first were in good faith pretty much what the *sine Jesu Christo* were by system and tactics; they appear to us as convinced adversaries of necessitating grace, but no less sincere defenders of efficacious grace; rigorists in moral and sacramental questions; often opposed, like the Parlementarians, to the rights of the Holy See; generally favourable to the novices of the... In matters of worship and discipline. The second category is that of men of Jansenist tinge. While remaining within bounds in theological opinions, they declared themselves against really relaxed morality, against exaggerated popular devotions and other similar abuses. They were greater zealots of the Roman Catholic faith, but their zeal, agreeing with that of the Jansenists on so many points, took on, so to speak, an outer colouring of Jansenism, and they were drawn into closer sympathy with the party in proportion to the confidence with which it inspired them. Even more than the “duper” Jansenists they were extremely useful in screening the sectarians and in securing for them, on the part of the pastors and the multitude of the faithful, the benefit either of silence or of a certain leniency.

But the error remained too active in the hearts of the Jansenists, to be cured by such means for a very long time. At the beginning of the eighteenth century it manifested itself by a double occurrence which revived all the strife and trouble. The discussion began afresh with regard to the "case of conscience" of 1701. A provincial conference was supposed to inquire whether absolution might be given to a cleric who declared that he held on certain points the sentiments "of those called Jansenists", especially that of respectful silence on the question of fact. Forty doctors of the Sorbonne, among them some of great renown, such as Natalis Alexander, decided affirmatively. The provincial council condemned Catholics, and the "case of conscience" was condemned by Clement XI (1703), by Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, by a large number of bishops, and finally by the faculties of theology of Louvain, Douai, and Paris. The last-named, however, as its slowness would indicate, did not arrive at this decision without difficulty. As for the doctors assigned, they were terrified by the storm they had let loose, and either retracted or explained their action as best they might, with the exception of the author of the whole movement, Dr. Petitpied, whose name was erased from the list of the faculty. But the Jansenists, thanks to the support of the pope, at the same time did not yield. For this reason Clement XI, at the request of the Kings of France and Spain, issued 16 July, 1703, the Bull "Vineam Domini Salvaoth" (Enchiridion, 1350) in which he formally declared that respectful silence was insufficient for the obedience due to the constitutions of his predecessors. This Bull, received with submission by the assembly of the clergy of 1705, in which only the Bishop of Saint-Pons obstinately refused to agree with the opinion of his colleagues, was afterwards promulgated as a law of the State. It may be said to have officially terminated that period of half a century of agitation occasioned by the signing of the formulary. It also terminated the existence of Port-Royal des Champs, which up to that time had remained a notorious centre and hotbed of rebellion.

When it was proposed to the religious that they should sign the Bull, they would consent only with this clause: "that it was without derogating from what had taken place in regard to them at the time of the peace of the Church under Clement XI". This restriction brought up again their entire past, as was clearly shown by their explanation of it, and therefore led to no result. Cardinal de Noailles urged them in vain; he forbade them the sacraments, and two of the religious died without receiving them, unless they were secretly from a disqualified priest. As all measures had failed, it was high time to put an end to this scandalous resistance. A Bull suppressed the title of the Abbey of Port-Royal des Champs, and reunited that house and its holdings to the Paris house. The Court gave peremptory orders for a prompt execution, and, despite all the means of delay contrived at the last moment, nothing wavered. The pontifical sentence had its full effect. The surviving choir religious were scattered among the convents of the neighbouring dioceses (29 October, 1708). This separation had the desired good results. All the rebellious nuns ended by submitting, save one, who died at the Convent of Blois without the sacraments, in 1716. The Government wishing to eradicate even the trace of this nest of errors, as Clement XI called it, destroyed all the buildings and removed elsewhere the bodies buried in the cemetery.

During the disputes concerning the "case of conscience", a new book came cautiously on the scene, another "Augustinus", pregnant with storms and tempeste, as violent as the first. The author was Paschase Quesnel (q.v.), at first a member of the French Oratory, but expelled from that congregation for his Jansenistic opinions (1684), and since 1689 a residence at Brussels where the head of whom he succeeded in 1696 as leader of the party. The work had been published in part as early as 1671 in a 12mo volume entitled "Abrégé de la morale de l'Evangéliste, ou pensées chrétiennes sur le texte des quatre évangelistes". It appeared with the hearty approbation of Vialar, Bishop of Chalon, and, thanks to a style at once attractive and full of jargon which seemed in general to reflect a solid and sincere piety, it soon met with great success. But in the later development of his first work, Quesnel had extended it to the whole of the New Testament. He issued it in 1705, 1706, 1713, in an edition entitled "Four large volumes entitled, "Nouveau testament en françois, avec des réflexions morales sur chaque verset". This edition, besides the earlier approbation of Vialar which it inopportune bore, was formally approved and heartily recommended by his successor, de Noailles, who, as subsequent events showed, acted imprudently in the matter and without any secure foundation as to the contents of the book. The "Réflexions morales" of Quesnel reproduced, in fact, the theories of the irresistible efficaciousness of grace and the limitations of God's will with regard to the salvation of men. Hence they soon carried forth the sharpest criticism. And indeed this was the case at the time of the last of the Jesuits, the guardians of the Faith. The Bishops of Apt (1703), Gap (1704), Nevers, and Besançon (1707) condemned them, and, after a report from the Inquisition, Clement XI proscribed them by the Brief "Universi dominici" (1708) as "containing the propositions already condemned and as manifestly savouring of the Jansenist heresy". Two years later (1710) the Bishops of Luçon and La Rochelle forbade the reading of the book.

Their ordinance, posted in the capital, gave rise to a conflict with Noailles, who, having become cardinal and Archbishop of Paris, found himself under the necessity of withdrawing the approbation he had formerly given at Châlons. However, as he hesitated, less through attachment to error than through self-love, to take this step, Louis XIV asked the pope to issue a solemn constitution and put an end to the trouble. Clement XI then ordered a new and very minute examination, and in the Bull "Unigenitus" (8 September, 1713) he condemned 101 propositions which had been taken from the book (Enchiridion, 1351 sq.). Among these were some propositions which, in themselves and apart from the context, seemed to be on a orthodox footing, and with him eight other bishops, though they did not refuse to prosebe the book, seized this pretext to
ask explanations from Rome before accepting the Bull. This was the beginning of lengthy discussions, the greatest of which was the death of Louis XIV (1715), who was succeeded in power by Philippe d'Orléans. The regent took a much less decided stand than his predecessor, and the change soon had its effect on various centres, especially on the Sorbonne, where the sectaries had succeeded in winning over the majority. The faculties of Paris, Reims, and Nantes, who had received the Bull, revoked their previous acceptance. Four bishops went even farther, having recourse to an expedient of which only heretics or declared schismatics had hitherto been thought to have recourse to. They were: the Bull "Unigenitus" to a general council (1717). Their example was followed by some of their colleagues, by hundreds of clerics and religious, by the Parlements and the magistracy of the state. All these, for a long time undecisive and always inconsistent, ended by appealing also, but "from the pope obediently to the pope better informed and to a general council."

Clement XI, however, in the Bull "Pastoralis officii" (1718), condemned the appeal and excommunicated the appellants. But this did not disarm the opposition, which, involved Bull as the first; Naillol himself published a new appeal, no longer chiefly to the pope "better informed", but to a council, and the Parlement of Paris, suppressed the Bull "Pastoralis". The multiplicity of these defections and the arrogant clamour of the appellants might give the impression that they constituted, if not a majority, at least a very imposing minority. Such, however, was not the case, and the chief evidence of this lies in the well-established fact that enormous sums were devoted to paying for these appeals. After allowing for these shameful and suggestive purchases, we have still to account for the Bull as a whole. The return of Naillol, who was about eighteen bishops, and three thousand clerics. But without leaving France, we find opposed to them four cardinals, a hundred bishops, and a hundred thousand clerics, that is, the moral unanimity of the French clergy. What is to be said, then, when the important protagonists is compared to the whole of the Churches of England, the Low Countries, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Naples, Savoy, Portugal, Spain, etc., which, on being requested to pronounce, did so by proscribing the appeal as an act of schism and foolish revolt? The polemics, however, continued for about six months. The return the Naillol, who published without restriction in 1726, six months before his death, was a telling blow to the party of Quesnel. Henceforth it steadily grew less, so that not even the scenes that took place at the cemetery of Saint-Médard, of which mention is made below, restored it. But the Parlements, eager to declare themselves and to apply their principles, continued for a long time to refuse to receive the Bull "Unigenitus". They even made it the occasion to meddle in scandalous fashion in the administration of the sacraments, and to persecute bishops and priests accused of refusing ordination to those who would not submit to the Holy See.

VI. THE CONVOLUSIONAIREs.—We have reviewed the long series of defensive measures contrived by the Jansenists: rejection of the five propositions without rejection of the "Augustinus"; explicit distinction between the question of right and the question of fact; restriction of themedium to the Bull and the "artifices". The tactics of respectful silence, and appeal to a general council. They had exhausted all the expedients of a theological and canonical discussion more obstinate than sincere. Not a single one of these had availed them anything at the bar of right reason or of legitimate authority. They then thought to invoke in their behalf the direct testimony of God Himself, namely, miracles. One of their number, an apostle, a rigorist to the point of leaving once passed two years without coming to fragments; for, in the retired and penitent life, the déacon François de Paris, had died in 1727. They pretended that at his tomb in the little cemetery of Saint-Médard marvellous cures took place. A case alleged as such was examined by de Vintimille, Archbishop of Paris, who with proofs in hand declared it false and suppositions (1731). But other cures were claimed by the party, and so noise abroad that soon the sick and the curious flocked to the cemetery. The sick experienced strange agitations, nervous commotions, either real or simulated. They fell into violent transports and insisted that they had beheld the déacon and the convulsionaries of Cévennes had denounced the papacy and the Mass. In the excited crowd women were especially noticeable, screaming, yelling, throwing themselves about, sometimes assuming the most astounding and unseemly postures. To justify these extravagances, complacent admirers had recourse to the theory of "figuration". As in their eyes the fact of the general acceptance of the Bull "Unigenitus" was the apostasy predicted by the Apocalypse, so the ridiculous and revolting scenes enacted by their friends symbolized the state of upheaval which, according to them, an impending conflagration was about to convert thus to a fundamental thesis such as had been met with in Jansenius and St-Cyrano, and which these latter had borrowed from the Protestants. A journal, the "Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques", had been founded in 1729 to defend and propagate these ideas and practices, and the "Nouvelles" was profusely spread, thanks to the pecuniary resources furnished by the "Bolle à Perrette", the name given later to the capital or common fund of the sect begun by Nicole, and which grew so rapidly that it exceeded a million of money. It had hitherto served chiefly to defray the cost of ap-- it was the only ap-- the "Nouvelles" was profusely spread, thanks to the pecuniary resources furnished by the "Bolle à Perrette", the name given later to the capital or common fund of the sect begun by Nicole, and which grew so rapidly that it exceeded a million of money. It had hitherto served chiefly to defray the cost of ap-- it was the only ap-- the "Nouvelles" was profusely spread, thanks to the pecuniary resources furnished by the "Bolle à Perrette", the name given later to the capital or common fund of the sect begun by Nicole, and which grew so rapidly that it exceeded a million of money. It had hitherto served chiefly to defray the cost of ap--
distinctions and divisions, we may ask how we are to judge what took place at the cemetery of Saint-Médard and the matters connected therewith. Whatever may have been said on the subject, there was absolutely no trace of the Divisio of the Church, in which it was needless to recall St. Augustine's principles that all prodigies accomplished outside the Church, especially those against the Church, are by the very fact more than suspicious: "Præter unitatem, et qui facit miracula nihil est". Two things only call for remark. Several of the so-called miraculous cures were made the subject of a judicial investigation, and it was proved that they were based only on testimonies which were either false, interested, preconceived, and more than once retracted, or at least valueless, the echoes of diseased and fanatic imaginations. Moreover, the convulsions and the secessions certainly took place under circumstances which mere good taste would reject as unworthy of Divine wisdom and holiness. Not only were the cures, both acknowledged and claimed, supplementary of one another, but cures, convulsions, and secessions belonged to the same order of facts and tended to the same concrete end. We are therefore constrained in confessing that God did not appear in the whole or in any of its parts. On the other hand, although fraud was discovered in several cases, it is impossible to ascribe them all indiscriminately to trickery or ignorant simplicity. Critically speaking, the authenticity of some extraordinary phenomena and events is beyond question, but the place publicly and in the presence of reliable witnesses, particularly anti-sectarian Jansenists. The question remains whether all these prodigies are explicable by natural causes, or whether the direct action of the Devil is to be recognized in some of them. Each of these opinions has its adherents, and the former seems difficult to uphold despite, and in part perhaps because of, the light which recent experiments in suggestion, hypnotism, and spiritism have thrown on the problem. However this may be, one thing is certain; the things here related served only to discredit the cause of the party which exploited them. Jansenists themselves came at length to feel ashamed of such practices. The excesses connected with them more than once forced the civil authorities to intervene at least in a mild way; but this creation of fanaticism succumbed to ridicule and died by its own hand.

V. IN HOLAND AND THE SCHISM OF Utrecht.—Injurious as Jansenism was to religion and the Church in France, it did not there lead to schism properly so called. The same does not hold good of the Dutch Low Countries, which the most important or most deeply implicated of the sectaries had long made their meeting place, finding there welcome and safety. Since the United Provinces had for the most part gone over to Protestantism, Catholics had lived there under the direction of vicars Apostolic. Unhappily these representatives of the pope were soon won over to the doctrines and intrigues of which the "Augustinians" were the origin, and the Jansenist Néercassel, titular Archbishop of Castoria, who governed the whole church in the Netherlands from 1663 to 1686, made no secret of his intimacy with the party. Under him the country began to become the refuge of all whose obstinacy forced them to leave France and Belgium. Thither came such men as Antoine Arnauld, du Vaucel, Gerberon, Quesnel, Nicole, Petitpied, as well as a number of priests, monks, and nuns who preferred exile to the acceptance of the pontifical Bulls. A large number of these deserters belonged to the Congregation of the Oratory, but other orders shared with it this unfortunate distinction. When the French revolution was at its height, the Carthusians of the Paris house escaped from their cloister during the night and fled to Holland. Fifteen Benedictines of the Abbey of Orval, in the Diocese of Trier, gave the same scandal. Peter Codde, who succeeded Néercassel in 1686, and who bore the title of Archbishop of Sebaste, went further than his predecessor. He refused to sign the formulary and, when summoned to Rome, defended himself so poorly that he was first disposed to expel him from the jurisdiction, and then deposed by a decree of 1704. He died still an inhabitant of 1710. He had been replaced by Gerard Potkamp, but this appointment and those that followed were rejected by a section of the clergy, to whom the States-General lent their support. The conflict lasted a long time, during which the episcopal elections were not held. In 1723, the Chapter of Utrecht, i.e., a group of seven or eight priests who assumed this name and quality in order to put an end to a precarious and painful situation, elected, on its own authority, as archbishop of the same city, one of its members, Cornelius Steenhoven, who then held the office of vicar-general. This election was not canonical, and was not approved by the pope. Steenhoven nevertheless had the audacity to get himself consecrated by Varlet, a former missionary bishop and coadjutor Bishop of Babylon, who was at that time suspended, interdicted, and excommunicated. He was consumed by this schism and died in 1725. Those who had elected him transferred their support to Barchman Wuitiers, who had recourse to the same consecrator. The unhappy Varlet lived long enough to administer the episcopal unction to two successors of Barchman, van, as the Opposition was called, in public and in the presence of reliable witnesses, particularly anti-sectarian Jansenists. The question remains whether all these prodigies are explicable by natural causes, or whether the direct action of the Devil is to be recognized in some of them. Each of these opinions has its adherents, and the former seems difficult to uphold despite, and in part perhaps because of, the light which recent experiments in suggestion, hypnotism, and spiritism have thrown on the problem. However this may be, one thing is certain; the things here related served only to discredit the cause of the party which exploited them. Jansenists themselves came at length to feel ashamed of such practices. The excesses connected with them more than once forced the civil authorities to intervene at least in a mild way; but this creation of fanaticism succumbed to ridicule and died by its own hand.

VI. THE DECISION AND END OF Jansenism.—During the second half of the eighteenth century the influence of Jansenism was prolonged by taking on various forms and ramifications, and extending to countries other than those in which we have hitherto followed it. In France the Parlements continued to pronounce judgments, to inflict fines and confiscations, to suppress episcopal ordinances, and even to address remonstrances to the king in defence of the pretended right of the episcopate to abominate and even to depose the last sacraments. In 1756 they rejected a very moderate decree of Benedict XIV regulating the matter. A royal declaration confirming the Roman decision did not find favour in their eyes, and it required all the remaining strength of the monarchy to compel them to register it. The sectaries seemed by degrees to detach themselves from the primitive Jansenism, but they retained unabated the spirit of insubordination and schism, the spirit of opposition to Rome, and above all a mortal hatred of the Jesuits. They had vowed the ruination of that order, which they always found blocking their way, and in order to attain their end they succeeded, among the Catholic princes of Europe, in increasing it to a certain extent. The ministers in Portugal, France, Spain, Naples, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the Duchy of Parma, and elsewhere to join hands with the worst leaders of impiety and philosophy. The same tendency was dis-
played in the work of Febronius, condemned (1764) by Clement XIII; and, instilled into Joseph II by his councillor Godfried van Swieten, a disciple of the revolting church of Utrecht, it became the principle of the emancipation of the free corps of monks, gathered together by the sacratian-emperor (see FEBRONIANISM). It raged in similar fashion in Tuscany under the government of the Grand Duke Leopold, brother of Joseph II; and found another manifestation in the famous Synod of Pistola (1780), the decrees of which, at once the quintessence of the principle of the heresy of Jansenism, were repulsed by the Bull of Pius VI, "Auctorem fidei" (1794). On French soil the remains of Jansenism were not completely extinguished by the French Revolution, but survived in some remarkable personalities, such as the constitutional Bishop Grégoire, and in two religious congregations, as the Sisters of St. Martha, who did not return in a body to Catholic truth and unity until 1847. But its spirit lived on, especially in the rigorism which for a long time dominated the practice of the administration of the sacraments and the teaching of moral theology. In a great number of French seminaries, Bailly's "Théologie", which was impressed with this rigorism, remained the standard textbook until Rome in 1852 put it on the Index "donee corrigatur". Among those who even prior to that had worked energetically against it, chiefly by offering in opposition the doctrine of Augustinus, two persons are deserving of special mention: Gouset, whose "Théologie morale" (1844) had been preceded by his "Justification de la théologie morale du bienheureux Alphonse-Marie Liguori" (2nd ed., 1832); Jean-Pierre Berman, professor at the seminary of Nancy for twenty-five years (1828-1853), and author of a "Théologie moralis ex S. Ligorio" (7 vols., 1855).

Such is, in outline, the historical account of Jansenism, its origin, its phases, and its decline. It is evident that, besides its attachment to the "Augustinus" and its rigorism in morals, it is distinguished among heresies for crafty proceedings, chicanery and lack of frankness on the part of its adherents, especially their pretence of remaining Catholics without renouncing their errors, of staying in the Church despite the Church itself, by skillfully eluding or braving with impunity the decisions of the supreme authority. Such conduct is beyond doubt without a parallel in the annals of Christianity previous to the outbreak of Jansenism; in fact, it would be incredible if we did not in our own day find in certain groups of Modernists examples of this astonishing and absurd duplicity. The deplorable consequences, both theoretical and practical, of the Jansenist system, and of the policy which sprang therefrom, may readily be gathered from what has been said, and from the history of the last few centuries.

From the theological standpoint see the treatises De Deo Creator: also the treatises De Gratia, especially those of Tournel, Mazella, Palmieri, and Battoli. Among good handbooks are Foschi, Protectiones dogmaticae, III and V (Freiburg, 1885, 1887); Tangueray, Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae specialis, I and II (12th ed., Paris, 1908); especially St. Deuchamps, De haeresibus ianuenses ab Apostolico Sedere (Paris, 1854); and Paquier, la Jansenisme, étude doctrinale d'apres les sources (Paris, 1890). A helpful study is: Hartn, Histoire du Jansenisme depuis son origine jusqu'en 1844 (Paris, 1881); Mémoires du P. R. R. Rapin sur l'Eglise et la cour, la ville et le Jansenisme (4 vols., Paris, 1866); De Mar, Histoire des cinq propositions de Jansenius (3 vols., Liège, 1899); Luchtert, Histoire polémique de Jansenius (3 vols., Rome, 1711); Letranger, Histoire de la constitution Unigenitus (5 vols., Liège, 1879); Schulte, Die Constitution Unigenitus (Freiburg, 1876); van den Peerbroeck, Considerations Nécessaires pour Tyr espary, as mort, son testament, ses épiphanies, Brussels, 1882.

J. FORGET.

JANSSEN, JOHN. See BELLEVILLE, Diocese of.

JANSSENS, ABRAHAM, Flemish painter, b. at Antwerp about 1573; d. probably in the same place about 1631. He is also known as Janssens Van Nuyssens, and several of his pictures are signed with this name, which it is believed he adopted from his mother's family with the object of distinguishing himself from other members of the Janssens family, contemporary artists. He was a pupil of Jan Snellinck in 1585, according to some writers, but it is believed that this date is a little too early; he was greatly influenced by the seven-year-old Rubens, who was already recognized as one of the most promising of the young artists, and by the Latin poet and humanist Pieter Breughel the younger, the son of "Velvet" Breughel, and the second of his sons, named Abraham like his father, became a painter, and was admitted a member of the Guild of Painters in 1638.

A story was started by Houbraek who is to the effect that Janssens, a bitter opponent of Rubens, but Houbraek's work is the only authority for this legend, and the author appears to have had a spite against Janssens, and to have said everything that was possible to injure his character. Janssens was a contemporary of Rubens, and a man who appears to have been very much respected in Antwerp, spoken of in terms of friendship and affection by other artists, and recognized as a man of great genius, taking a high position in the very first rank. It seems to be most unlikely that Houbraek's story is a truthful one, especially as there is no evidence whatever in support of it. The beautiful scenes of pictures are to be seen at Antwerp, especially in the churches of the Carmelites and St. Charles, and in the cathedral, the painting of the "Entombment" in the Carmelite church being one of his very finest productions. There are three important paintings by him in the Antwerp Museum, two in the cathedral at Ghent, one in the cathedral at Bruges, a remarkable mythological scene representing Venus and Jupiter in Brunswick, and a fine picture of St. Cecilia at Cologne. Other galleries containing works by this important artist are those of Berlin, Brussels, Cassel, and Vienna. In at least two of his pictures he worked in collaboration with Snyders, the flowers and fruit in his picture of Pomona at Berlin, and the animals in his representation of Atlas and in the same gallery, having been painted by his friend. In splendour of colouring and in vigour of composition he was surpassing his contemporary in Antwerp as a man of profound talent and great skill. Many of his pictures were engraved.

HOUBRAEK, De Groote Schouwburg der Nederlantse (Amsterdam, 1718); KRAEMER, De Laeken, Le Jansenisme (Amsterdam, 1857); ROMBOUTS, Les Liaisons et autres Archives, etc. (Paris, 1864).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

JANSSENS, JOHANN HERMANN, Catholic theologian, b. at Maseyck, Belgium, 7 Dec., 1783; d. at Engis, 23 May, 1853. After completing his theological studies in Rome he was appointed professor in the College of Fribourg, Switzerland, in 1800. While in this position, which he held until 1816, he composed his "Hermeneutica", which, however, was not published until 1818, after he had been appointed professor of Scripture and dogmatic theology in the ecclesiastical seminary of Liège. His teaching in this institution was taxed with heresy, and in 1838 he was removed and made pastor of Engis. Shortly afterward, and against the will of his ecclesiastical superiors, he accepted the chair of anthropology and metaphysics in the philosophical college of Louvain. He retained this position until the Revolution of 1830, when the college was suppressed. In 1835 he was returned to Engis, where he composed a history of the Netherlands (3 vols., Liège, 1840), written from the Protestant standpoint. Outside of Belgium he is chiefly known through his first publication, "Hermeneutica Sacra seu Introductio in omnes et singulos libros sacros Veteris et Novi Testamenti". A French translation of this work was published in 1820.
tion of this work, the original of which had reached its nineteenth edition in 1897, was published by Paeaud as early as 1828. A fifth edition of this translation, edited by Claire and Sionnet, was published in 1898.


James F. Driscoll

Januarius, Saint, Martyr, Bishop of Beneventum, is believed to have suffered in the persecution of Diocletian, 303 A.D. With regard to the history of his life and martyrdom, we know next to nothing. The various collections of "Acts", though numerous (cf. Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina, n. 4115-4140), are all extremely late and untrustworthy. Bede (c. 733) in his "Martyrologium" has epitomized the so-called "Acta Bononiana" (see Quentin, "Les Martyrologes historiques", 76). To this source we may trace the following entry in the present Roman Martyrology, in a very strange way, as though it had but freshly been shed."

It is especially this miracle of the liquefaction which has given celebrity to the name of Januarius, and to this we turn our attention. Let it at once be said that the supposition of any trick or deception is always out of the question, as candid opponents are now willing to admit. For more than four hundred years this liquefaction has taken place at frequent intervals. If it were a trick it would be necessary to admit that all the archbishops of Naples, and that countless ecclesiastics eminent for their sanctity and for their great sanctity, were accomplices in the fraud, as also a number of secular officials; for the relic is so guarded that its exposition requires the concurrence of both civil and ecclesiastical authority. Further, in all these four hundred years, no one of the many who, upon the supposition of such a trick, must necessarily have been in the secret, has made any revelation or disclosed how the apparent miracle is worked. Strong indirect testimony to this truth is borne by the fact that even at the present time the rationalistic opponents of a supernatural explanation are entirely disinclined as to how the phenomenon is to be accounted for.

What actually takes place may be thus briefly described: in a silver reliquary, which in form and size somewhat suggests a small carriage lamp, two phials are enclosed. The lesser of these contains only traces of blood and need not concern us here. The larger, which is a little flagon-shaped flask four inches high and about two and a quarter inches in diameter, is normally rather more than half full of a dark and solid mass, absolutely opaque when held up to the light, and showing no displacement when the reliquary is turned upside down. Both flasks seem to be so fixed in the lantern cavity of the reliquary by means of some hard gummy substance that they are hermetically sealed. Moreover, owing to the fact that the dark mass in the flask is protected by two thicknesses of glass it is presumably but little affected by the temperature of the surrounding air. Eighteen times in each year, i.e. (1) on the Saturday before the first Sunday in May and the eight following days, (2) on the feast of St. Januarius (19 Sept.) and during the octave, and (3) on 16 Dec., a silver bust believed to contain the head of St. Januarius is exposed upon the altar, and the reliquary just described is brought out and held by the officiant in view of the assembly. Prayers are said by the people, begging that the miracle may take place, while a group of poor women, known as the "zie di San Gennaro" (aunts of St. Januarius), make themselves specially conspicuous by the fervour, and sometimes, when the miracle is delayed, by the extravagance, of their supplications.

In 1859, an officiant usually holds the phials in his extremities, without touching the glass, and from time to time turns it upside down to note whether any movement is perceptible in the dark mass enclosed in the phial. After an interval of varying duration,
usually not less than two minutes or more than an hour, the mass is gradually seen to detach itself from the sides of the phial, to become liquid and of a more or less milky appearance, e.g., a mixture of the phosphates to froth and bubble up, increasing in volume. The officiant then announces, "Il miracolo è fatto", and the reliquary containing the liquefied blood is brought to the altar rail that the faithful may venerate it by kissing the containing vessel. Rarely has the liquefaction failed to take place in the expositions of May or September, but by the end of 16 Dec. the mass remains solid more frequently than not.

It is of course natural that those who are reluctant to admit the supernatural character of the phenomenon should regard the liquefaction as simply due to the effects of heat. There are, they urge, certain substances, e.g., a mixture of the phosphates, at which have a very low boiling point. The heat produced by the hands of the officiant, the pressing of the sunbeams, of the lights on the altar, and in particular the candle formerly held close to the reliquary to enable the people to see that the mass is opaque, combine to raise the temperature of the air sufficiently to melt the substance in the phial—a substance which is assumed to be blood, but which no one has ever analysed. Further, ever since the early years of the eighteenth century, sceptical scientists, by using certain chemical preparations, have reconstructed the phials which were destroyed. What is to say, they have been able to exhibit some red substance which, though at first apparently solid, melted after an interval without any direct application of heat. None the less, it may be said with absolute confidence that the theory of heat affords no adequate explanation of the phenomena observed.

For more than a century careful observations of the temperature of the air in the neighbourhood of the relic have been made on these occasions and the records have been kept. It is certain from the scientific memoirs of Professors Fergola, Punzo, and Spezio and that there is no direct relation between the temperature, and the time and manner of the liquefaction. Often when the thermometer has stood at 77°Fahrenheit or even higher, liquefaction has been delayed for so much as twenty or even forty minutes, while on the other hand the contents of the phial have sometimes liquefied in considerably less time than when the temperature remained at 60°Fahrenheit or 55°F. Moreover, the heat theory by no means accounts for another remarkable fact observed for quite two hundred years past. The mass in melting commonly increases in volume, but when it solidifies again it does not necessarily return to its original bulk. In some cases the volume of the phial increased by repeated movements, such as those that the reliquary experiences when the moment of liquefaction is impatiently waited for. Further, such a viscous fluid easily cakes upon the walls of the containing vessel, and admits large air bubbles which cause the deceptive appearance of a change of volume.

Professor Albini claims to have reproduced all the phenomena with a compound made of powdered chocolate and the serum of milk. On the other hand, those who have studied closely the process of liquefaction of the contents of the phial declare that such an explanation is absolutely impossible. Moreover, there seem to be well-attested instances of liquefaction taking place both in the case of this and other similar relics of blood which have been standing by itself without any movement whatsoever.

Accordingly, the suggestion has also been made (see Di Pace, "Ipotesi scientifica sulla Liquefazione", etc., Naples, 1905) that the phenomenon is due to some form of psychic force. The concentration of thought and will of the expectant crowd and the invocation of the "aunts of St. Januarius" are held to be capable of producing a physical effect. Against this, however, must be set the fact that the liquefaction has sometimes taken place quite unexpectedly and in the presence of very few spectators.

Probably the most serious difficulty against the miraculous character of the phenomenon is derived from the circumstance that the same liquefaction takes place in the case of other relics, nearly all preserved in the neighbourhood of Naples, or of Neapolitan origin. These include relics which are affirmed to be the blood of St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen the martyr, of St. Pantaleon, of St. Patrius, of St. Nicholas of Tolentino, of St. Aloysius Gonzaga, and others. In the case of the alleged liquefaction of the so-called "Milk of Our Lady" (see Putignani, S.J., "De Redivivo Sanguine S. Januarii", Naples, 1723, I, 90) or of the fat of St. Thomas Aquinas (see Macintosh, Valiently, reprinted in 1884), it is to say, they have probably a purely fiction, but the phials traditionally associated with the names of St. John the Baptist, St. Stephen, and St. Pantaleon undoubtedly still exhibit on the respective feast days of these saints phenomena exactly analogous to those shown in the case of the more famous relic of St. Januarius. Further, it is asserted by eyewitnesses of scientific credit and high respectability that a block of basil at Pozzuoli, reputed to bear traces of the blood of St. Januarius, grows vividly red for a short time in May and September at the hour when the miracle of the liquefaction takes place in Naples (see Cavena, "Le Chêbre Miracle de S. Janvier", 1909, 277–300).

Three other points attested by recent investigators seem worthy of special note. (1) It now appears that the first certain record of the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius dates from 1389 (see de Blaisis, "Chromatographe in Inconnus", Naples, 1887, 85), and not from 1456 as formerly supposed.

(2) In 1902 Professor Sperindeo was allowed to pass a ray of light through the upper part of the phial during liquefaction and examine this beam spectroscopically. The experiment yielded the distinctive lines of the spectrum of blood. This, however, only indicates that there are no detectable traces of blood in the contents of the phial (see Cavena, "Le Chêbre Miracle", 262–275).

(3) Most remarkable of all, the apparent variation in the volume of the relic led in 1902 and 1904 to a series of experiments in the course of which the whole reliquary was weighed in a very accurate balance. It was found that the weight was not constant any more than the volume, and that the weight of the reliquary when the blood filled the whole cavity of the phial exceeded, by 26 grammes, the weight when the phial seemed but half full. This very large difference renders it impossible to believe that such a substantial variation in weight can be merely due to an error of observation. We are forced to accept the fact that, contrary to all known laws, a change goes on in the contents of this hermetically sealed vessel which makes them heavier and lighter in a ratio roughly, but not exactly, proportional to their apparent bulk (Cavena, 333–39). The reality of the miracle of St. Januarius has repeatedly been made the subject of controversy. It has had much to do with many conversions to Catholicism, notably with that of the elder Herder. Unfortunately, however, allegations
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have often been made as to the favourable verdict expressed by scientific men of note, which are not always verifiable. The supposed testimony of the great chemist, Sir Humphry Davy, who is declared to have seen this belief in the genuineness of the miracle, seems to be a case in point.

Though in many respects uncritical, the best account of the miracle of St. Januarius is that given by Cavend, Le Chérub Miroirs de S. Janvier (Paris, 1600). From the historical side, fuller details may be found in Toccalattela, Memoria Storico-critica dell' Invenzione della S. Sangue di S. Gennaro (Naples, 1812); among recent works may be mentioned: Januario, Il Sangue di S. Gennaro (Naples, 1802); two articles by Silva and Sper- rendi, La Sangue di S. Gennaro: detta Statua e Later, per il centenario della morte del 1805; also Sperrendi, Il Miroirolo di S. Gennaro (3rd ed., Naples, 1808); Thurston, The Tablet, 22 and 24, 1805, 1806. A correspondence by a connoisseur was published in a French journal.

Earlier dates are Fucino, La Toca di S. Gennaro (Naples, 1808); Idee, Indagini ed osservazioni sulla Toca (Naples, 1808); Alberini, Dieuboni della Accademia delle Scienze fariche e matematiche (Naples, 1804), series II, vol. IV (1804), 24-27; Acta SS., 11 Sept. There is also an excellent article by Lexog in Miere, Dictionnaire des Pétrophiles et des Miroirs (1889), 1004-1014. The older books, such as those of Foggiana, Tottini, Falcone, etc., are too numerous to mention. The first books in English are: The Miroirolo of S. Gennaro (3rd ed., Naples, 1808); Thurston in The Tablet, 22 and 24, 1805, 1806. A correspondence by a connoisseur was published in a French journal.

The straits separating the principal islands are the Strait of Soya or La Pérouse between Hokkaido and the Sakhalin Islands, the Strait of Tsugaru between the Great Island Honshu and Hokkaido, and the Strait of Shimonoseki between the southernmost island of Shikoku and the islands of Kagoshima, Yatsushiro, Amagusa, Shimabara, etc.

Lakes.—The largest is Lake Biwa, which is about 180 miles in circumference, 364 miles long, and 124 miles wide. According to tradition Lake Biwa was formed by an earthquake in 286 B.C. Renowned for the beauty of its scenery, its praises have often been sung by the poets. After Lake Biwa the best known are Lake Suwa in Shinano, Lake Hakone, on the summit of the mountain of the same name, Lake Chuzenji in Shimotakai, west of Nikko, 154 miles in circumference, 4757 feet above sea-level. The cascade of Kegon, one of the most beautiful and renowned of Japan, is on this lake.

Rivers.—The slopes of the mountains being so close to the sea, the watercourses are not very long. They are for the most part only torrents, few of them capable of carrying boats, but they are utilized for rafting timber, etc.

Mountains.—In Japan the mountains cover two-thirds of the surface of the soil. The country is traversed by two chains of mountains, one a part of Sakhalin Island, the other south of Formosa, and the southern part of China crossing Formosa. These two chains meet in the middle of the Great Island (Honshu), dividing it into two parts which present striking contrasts as much from the political as from the geographical point of view. The highest peaks are situated at the intersection of these two chains, about the thirty-fifth parallel, which has caused tourists to give them the name of the Japanese Alps. The highest are Niitaka in Formosa (12,850 feet), and Fuji (12,395 feet) in Honshu. This last mountain must have been formed by the same earthquake which hollowed out Lake Biwa (286 B.C.).

It is a volcano of composite type, 11,000 feet high, with its regular outline and its majestic beauty it has furnished an inexhaustible source of inspiration to Japanese artists, poets, etc.

Valleys.—Although very mountainous, the country is not devoid of valleys, the principal ones being those of Etchigo, Sendai, and Kwan, with Tokio and Yokohama, and a population of 6,000,000 souls, of Mino and Owari (1,150,000 souls), of Kina, with Kyoto, Osaka, and Kobe (2,600,000 souls), of Tsukushi in Kiusiu. The oil mines of this valley furnish 67% of the total production of the mines of Japan.

Volcanoes.—Three chains of volcanoes exist in Japan. The Kuriles, Fuji, and Kirishima contain 200 volcanoes, of which 100 are still active. The principal ones are Tarumai, Noboribetsu, Komagatake, Agatsuma, Bandai, Kusatsu, Kaimon, Sakurajima, Fuji, Kirishima, Asama, and Aso. This last, situated north-east of Higo, numbers five peaks, the highest of which reaches an altitude of nearly one mile. It is perhaps the largest volcano in the world, its craters having an extent of 15 miles from north to south, 10 miles from east to west. It was in eruption in 1884, 1889, and 1896.

Earthquakes.—Their number is proportionate to the number of volcanoes. From 1883 to 1897 there were 17,750, that is, 1365-per year, and nearly 31 per day. From 1596 to 1877 Japan was visited by 100 more or less disastrous earthquakes. According to minute researches made by a commission of scholars, the number of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions which have
caused more or less damage from the beginning of historical times to the present day must equal 2006. One of the most terrible was that of 1855 at Tokio, in which more than 100,000 persons perished and the greater part of the city was destroyed.

Mineral Springs.—A compensation for the damage caused by the volcanoes Japan has a large number of mineral springs. There are at least 100 which, because of ease of access and their medicinal qualities, are much frequented.

Chills, Typhoons.—During the cold season, which begins in October and ends in April, Japan is visited by the north and the west wind, the atmospheric pressure being lower on the Pacific Ocean than on the continent. The contrary is the case from May to October, because the wind then comes from the south and east. This difference of atmospheric pressure gives rise to numerous typhoons, which often cause great disasters. To mention only that of 1902, the number of persons killed equalled 3639, vessels lost 3244, houses destroyed or damaged 695,062. Total loss, 29,742,081 yen.

Rain, Snow.—Japan is one of the most rainy countries in the world. The average yearly rainfall is about 61 inches. The average number of rainy or snowy days per year is 150. There are 98 meteorological stations, where six observations are made daily, at two, six, and ten o'clock, morning and evening (13° E. of Greenwich time).

Imperial House.—Dynasty (Teishitsu).—The form of the Japanese Government is an hereditary and constitutional monarchy. A single dynasty has reigned in Japan since the foundation of the empire. The present emperor is the one hundred and twenty-second descendant of Jimmu Tenno, first emperor of Japan. His own name is Mutsuhito; he has no family name, since he is supposed to be descended directly from the race of the gods. Born 3 November, 1852, he succeeded his father Komei Tenno, 13 Feb., 1867, and was crowned 12 October, 1868. On 28 December of the same year he married the Princess Haruko, third daughter of Kuge Ichijo Tadaka, a noble of the first rank, b. 28 May, 1850. Yoshihito Haru no miya, son of the emperor, b. 31 August, 1879, was proclaimed heir apparent, 31 August, 1887. On 10 May, 1900, he married Sadako, fourth daughter of Duke Kuko, by whom he has had three sons.

Estate of the Imperial Family (Koazoku).—There are fourteen branches of the imperial family: Fushimi, Arisugawa, Kan-in, Higashi-Fushimi, Kwacho, Yamashina, Kaya, Kun, Nishimoto, Kita-Shirakawa, Komate, Takeda, Asaka, Higashi-Kuni. The first four families have the title of Shino (princes of the blood), and constitute the four branches from whom must be chosen the heir to the throne, if the emperor dies without issue. The others have the title of O (princes). The first, when they are of age, have by right a seat in the House of Peers. The others may only sit there by order of the emperor. These last may also succeed a nobleman or be adopted by him. All the branches of the imperial house are not equal. They may be neither arrested nor summoned before a court without the command of the emperor, nor marry without his permission, nor ally themselves with any save the family designated by him. If they commit an act unworthy of their rank, the emperor has the right to reduce them to the imperial house of dukes, or to deprive them of their imperial title of prince. If they are wasteful of their property, they may be interdicted and forced to submit to the appointment of an administrator of their property.

Estates of the Crown.—According to present data the Crown possesses 12,135 acres of built land, representing a value of 4,572,745 yen; 7,060 acres of forests valued at 123,809,642 yen; and 300,770 acres of divers territory estimated at 2,319,808 yen. Its bonds and stocks represent in gross a sum of 30,000,000 yen, while the amount of its treasure is unknown.

Crown Laws.—In the Constitution is inserted a collection of laws known as the Code of the Imperial House (Koishita Tempan), in twelve chapters, which govern the Crown. This code regulates the succession to the throne, and the coronation ceremonies, fixes the majority of the prince imperial, and the various members of the imperial family. It contains laws concerning the regency, the family council, the governor to be assigned to an emperor in his minority, the expenses of the court, possible disputes between members of the emperor's family, the disciplinary measures to be taken against persons who are charged with the collection of imposts (in the provinces), with the possessions of the Crown, etc. He had eight ministers under his jurisdiction. After the Restoration the Kunaisho was retained, but underwent two modifications, one in 1870, the other in 1889. To-day the Kunaisho is charged with the affairs of the emperor's household. A minister is at the head charged with the administration and all the employees of the ministry are under his immediate jurisdiction. He has control of the nobility, regulates the civil and religious ceremonies, distributes the favours, presents, or rewards granted by the emperor, notifies those interested of the decrees raising them to a dignity or an office, and is the executor of all the regulations of the imperial household. He is assisted by a vice-minister and fifteen councillors, all chosen by the emperor. The chief of these are the chamberlain, the keeper of the seal, the emperor's steward, the master of ceremonies, the director of the bureau of domestic, and the director of the bureau of the nobility. The number of the employees of the imperial household is 2534; salaries, 1,003,505 yen.

Decorations.—In Japan there are six orders of decoration conferred as reward of merit: (1) Order of the Chrysanthemum (Kikutoshu), created in 1876, reserved to sovereigns and members of princely families; (2) Order of Paulownia (Tokiawaso), created in 1876, granted to princes and very exalted personages; (3) Order of the Rising Sun (Kyokujitensho), created in 1875, conferred for military and civil services; 8 classes: (4) Order of the Precious Clouds (Kiyosanzushi), created in 1888, to reward military and civil services; 8 classes; (5) Order of the Crown (Hokowo), created in 1888, reserved to women; 8 classes; (6) Order of the Golden Kite (Kinkocho), created in 1890, rewards extraordinary military facts, and entitles to a pension. In recognition of meritorious deeds which, however, do not deserve a decoration, the Government awards certificates, medals, and cups of gold, silver, or wood. The number of Japanese thus decorated or rewarded reaches into the millions. On 31 March, 1908, the number of persons decorated and entitled to a pension was 76,822. Pensions furnished by the Government, 9,063,000 yen. Number of decorations distributed in 1903, 3914; in 1905, 36,357; in 1907, 37,602, not counting the decoration of the Golden Kite. Decorations of the Golden Kite in 1904, 2316; in 1905, 27,649; in 1906, 73,810; in 1907, 1180; number of persons who have received certificates, medals, gold, silver, or wood, 2,492,510; in 1906, 2,512,818; in 1907, 1,305,018. This shower of decorations was caused by the war with Russia. The number of foreigners decorated by the Japanese Government was, on 31 March, 1907, 417, and that of Japanese decorated by foreign governments, 542.

Titles of Nobility.—The class of nobles (Koazoku) comprises the ancient nobles of the court (Kuge), the ancient lords of the provinces (Daimio), and those who have been ennobled since the Restoration, or the new
nobility (Shin-Kawazoku). Graduated titles were created in 1854 for these nobles of various degrees, in Japanese Ko, Ko, Haku, Shi, and Dan, corresponding to the marquisate, count, viscount, count, and baron. Nobility is hereditary, and on 31 March, 1908, this class consisted of 15 dukes (Ko), 36 marquesses (Ko), 100 counts (Haku), 375 viscounts (Shi), and 376 barons (Dan), that is 901 families, comprising 4600 members, which form the Manchurian Court. Besides the title of nobility there are purely honorary dignities forming a sort of court hierarchy. This hierarchy was established in Japan in the reign of the Empress Suiko (A. D. 603). In 682 the number of degrees was raised to forty-eight; in 702 it was fixed at thirty. At the Restoration, this number was retained but very much simplified. At present there are eight degrees, each, except the first, being divided into two, which gives a total of fifteen. These titles or dignities (I-Kai or Kurai) are awarded to nobles, to functionaries of high rank, or to citizens who, while not belonging to these classes, have rendered signal services to the nation. These dignities carry with them certain rights, e.g. that of assisting at the emperor's reception on a certain day of the year. They are conferred only on Japanese. The number of persons honoured with these titles was in 1897, 50,908, among them 133 in the ranks of Funkoku and Military Officers. The former are called Bunkwan and the latter Bukwan. Both are divided into four classes, Shinnin, Chokunin, Sonin, and Hannin. The Shinnin, who form the highest class, receive their investiture from the hands of the emperor himself. The decree of promotion bears the seal of the empire and is countersigned by the president of the Council. The Chokunin are appointed by a decree of the emperor, bearing the seal of the empire. The Sonin are appointed by the cabinet on presentation by the ministers. The Hannin are appointed by their respective ministers. Civil and military officials of the rank of Shinnin, 46; civil official of the rank of Chokunin, 370; Sonin, 705; Hannin, 51,952. Army and navy: all the generals and admirals have the rank of Chokunin; all the other officers have that of Sonin, and all non-commissioned officers that of Hannin. For the number see under Military Officers. The Chokunin, Sonin, and Hannin are civil or military officials. The statistics for the Chokunin make no distinction between civil and military officials for this exalted degree only.

CONSTITUTION OF THE EMPIRE.—On his accession to the throne the emperor promised to establish a National Diet, and the government of the country. Although proceeding from the free will of the sovereign, the project of a Constitution, before being put into execution, encountered many obstacles and provoked violent contests between the Government and the democratic party. The various phases of these conflicts may be summarized as follows: In 1873 Itagaki and his followers addressed a petition to the Government in which they called upon it to carry out the sovereign's wishes, and in 1880 a campaign was organized throughout the country for the promotion of the rights of the people. In 1881 Itagaki and his followers organized the Liberal Party and vigorously urged forward the movement in favour of the establishment of a parliament. In the same year the emperor promised to promulgate the Constitution within ten years. Finally on 11 February, 1889, the Constitution was promulgated and the Diet of the Nation was opened.

PREROGATIVES OF THE EMPEROR.—The chief rights accorded to the emperor by the Constitution are: to convocate, open, close, and suspend the Parliament; to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies; to issue ordinances having the force of law; under urgent circumstances when the diet is not sitting and on condition that they be submitted to it in the next session, to give orders for the execution of the laws, to maintain peace and promote the welfare of the people, to assume command of the forces at sea and land and to regulate the organization of both, to declare war, to make peace, conclude treaties, proclaim a state of siege, to grant titles of nobility, rank at court, decorations, and other honorary titles, to declare amnesty, to commute penalties, and to rehabilitate.

Rights of the People.—The rights granted to the people by the Constitution are as follows: Every Japanese subject without distinction of class may be promoted to any civil or military rank or public office. No Japanese subject may be arrested, held, or punished except according to law. Except in cases provided for by law, the dwelling of every Japanese is inviolable and is not subject to any domiciliary visit. Secrecy of mailed letters and the rights of property are inviolable. The Constitution further grants liberty of religious belief in all that is not prejudicial to peace and order and the duties of a subject, freedom of speech, of the press, of public assembly, of association, and the right to present petitions in a respectful manner.

Government.—For the management of state affairs the emperor employs several ministers, at the present time nine in number, viz. ministers of foreign affairs, of the interior, of justice, of finance, of war, of the treasury, of public instruction, of agriculture and commerce, and of communications.

Privy Council (Sumitei-in).—The emperor is also assisted by a privy council, created in 1888 and composed of a president, a vice-president, and fifteen members, chosen from among the highest functionaries at least forty years of age. The president of the cabinet and all the members are councillors ex officio. The privy council gives its opinion concerning questions submitted by the emperor, but is not entitled to make proposals, to decide as last resort, nor to exercise executive power. It gives advice with regard to treaties to be concluded with other powers, in urgent cases, in quarrels which may arise between the Government and the Chambers, in fine in all circumstances in which the supreme power is expected to intervene.

Parliament.—The emperor shares the legislative power with two large political bodies, the Chamber of Peers and the Chamber of Deputies. The Chamber of Peers enjoys certain privileges. The emperor may suspend but not dissolve it. The duration of the commission of the peers is seven years, that of the deputies four years. The peers, being appointed by the emperor or by right of birth, are such for life. All the deputies may discuss and vote on the acts of the chambers discuss and vote on projected bills, the budget, taxes, etc., but their decisions do not go into effect till they have received the sanction of the emperor.

The Chamber of Peers is composed of the members of the imperial family, of all dukes and marquesses over twenty-five, of a certain number of counts, viscounts, and barons who have attained their twenty-fifth year and who are elected by their peers, of members aged at least thirty appointed for life by the emperor because of their services or learning, and lusty of forty-five members aged at least thirty, elected from among the fifteen most influential citizens of each district which returns them. Their election must be confirmed by the emperor. The number of these two categories must not exceed that of the members of the nobility. In 1908 the Chamber of Peers was composed as follows: members next year, 97; dukes and marquesses, 28; counts, 17; viscounts, 69; barons, 55; appointed for life by the emperor, 124; chosen from amongst the citizens paying the largest taxes, 45. Total, 361. In the upper chamber there is no political party properly so called; the peers are merely divided into groups, generally composed of members of the same class.
The Chamber of Deputies is composed of two kinds of members, the first returned by the cities having at least 30,000 inhabitants, the others by the districts. Each city and department forms an independent district. To be an elector it is necessary to have attained the age of twenty-five and to have been sentenced to ten yen in direct contribution. One may be a deputy without paying the contribution but it is necessary to have attained at least thirty. Those who are neither electors nor eligible are outlaws, bankrupts, whose property has been confiscated, those who have lost twenty-five yen and to have been sentenced to prison, soldiers in active service, pupils in the public or private schools, professors in the primary schools, ministers of any religion whatever, contractors of government work, officials charged with intervening in the elections, the employees of the ministry of the imperial household, judges, attorneys, collectors, police employees, and general councillors. At present the deputies are divided into four parties: (1) the Government Party (Seiyukwai), which in 1900 replaced the old Liberal Party of Itagaki (1881); (2) the Progressive Party (Shimpoo), or opposition (1890); and (3) the United Party, formed of old imperialists, opportunists, and deserters from the Progressive Party; (4) the New Association (Yushinkwai) or Advanced Party, among whom there are a number of Socialists. The number of deputies (end of March, 1908), 379; number of votes 1,533,676; number of votes cast, 1,533,301; unable to write the candidate's name, 3338. Number of deputies in Government Party, 167; Progressives, 94; United Party, 68; New Association, 36; nobles (former Samurai), commoners, 272.

Diplomatic Corps in Foreign Lands.—Embassies, 7, viz. to England, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, and Russia. Legations, 8; to Spain, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, China, Siam, Mexico, Brazil. Staff, 90.

Consulates.—Consul general, 11; consuls and vice-consuls, 31; staff, 365. Civil officials and employes of the Government, 152,159; annual salaries, 44,787,112 yen; government engineers, 9492; employes under their supervision, 17,941; total, 27,438; salaries, 9,638,546 yen. Tax bureaux, 18; staff, 8443; annual salaries, 2,122,601 yen.

The number of retired officials, widows, or orphans; persons assisted or pensioned, 206,860. Total amount, 15,847,280 yen.

Political Geography and Local Administration.—Japan is divided into ten large regions comprising eighty-eight provinces. These are: (1) Kinaoi (or Koa Kinaoi), 5 provinces; (2) Tokaido, 15 provinces; (3) Tosa, 13 provinces; (4) San-in, 8 provinces; (5) Hokurokudo, 7 provinces; (6) Sanyodo, 8 provinces; (7) Nankaido, 6 provinces; (8) Saikaido, 9 provinces (Kiwari); (9) Hokkaido, 10 provinces; (10) Taiwan (Formosa), 5 provinces.

Before the Restoration Japan was divided into fiefs (hant), and the total number of fiefs was up to about fifty. The ban established by degrees in the course of the twelfth century were regularly organized by Yoritomo (1192–99). Under the Ashikaga it was no longer the will of the emperor or the shogun but force of arms which designated the rulers. Tokugawa Ieyasu estimated the number of han as more than 300. They were divided into three classes, according to the importance of their revenues, the Dai-han (large fiefs) being worth upward of 400,000 koku of rice, the Chu-han (medium fiefs), from 100,000 to 400,000 koku, and the Sho-han (small fiefs), upward of 100,000 koku.

After the Restoration Japan was divided into departments (ten) and prefectures (fu). The number of these varied several times. To-day for the convenience of the administration the country is divided into three fu, 43 ken, and two special governments (cho), those of Hokkaido and Formosa, comprising altogether 660 districts (gun or kori), 63 municipalities (shi), 1138 towns (cho or machi), and 11,801 villages (son or mura). The three fu (prefectures) are Tokio, Osaka, and Kyoto. Among the municipalities sixteen are more than 50,000 inhabitants and less than 100,000, three more than 100,000 and less than 200,000, and six a population exceeding 200,000 inhabitants. These six cities are Tokio, 1,811,655, inhabitants, Osaka, 995,945, Kyoto, 390,565, Yokohama, 326,035, Nagoya, 283,639, and Kobe, 285,602.

At the head of each department is a prefect assisted by a council of prefecture which represents the central government, while the general council represents the rights and interests of the people. The general council exercises over the finances of the department a control similar to that which the parliament exercises over the finances of the State. They regulate the distribution of taxes and vote on the needs of the departments. All the citizens residing in a department and who pay a direct yearly tax of three yen have the right to vote for the election of councillors. Payment of a tax of ten yen is necessary for eligibility. The prefects are nominated by the Government. At the head of each district is a sub-prefect, at the head of each town or village is a mayor assisted by a council. The departments, districts, towns, and villages have a special budget administered by the general council, the district council, the municipal council, and increased by the amount of the taxes levied by the central Government. These departments, districts, towns, and villages may contract loans with the authorization of the minister of finance. For loans payable in less than three years they are not obliged to secure this authorization. For the financial year 1907–08 the total of the budgets of the departments and municipalities was as follows: receipts, 173,004,325 yen; expenditures, 166,614,817 yen; fund for public relief, 34,884,370; total amount of debt, 89,266,115 yen. Ten years earlier (1897) the receipts amounted to 100,888,000 yen; expenses, 88,817,000 yen; debt, 16,330,000 yen.

Legislation.—For many centuries Japan had no legal code, the moral law and local custom taking its place. In 604, in the reign of the Empress Suiko, Shotoku Taishi promulgated a code of laws in seventeen chapters borrowed from China. This is the earliest code of which mention is made in the history. Later the Emperor Mommu (696–707) appointed a commission of scholars to draw up a new code, and the work was completed and promulgated in 701. It is called the code of the era of Taiho (Taiho-ryo), and save for some modifications was in force until the Restoration. At this time intercourse with foreigners and study of the laws in use in European countries brought home to the Japanese the necessity of a new code, more in harmony with their new situation. With the aid of foreign legalists they undertook this work of codification, which they brought to a successful issue at the end of twenty years. The collection of laws thus produced has since been called the Gokasho. It comprises: (1) the Civil code, the criminal code, the commercial code, and the codes of civil and criminal procedure.

For the application of this new legislation a judiciary organization was created very similar to that which exists in France. It comprises tribunals of justice of the peace (Ku-Saiibansho), lower courts (Chiko-Saiibansho), courts of appeal (Koso-in), and a court of cassation (Taishin-in). The Constitution published February, 1889, established the irremovability of magistrates, who can only be suspended by special law. The tribunals number 338; court of cassation, 1; courts of appeal, 7 (Koso-in, Naga, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Miyagi, and Hakodate); lower courts (district courts), 49 (at least one to a department); courts of justices of the peace (sub-district courts), 301. Staff of the tribunals, 11,826; judges,
Marriage.—The law exacts the completion of seventeen years for a man and fifteen for a woman. The consent of the parents is required for males under thirty, and for females under twenty-five. Minors must secure the consent of a guardian and of the family. No person who already has a spouse may marry, and the penalty for so doing is two years in prison. An adulterer is forbidden to marry the partner in the sin. Marriage between blood relations is forbidden within all degrees in the direct line, and in the collateral line within the third degree inclusive. Marriage between relations (affinities) is forbidden within all degrees in the direct line, even after divorce, but in the collateral line there is no impediment. All marriages contracted through mistaken identity, fraud, or violence may be annulled within the three months following their celebration. The woman may not marry till six months after the dissolution or annulment of the first marriage. Husband and wife must live together, the law not admitting separation of body. The fact of the marriage should be inscribed on the register of the civil Government, and in default of this formality the marriage does not exist before the law and is without effect. Formerly women could not possess property but now they are accorded this right. The law regulates the conjugal partnership of goods, but husband and wife are at liberty to make a contract. The husband is obliged to provide for the support of the family and to defray the expenses of the children's education. He has the right to administer the property of his wife and to collect the profits, but he is not entitled either to sell it, or to give it as security, or to lend it without her consent. In Japan marriage is always arranged by an intermediary. The law stipulates nothing with regard to the ceremony, which is left to the choice of those concerned. The peasants follow the customs of the country, the chief of which consists in the exchange of cups of wine by the betrothed pair. The Buddhist or Shintoist priests (bonzes or Kamushii) have no share in the celebration of marriage. The Christians marry according to the rites of their religion. Politeness demands that the newly wedded pair pay a visit in the course of a month to all who assisted at the ceremony.

Divorce.—The Japanese law allows divorce, and this divorce annuls all the effects of marriage except the impediment of affinity. Divorce may be granted in two ways, privately or by court sentence. The chief causes for divorce are (1) bigamy; (2) adultery (for a woman); (3) notorious adultery for a man; (4) crimes of forgery, petty larceny, robbery with violence, fraudulent possession, receiving of bribes, obscene acts, and all crimes involving a prison sentence of three years; (5) ill-treatment or grievous injury of the other party or of his father or mother; (6) ill-treatment or grievous injury received from the relations of the other party; (7) abandonment by one of the parties of the other with evil intent; (8) ignorance for three years as to whether the other party is living or dead. Wills.—Every one may dispose of his possessions by will, provided the will is submitted to certain conditions. Those only are incapacitated from making a will who are of unsound mind or who have not attained the age of fifteen. Japanese law recognizes natural heirs and every clause injurious to their rights is null. The Japanese law recognizes three classes of wills, olographic, authentic, and secret. An olographic will (Jhitu-sho sho) is one which the testator writes, dates, and signs with his own hand, and to which he affixes his seal. An authentic will (Kosei-sho sho) is dictated by the testator with the formalities prescribed by law in presence of at least two witnesses, written by a notary (Kosho-nin), who reads the will to the testator and the witnesses. If it is approved the testator and the witnesses should then sign it and affix their seal. The secret will (Jinmu-sho sho) is signed and sealed by the testator and presented by him to a notary in presence of at least two witnesses. The testator declares that it is his will and gives the name and address of him who drew it up. The notary records on the envelope the report of this presentation, whereupon the testator, the witnesses, and the notary sign and affix their seals. Besides these wills Japanese law recognizes others which have only a temporary existence and cease with the circum-

stances which gave rise to them, e. g. military wills, naval wills, wills made in time of contagious disease or at the point of death, if the sick person recovers. To make an act legal every Japanese must affix his seal (Jitsu-in) to that act. A copy (in-kan) should be deposited at the surrogate's office. For foreigners the signature is sufficient. The will goes into effect immediately on the death of the testator; if it is conditional, as soon as the conditions are realized. But to put it into execution the executor must have it signed by the court. The testator may always revoke his will in whole or in part. When the same person has made two wills the second prevails. Anyone is free to reject a will made in his favour. The share reserved to the natural heirs in the direct line is one-half the property, that of the other heirs, one-third.

Prisons (Kangoku).—In the present penal system prisons are divided into two chief classes, civil and military. Civil prisons comprise six categories: (1) criminal or convict prisons for those sentenced to deportation or banishment (three); (2) temporary prisons, in which are confined those sentenced to deportation or banishment until such time as they shall be transferred to their final destination (three); (3) departmental prisons for those sentenced to simple detention and compulsory labour (at least one for each department); (4) detective prisons, destined to receive prisoners who have been indicted and accused persons until the law has decided their case; (5) houses of correction reserved for minors under twenty and for deaf-mutes; (6) jails, for those sentenced to
thirty days' imprisonment by police magistrates. These jails are annexed to the police stations. The prisons are under the jurisdiction of the minister of justice, who appoints the general inspectors and all the employees. Number of civil prisons for the year 1908, 56; bridewells, 92; general inspectors, 56; wardens, 620; engineers and interpreters, 29; physicians, 198; chaplains and instructors, 222; servants of the first class, 7907; of the second class, 302; women servants, 383; employees of various kinds, 230. Total, 9,997. Inmates of penitentiary establishments at the end of 1907: detention prisons, men, 4008; women, 203; houses of detention, men, 46,175; women, 255; houses of correction, men, 738; women, 69. Total, 53,743. The total number of persons sentenced in 1907, men, 114,236; women, 16,748.

Police (K seisatsu).—The police service as it exists to-day was organized at the beginning of the present reign according to the English system. It is divided into two main sections, the administrative police (Gyosei Keisatsu) and the judiciary police (Shito Keisatsu). In the department it is subject to the prefecture, at Tokio to the prefecture of police (Keishicho). It has its courts, which are empowered to judge offenses for which the penalty does not exceed thirty days' imprisonment. On 8 th March, 1872, the police department numbered: chief police stations or bureaus, 713; branch stations, 618; city station-houses, 1841; rural station-houses, 12,648; inspectors or superintendents (Keshu), 1861; police agents (Junsa), 33,855. Crimes, offences, and cases in which the police have had to intervene were registered and classified by violence, 1,239; without violence, 267,630; squindlings, 28,876; total number of robberies, 297,145. Violent deaths: suicides, 9,896; murders, 13,263; sudden deaths, 13,877; victims of accidents and others, 14,015. Total, 23,544. Fires: involuntary, 12,462; incendiary, 1,856; camping, or by laws, 2,882; by lightning, 2174. Total, 15,494. Number of houses burned, 36,669. Public reunions, indoors, 587; number of orators, 1863; in the open air, 87; orators, 55. Total number of arrests made by the police for crimes, offences, or infractions of the law, 778,281.

Hygiene.—The organization of the hygienic service dates from 1872. It began with the organization of a medical bureau, which was suspended in 1875 and replaced by a bureau of health. In 1879 a central board and local boards of public health were established and the service was extended to all the departments. It was extended to all the townships, villages and private committees were formed. The chief regulations relative to hygiene are: the cleansing of houses and drains, which should be done twice yearly under police supervision; the building and improvement of hospitals, prisons, schools, and all public institutions; the location of cemeteries; burial; vaccination; etc. The hygiene service is within the jurisdiction of the police who are charged with enforcing its regulations.

Hospitals and Medical Bodies.—Before the Restoration, Japan had five hospitals located at Nagasaki, Saga, Fukui, Kanazawa, and Osaka. The first in point of time was Nagasaki, founded in 1861. On 31 March, 1908, the number of hospitals was 870, 5 founded by the Government, 205 by the departments, and 660 by private citizens. To all these hospitals, private as well as public, is attached a force of women-nurses, who must be at least eighteen years of age and provided with a diploma. Throughout the empire there are: doctors, 36,776; midwives, 26,387; druggists, 29,813; chemists, 2370. In 1907 the number of persons afflicted with contagious diseases was 71,332; typhus, 27,988; dysentery, 24,942; deaths from contagious diseases, 19,536.

Education.—Until the shogunate of the Tokugawa education was left entirely to the Buddhist priests. Under the Tokugawa (1603-1868) it was con-

fided to lay teachers and during this period of 265 years the Chinese classics were the basis of instruction. But in this aristocratic country knowledge was a privilege together with nobility, and there were no public schools save for the sons of Samurai. However, the lower classes were not wholly abandoned to ignorance. Farmers, mechanics, and merchants received an education by reading books, sometimes connected with the temples, known as Terapogy, and in private schools. To-day freedom to learn is granted in Japan to all degrees of the social scale. Instruction is compulsory from six to twelve years, and non-religious. At the head of public instruction is a minister assisted by boards and corps of inspectors. Schools are divided into primary schools in which class are included the infant schools and the schools for deaf-mutes and the blind, secondary schools, high schools, universities, ordinary normal schools, higher normal schools, special schools, technical schools, and various.

Primary Schools are divided into two classes, common and high schools. The duration of the first is six years, and as the instruction is compulsory, attendance at this school is required from six to twelve years. The certificate of completion of this term secures admission into the public schools which course lasts two years and is optional. Number of primary schools, 27,269; teachers, 116,070; pupils, 6,601,620; average number of children receiving instruction, 96.5%. Private schools, only 249. Infant schools, 361. Women attendants, 984; children, 22,545. Denomination is by parents, Catholic, 12; Episcopalian, 18; Presbyterian, 19; Congregational, 18; and Baptists, 168; pupils, 1,532. The secondary schools for boys were founded as a preparation for the high schools. Graduates of these schools are qualified to obtain position under the Government, according to their abilities, without passing a preliminary examination. The course lasts eight years. Number of schools, 251; founded by the Government and the municipalities, 228; private, 58; teachers, 5,336; pupils, 108,531.

Secondary Schools for Girls.—The duration of the course is from four to five years at choice. To the regular courses may be added special courses for the study of foreign languages or some womanly art, and supplementary courses for pupils desiring to perfect themselves in a particular branch. These courses should not exceed two or three years. Number of schools, 111; public, 98; private, 16; teachers, 1770; pupils, 35,876. The higher schools are a preparation for the university. The course lasts three years, and is divided into three classes which differ among themselves. The instruction given in each class corresponds to the career to which the pupil is destined. Number of schools, 7; all founded by the Government and under its supervision. They are located at Tokio, Sendai, Kyoto, Kanazawa, Okayama, Kumamoto, and Koshima; teachers, 272; pupils, 4888.

Imperial Universities.—There are two of these, one at Tokio and one at Kyoto. The University of Tokio comprises besides the University Hall the faculties of law, medicine, literature, science, agriculture, and engineering. Number of professors: Japanese, 275; foreigners, 15; Japanese students, 5050; foreigners, 39. The University of Kyoto comprises besides the University Hall, the faculties of law, medicine, literature, science, and engineering. Japanese professors, 166; foreign professors, 4; students, 1507. Besides these universities there are about forty public or private schools which assume the name of universities, but for entrance to which it is not necessary to have a diploma from the higher schools. The two most important are the University of Waseda, from 5000 to 6000 students, and that of Keio-gijuku, 1100 students. The former was founded by Okuma in 1882, and the second by Fukusawa in 1865.
FUJI-SAN (PEERLESS MOUNT), THE FAMOUS VOLCANO OF JAPAN
APPARENTLY EXTINCT SINCE 1707; HEIGHT, 12,395 FEET; ASCENDED BY LARGE NUMBERS OF PILGRIMS
Normal Schools.—Each department is obliged to have at least one normal school. The course is four years long, containing 1,404,276 preparatory courses and courses of pedagogy may be added according to circumstances to the regular courses. The expenses of education are defrayed by the departments, but graduates are obliged to teach for eight years. Number of normal schools, 67; teaching staff, 1,549 drawn from amongst the following: boys, 14,176; girls, 4,752. Higher normal schools: for boys, 2; teachers, 212; students, 2,456; for girls, 1; teachers, 95; students, 858.

Special Schools.—Medicine and pharmacy, 10; statistics, law, political economy, 12; literature and religion, 19, 829. Total: schools, 50; professors, 1,537; students, 25,573.

Technical Schools, and Schools Preparatory thereto.—Schools of agriculture, 142; professors, 1,151; students, 17,390; preparatory schools, 3,785; professors, 1,162; students, 149,225. Fishery schools, 11; professors, 64; students, 811; preparatory schools, 103; professors, 48; students, 3,344. Schools of arts and crafts, 35; professors, 599; students, 6,308; supplementary schools, 155; professors, 240; students, 8,365. Schools of commerce, 70; professors, 1,087; students, 20,685; supplementary, 107; professors, 223; students, 7,452. Schools of artillery, 135; professors, 2,008; supplementary, 1; professor, 7; students, 27. Schools of apprenticeship or of foremen, 326; professors, 3402; students, 51,929. Total: schools, 4,804; professors, 8,106; students, 270,723. In 1899 the number of technical schools was 227; professors, 1245; students, 23,065. Miscellaneous schools, 2092; professors, 7619; students, 142,695.

Establishments Founded and Maintained by the Government.—Under the jurisdiction of the minister of public instruction are: the two universities of Tokio and Kyoto, the seven high schools, the two higher normal schools for boys, and that for girls. There are besides, one high school of agriculture and arboriculture (professors, 32; students, 244); five high schools of arts and crafts (professors, 139; students, 1502); four high schools of commerce (professors, 109; students, 2477); five high schools of medicine (professors, 116; students, 2693); one school of foreign languages, in which are taught English, French, German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, Chinese, Corean, Hindustani, Malay, and Mongolian (Japanese professors, 32; foreign, 12; students, 648); 1 school of fine arts (professors, 52; students, 440); 1 school of music (Japanese professors, 50; foreign, 9; students, 597); 1 school for deaf-mutes and the blind (professors, 20; students, 320); 4 schools of pedagogy (professors, 15; students, 87).

Under the Jurisdiction of the Imperial Household.—Schools for the nobility, 1 for boys (professors, 86; students, 331); 1 for girls (professors, 60; students, 618). Dependent on the minister of communications, 1 naval school of commerce (professors, 48; students, 495). Dependent on the ministry of war: one high school of war; one school of practical artillery and engineering; one military school; one central military public school at Tokio; five other public schools outside of Tokio; school for scouts; cavalry school; school of sharpshooting; commissariat school; school of military music (professors, 624; students, 4111). Dependent on the ministry of marine: high school of marine; naval school; school of mechanics; medical school; school of accountants; school of naval construction, etc. (professors, 213; students, 902). Total number of professors in schools under Government supervision, 2748; students, 32,879. In 1907 the expenditure for schools under the supervision of the departments and districts reached 44,855,568 yen. The number of libraries (1907) equaled 127, containing 1,449,716 volumes. Numbers were issued during the year, 28,319; journals and reviews, 1908. An academy (Gakushi-Kwai-in) was founded at Tokio by imperial decree in 1890. Placed under the jurisdiction of the minister of public instruction, it is composed of forty members, divided into two classes: Fifteen are elected by the general public, and fifteen are appointed by the emperor, the remaining twenty-five by the minister at the nomination of the former. They discuss the questions proposed by the minister of public instruction and give their advice. They meet once a month and treat scientific questions. The hall is open to the public.

Army.—From the beginning of the feudal system until its abolition (1192-1868), that is, for a period of nearly 700 years, military service was the exclusive privilege of the Samurai. This privilege was abolished after the Restoration. To-day every Japanese without distinction of caste is liable to be called upon to bear arms. Japan has adopted the European system for its armies. Conscription was inaugurated in 1872. The drawing of lots takes place at the age of twenty. The average annual number of recruits is 120,000 men; infantry, 68,000; cavalry, 3900; artillery, 7500; and dress guard (political and imperial guard). Sappers and miners, 2600; commissariat, 2000; railroad and telegraph corps, 700; train, 20,000. Adding to this those who are assigned to special services, we reach the figure of 120,000 men.

Exemptions.—A son whose father is sixty years of age is exempt from service, if the latter has no means of support. A repreive is granted to students who have a diploma from the secondary schools and to students who reside in a foreign country (except those who are in the Asiatic countries near Japan). The term of service may be shortened by a year of voluntary service, or it is necessary to complete a term of service with a diploma from the secondary schools. After their year of service the volunteers are passed into the reserves with the grade of non-commissioned officer. They are obliged to defray all the expenses of the barracks. Professors in the primary schools are bound to only six months' service, at the expiration of which they are passed into the territorial forces.

Organization.—The army is divided into the active army, army of reserve, and territorial army. The duration of service in the active army is two years; in the reserve, four and a half years; in the territorial army, ten years. The active army, in its peacetime form, was organized in 1908, necessitated a supplementary expenditure of 170,000,000 yen, to be assessed in ten years. The number of divisions during the Russo-Japanese war was raised from twelve to sixteen. At present there are eighteen, not counting the division of the imperial guard. In time of war Japan can put in the field an army of 1,000,000 men. Officers and officials affiliated with the active army: generals, 16; generals of divisions, 33; brigadier-generals, 96; colonels, 233; lieuten-colonels, 353; commandants, 1008; captains, 3428; lieutenants, 3976; sub-lieutenants, 3208; affiliated officers, 1712; total, 14,085; salaries, 9,402,778 yen. Councils of war are established in the army to judge the soldiers. Where a state of siege has been proclaimed their jurisdiction extends to all citizens without exception. There are eighteen of these, one to a division. Cases judged in 1907, 1908. To each division are attached a prison and a hospital. Soldiers committed to prison (1907), 2311; released, 2369. Sick persons cared for in the hospitals, 78,599; deaths, 357. In 1877 the constabulary (gendarmerie) was created according to the French system. It constitutes the police force of the armies of land and sea, and the functions of the minister of public instruction. The constabulary police. The constabulary wears a military uniform and carry a sword and pistol. The constabulary forms
eighteen companies, attached to the eighteen divisions of the army, and commanded by a brigadier-general. It numbers only 2,500 men. In 1907 it intervened in 2,082 cases, and assisted 66 sick or wounded persons.

Navy.—Under the government of the Tokugawa the lack of stimulation and the complete stagnation of the relations with the outside world caused the navy to be completely neglected. In 1871 a vessel presented by the King of Holland and some ships purchased abroad by the Government of the shogun and the daimios of Tosa and Satsuma constituted the imperial fleet. Of all the services organized under the present reign none has undergone such rapid development as that of the navy, as is shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Ships</th>
<th>Tonnage</th>
<th>Horse-power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6,000 tons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>258,252</td>
<td>518,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>506,093</td>
<td>1,045,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list does not include the 77 torpedoes weighing 7258 tons. This prodigious development of the Japanese navy in recent years is due to the three projects of expansion voted successively by the Chambers, the first (1903) requiring an extraordinary expenditure of 116,000,000 yen; the second (1905), 173,000,000 yen; and the third (1907), 76,000,000 yen. There are five maritime prefectures: Yoko-Suka, Kure, Sasebo, Maizuru and Port Arthur; three naval stations, Takashiki, the Pescadores, and Ominato. The fleet is divided into three squadrons. On 31 March, 1898, it was composed as follows: armoured battleships, 15, tonnage varying from 10,960 to 19,900 tons; armoured cruisers of the first class, 13, from 7700 to 14,600 tons; armoured cruisers of the second class, 10, from 3700 to 6630 tons; armoured cruisers of the third class, 8, from 2439 to 5420 tons; armoured coast-defence boats, 12; armoured gunboats, 6; torpedo gunboats, 2; dispatch boats, 5; destroyers, 55, from 350 to 281 tons; torpedoes, 77; total tonnage, 7258 tons. The navy is recruited by conscription and volunteer service, more than half the naval forces being volunteers. The number of recruits varies greatly each year. In 1902 there were 4139; 1905, 5658; 1906, 5838; 1907, 5652. On 31 March, 1908, the naval forces were composed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Active service</th>
<th>First reserve</th>
<th>Second reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>893</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>18,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,662</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>44,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were more than 780 students; in all 63,773 men. But in 1895 the force was 17,140; in 1899, 28,710; in 1904, 45,999. In 1907 the courts-martial judged 756 cases. Seamen committed to prison, 730; released, 562. Marine hospitals, 5; sick persons cared for during the year, 31,098; deaths, 191.

Japanese Religions.—Shintō (literally, "way of the gods" (Kami)) is properly the religion of Japan, born on the very soil and without foreign admixture. It has neither dogmas, nor moral code, nor sacred books, and is summed up in a rather confused mixture of nature-worship and veneration of ancestors. Philosophical analysis discovers a basis of pantheism. In Shintō mythology first speaks of five gods called Koto-Usu. The first three are the creators of heaven and earth, and they are Ame-no-minaka-nushi, who existed immobile at the time of the Creation; Takami-musubi, and Kami-busubi, agents in the Creation. The other two, Umi-no-shirabii-Hikoji and Ame-no-Tokotachi, have no clearly determined rôle. After them some seven generations of heavenly spirits (Tenjin-shikichi-dai), namely, Kuni-Tokotachi, Kuni- Shikichi, Toyokuni, Tokuji, Eiken and Sugi, Ito-shinjii, Otoji, Oto-shinjii, Omoroji and Kosoikone; finally Izanagi and Izanami, the special creators of Japan and of a number of gods, gods of water, wind, trees, mountains, rivers, roads, thunder, rain, etc. Of Izanagi and Izanami were born Amaterasu, Inari, and Susanu-oo, and Amaterasu became the god of the sun, Inari became that of the moon and Susanu-oo, the god of the earth. Amaterasu sent her grandson, Ninigi-no-mikoto, to reign over Japan and he was the great-grandfather of Jimmu Tenno, the first emperor. From Amaterasu to Jimmu Tenno there are five generations called terrestrial spirits (Chijito-go-dai), who succeeded the seven generations of heavenly spirits.

Hence, according to Shintōist mythology, the emperor is not only the high-priest, he is the representative and direct descendant of divinity, and as such has a duty devolved upon him of celebrating the worship of the gods who are his ancestors and of offering to heaven as supreme mediator the prayers and sacrifices of the subjects whom he governs. At first only the temple was the palace of the emperor, and the ceremonies consisted chiefly of ablutions and purifications. The temple of Ise was the first erected outside the palace, and an imperial princess was charged with the sacred treasures there contained. The treasures, which were transmitted by Amaterasu to her descendants, were the Mirror, the Sword, and the precious Stone.

Shintōism remained in this state of simplicity until the introduction of Buddhism in 552. It was soon supplanted by the new religion, which brought with it more profound metaphysics, a more exalted moral code, and more solemn ceremonies. A few conservatives attempted to resist, but the bonzes won the day by what they called Rio-bu-Shinto, a system according to which Shintōism and Buddhism should form one and the same religion. Thenceforth, save for a few private ceremonies at the palace and in the great temples of Ise and Izumo, the two religions were but one. This state of things lasted until the eighteenth century, when the works of Kamo Mabuchi and several others brought about a reaction against the national religion against Buddhism and Confucianism, both foreign importations. The Restoration completed what had been begun, and since 1888 Shintōism and Buddhism have been entirely separate from each other.

Together with the gods of its mythology Shintōism adores several of the emperors and famous men of Japan. It also pays special honour to the spirits of soldiers who died for the imperial cause. In several towns temples called Shokon-eha (temples where souls are invoked) are erected in their honour. Shintōism is prided into ten branches, each with its own ceremonies. The moral code of all being reduced to the single principle: follow the inspiration of your own heart and obey the emperor. Number of temples (miya or jinja) 190,436; staff: administrative heads of sects, 12; heads or rectors of temples, 10,365; priests (preachers), 74,347; priestesses, 4428; seminary students (March, 1908), 259; boys, 250; girls, 9. Japanese especially professing Shintōism, about 19,000,000.

National Feasts.—(1) Shihōhain, a ceremony celebrated in the palace on the first day of the year, from January 1 to January 5 A.M. The emperor is in the center, and at the four cardinal points, venerates the tomb of his ancestors and prays for the prosperity of his reign and preservation from every calamity during the year.
with difficulty to the worship of other gods than those of Shintoism, the gods of the country. Then the bonzes evolved the theory that the tutelary deities of Japan were but temporary manifestations (gegen), of the Buddhist divinities, whose fatherland (honchi) was India, but who had appeared in Japan, leaving there traces (suijaku) of their passage. The result of this theory was the fusion of the two religions.

**Buddhist Feasts and Customs.**—Among all the sects are observed 3 April, the birthday of Shaka, the founder of Buddhism; 8 February, the day of his death; and the feast of the two equinoxes. Among the Montoshu: in November, Ho-on-Ko, feast of thanksgiving, and the death of Shinran Shonin, founder of the sect. Among the Hokkeishu, E-shi-ki, the death of Nichiren,

**Buddhism.**—Buddhism was introduced into Japan in A.D. 552. The King of Kudara (Corea) sent Buddhist statues and books as a present to the Emperor Kōmyō. Two years later, Tonei and Doshin, the two first bonzes Japan had seen, came from the same country. They found a powerful protector in Soga-no-Ina, who built in his own residence the first temple (Mukihara or Kogen-ji), but they also encountered determined adversaries who claimed that the introduction of a new religion would be an injury to the gods of Shinto, who were the fathers and protectors of the country. Thenceforth there were two parties, the strife between whom lasted for thirty-five years, to end in 587 with the triumph of Buddhism. Upheld by Prince Shotoku Taishi (572–621), the new doctrine made rapid progress. Shortly after his death various sects arose in succession, viz.: Jojitsu and Sanron (625), Hosso (653), Gusha (660), Kegon (739), and Ritsu (754). These are the six sects of the era of Nara. They were followed by the three sects of the era of Hei-ankyo (Kyoto); Tendai (806); Shingon (806); and Yusei-nembutsu (1124). Finally the period of Kamakura saw the rise of five others, viz.: Zen (1174), Zen (1192), Shin or Montoshu (1224), Nichiren or Hokkeishu (1253), and Ji (1275). Three of these sects, Jojitsu, Sanron, and Gusha, no longer exist. The others are divided into several branches. There are at present twelve principal sects and thirty-nine branches. Owing to the elevation of the bonzes and the spread of the doctrines of Rio-bu-Shinto, the Buddhist and Shintoist religions existed in harmony for centuries and ministers of both religions officiated alternately in the same temples. But at the Restoration, Buddhism, having ceased to be recognised as the national religion, was obliged to restore the Shintoist temples in its possession. Thenceforth the two religions, although more or less confused in practice, became officially strangers to each other, and Buddhism, despite efforts that have been made to restore its philosophical and theological teachings, is decadent in Japan. In 1898 there were in the whole empire 109,740 temples (tera); administrative heads of temples, 52; superiors of temples, 53,120; bonzes (preachers), 70,755; bonzesesses, 1199. Various employees: men, 45,594; women, 3404; seminary students, boys, 9289; girls, 449. Japanese especially professing Buddhism, and non-Japanese, 2,941.

Rio-bu-Shinto or Shinbutsu-kongo (fusion of Shintoism and Buddhism) practically ceasing to exist in 1868, this theory also has ceased to be believed. It consisted as follows: about the beginning of the ninth century Buddhism had made great progress in Japan; nevertheless the people resigned themselves to its resemblance to Shintoism, then the only religion

**Chinese Buddhism.**—Indirectly into Japan in 285, Confucianism was received without opposition owing to its resemblance to Shintoism, then the only religion founded by the sect. In every Japanese house is a domestic altar, called by the Buddhists Butouden, by the Shintoists Kamidana. Many wealthy houses have a special room or a small temple built apart within the enclosure. In the Butouden is placed by the Montoshu, the statue of Amida, by the Jodoshu that of Shaka, by the Hokkeishu, that of Nichiren, by the Shingonshu, that of Fudo (the Immovable). In the Kamidana the Shintoists place the statue of Amaterasu, to which they offer sacred wine (Miki), on the first, fifteenth, and eighteenth of each month. As flowers the Buddhists use the water-lily, the Shintoists, the branches of a pale-leaved tree called Sasaik. There are also in every house the I-hai, wooden tablets or shelves on which are written the posthumous names of the parents and ancestors of the family. A lamp is lit every day before this domestic altar, at least in the evening, frequently also in the morning. At Buddhist funerals is burned a fragrant wood (shikids), a foreign tree brought from India with the custom, and whose flower is a violent poison. On returning from the cemetery salt is sprinkled on the garments of those who took part in the ceremony, in order to purify them.

**Confucianism.**—Introduced into Japan in 285, Confucianism was received without opposition owing to its resemblance to Shintoism, then the only religion
practised. But after the introduction of Buddhism it fell into disfavour and did not recover until the seventeenth century when Ieyasu caused the Chinese classics to be printed for the first time. Henceforth, being taught by learned masters such as Fujiwara Seikwa, Hayashi Doeshun, etc., it became the code of the Samurai and exercised a profound influence in Japanese society. Due to the efforts of the Restoration the European system of public instruction was adopted, Confucianism was again abandoned, but as the Chinese classics had been the basis of teaching for 250 years. But it cannot be denied that the origin of a number of the ideas still in favour among the educated may be traced to this.

Bushido (Way of the Samurai, Knighthood).—The principles of loyalty and honour which the Samurai are obliged to obey are called Bushido. This code has borrowed from Buddhism stoical endurance, scorn of danger and death, from Shintoism the religious veneration of fatherland and sovereign, from Confucianism a certain literary and artistic culture and the social ethics called "the five relations of men among themselves" (go rin). From this compound results the code of the perfect knight, which may be summed up in three sayings: the Samurai has not two words; he does not yield; he gives his blood for duty. The Bushido was born with the nation, it developed by degrees as the warrior class grew in influence, and it reached its most complete expansion at the beginning of the Shogunate of the Tokugawa. Then a change took place; lüiterally illiterate and even glorying in his ignorance, the Samurai turned to literary culture and neglected the military calling; decadence followed, and at the Restoration he had lost his ancient prestige. To-day the Samurai no longer form a class apart, but the spirit and influence of the Bushido are more or less preserved among the people.

There are two kinds of cemeteries, those connected with the temples and the public cemeteries, which belong to the municipalities. In the first the "parishioners" of the temples have the right to be interred, in the second all persons without distinction of class or religion. The local administration grants permission to establish new cemeteries, to abolish or to change the old, etc., but their inspection and control belong to the police. Every cemetery must have a superintendent (Kannisha), without whose permission no burial may take place. It is forbidden to bury the dead anywhere save in the cemeteries. Formerly it was customary to enlist the services of a Shintoist or Buddhist priest (bonze or kannushi) for every burial, but this law was abolished in 1884, and the presence of a priest is no longer necessary. If he is summoned he should perform the ceremony according to the rite of his religion. The formalities to be fulfilled are: the obtaining of a physician's certificate proving the death, the presentation of this certificate to the civil official, and the securing from the police authorization for burial. Interment may only take place twenty-four hours after the death; the grave must be six feet deep. Those who neglect to bury a dead person or who profane the cemeteries are liable to fine and imprisonment. Cemeteries are exempt from taxation.

Cremation is permitted in Japan. It takes place in a special oven called a Kuwabara. Persons dying of a contagious disease must be cremated, others being left free. As regards cemeteries and burials, the Christian communities are subject to the same laws and enjoy the same advantages as the pagan sects. They are allowed to have a separate cemetery, which most of them have. As to foreigners, according to Article ii of the treaty concluded with the different powers, "Europeans dying in Japan enjoy the right to be buried according to their religious custom in properly located cemeteries, which should be established, in case they do not exist, and carefully maintained".

Public Assistance.—Regulations concerning public relief were promulgated in 1899. They stipulated that each department should organize a minimum fund of 550,000 yen for relief in case of accidents (floods, typhoons, earthquakes, etc.). The Government in turn pledged itself to give yearly for ten years a sum proportionate to that collected in the departments. Besides this a sum is reserved each year to assist the poor and fund a foundation. The total of the department fund equaled a sum of 34,884,370 yen. Number of persons assisted in 1907, 13,894; number of children helped, 2086; cost, 47,016 yen.

Benevolent Organizations.—The chief of these are: (1) the Tokio yoku-in (asylum for the insane and orphaned), founded in 1878; (2) The Tokio sugamo byo-in (insane asylum), founded in 1879; (3) the Tokio kaisei-byo-in (charity hospital), founded in 1182; sick persons treated outside by the hospital, 39,962; (4) Fukuden-kai Ikuj-i (orphanage), private establishment; orphans assisted, 150; (5) Tokio kankyu-in (house of reception), private establishment; founded as an insane asylum in 1885; children received, 69. These establishments, the only ones mentioned in the official statistics, must be added about 900 other charitable organizations (orphanages, asylums, leper hospitals, infant asylums, houses of refuge for those discharged from prison, etc.). Founded by private citizens, the Buddhist sects, Catholic and Protestant missions. The Catholic and Protestant missionaries have been the promoters of these benevolent works in Japan, the Buddhists having merely followed their example. The last-named have founded in all 15 orphanages, 3 schools, and 8 asylums, or hospitals, and Shinto priests have not a single benevolent work to their credit.

Red Cross Society.—In 1877, during the civil war of Satsuma, a society was founded in Japan on the model of the Red Cross under the name of Hakusha (philanthropic society). In 1886, Japan having given its adhesion to the convention of Geneva, the philanthropic society changed its name to that of the Red Cross of Japan (Nihon sekijusha). The Red Cross Society is under the patronage of the imperial household which gives to the work an annual contribution of 20,000 yen. Besides this the emperor gives 5000 yen to the society of Shinto priests (bonze or kannushi), 5000 yen to the society of a Buddhist priest (bonze or kannushi), and 5000 yen to the society of a Protestant priest (bonze or kannushi), for every burial, but this law was abolished in 1884, and the presence of a priest is no longer necessary. If he is summoned he should perform the ceremony according to the rite of his religion. The formalities to be fulfilled are: the obtaining of a physician's certificate proving the death, the presentation of this certificate to the civil official, and the securing from the police authorization for burial. Interment may only take place twenty-four hours after the death; the grave must be six feet deep. Those who neglect to bury a dead person or who profane the cemeteries are liable to fine and imprisonment. Cemeteries are exempt from taxation.

Christianity in Japan.—Catholicism.—On 15 Aug., 1549, St. Francis Xavier arrived in Japan, at the port of Kagoshima in Kyushu, with two companions and three neophytes. By the kindness of his preaching, his sanctity, and his miracles, he renewed the marvels of the Apostolic age. He preached at Hirado, Yamaguchi, Bungo, and Funai, but he was unable to see the emperor or enter Mikado (Kyoto). He set out for China on 20 November, 1551. In Japan there were then 3000 faithful, who would afterwards be able to evangelize. Ordinarily, when a prince was converted a portion of his subjects followed him. The celebrated Nobunaga (1565), the terrible enemy of the
bonzes, was kindly disposed towards the Christians and a friend of the missionaries. When he died (1582) there were 200,000 faithful and 250 churches. The three Christian princes of Bungo, Arima, and Omura sent an embassy to Europe, which set out on 20 Feb., 1582, reached Lisbon 10 May, 1584, and Rome, 23 March, 1585. The ambassadors witnessed the coronation of Sixtus V. After a stay in Rome, the abbot of the Sanpo temple credence, Hideyoshi, the successor of Nobunaga, at first favoured the Christians, but being prejudiced by the bonzes he later believed that the missionaries were spies and proscribed the Christian religion, but refrained from slaying the Christians (1587). The missionaries his highness released, but remained in prison ten years, where they baptised 65,000 persons (1587–97), making a total of 300,000 faithful and 134 religious. In 1593 three Spanish Franciscans having been sent as ambassadors by the King of Spain, they were well received by Hideyoshi. A Spanish vessel, the "San Felipe", having run aground within the province of Tosa, the captain was foolish enough to say that the missionaries had been sent to prepare for the conquest of the country. Thereupon Hideyoshi became afraid and angry, and on 9 December, 1596, nine religious were arrested and orders were given to draw up a list of all Jesuits and to cause them all to die for death. On 5 February, 1597, twenty-six were crucified at Nagasaki, and died preaching and singing to the end. After the death of Hideyoshi in 1598 peace reigned for fifteen years. Christians increased and the faith manifested itself in all manner of good works; 130 Jesuits, some secular priests, and about 30 religious of the Orders of St. Francis, St. Dominic, and St. Augustine worked side by side. In 1609 and 1613 Dutch and English Protestants arrived who were envious of the Spanish and Portuguese Catholics. In 1613 persecution recommenced. In that year the project of Date Masamune of the Province of Roku-yemon on an embassy to Pope Paul V and the King of Spain, the Franciscan Sotelo accompanying him. In the following year (1614) the edict of destruction was published by the new master of the empire, Ieyasu Tokugawa, the first shogun of that name. It was decreed that Catholicism be abolished, and this edict was renewed by Hidetada in 1616, the successor of Ieyasu. The result was horrible. In 1622 took place what was called the "great Martyrdom", fifty-two chosen Christians being martyred on the same day (2 Sept.) at Nagasaki, twenty-seven being decapitated, and five burnt. In 1616 Hakodate an event of this year, under Iemitsu, the persecution waxed still more furious and extended throughout the empire. The cruelty and refinement of the tortures are unparalleled even in the history of the early ages of the Church. The exact number of the victims is unknown. In 1637 in the province of Arima 37,000 Christians, driven to extremities, revolted, shut themselves up within the fortress of Shimabara, and were slain to the last one. In 1640 four Portuguese ambassadors who had gone from Macao to Nagasaki were called upon to apostatize, and when they refused they were put in a public pillory; the further punishment of their followers was sent back to Macao with this warning: "While the sun warms the earth let no Christian be so bold as to venture into Japan. Let this be known to all men. Though it were the King of Spain in person or the God of the Christians or the Great Shaka himself [Buddha], whatsoever shall disobey this prohibition will pay for it with his head." Thus Japan was closed, and remained so for two centuries, during which time the persecution did not cease. A price was set on the head of foreign and native Christians. Each year every Japanese was called upon to trample the cross; once a day but a third time annually to separate themselves from the Christian population and allow themselves to be confined as prisoners in Nagasaki on the Island of Deshima, in order to carry on business with the Japanese. In 1642 five Jesuits embarked by stealth for Japan where they died after frightful tortures. They were followed in 1643 by five others who met the same fate, and an attempt on the part of the Dominicans of the Philippines (1647) was not more fortunate. If other attempts were made to enter this tomb it is not known. The last known is that of the Abbé Sidotti and the Jesuits of Como, at the age of forty, landed unaccompanied on the Japanese coast. Delivered to the governor of Nagasaki by the Prince of Satsuma, he was first examined in that town, and then, at the command of the shogun, conducted to Yedo and condemned to perpetual imprisonment. "The mention of that cell is still called "Zaks" (Hill of the Christians). While there he baptised two of his jailors and died after five years of captivity (1715). The learned Arai Hakuseki, government interpreter in the examination of Sidotti, wrote his history ("Sei yo Kibun", European history) which was reprinted in the "Missions Catholiques", 1894. However, in spite of persecution some vague and infrequent signs seemed to indicate that all the Christians of Japan had not perished. The Corean missionaries several times attempted to assure themselves of this, but without success, for since 1538 it had been impossible to establish any contact with the Japanese on any side. Interest in the Japanese mission, however, continued to increase, and in April, 1844, Père Forcade was sent to Japan as a missionary. He stayed at Okinawa in the Riu-Kiu Islands with the Chinese cateur Ko as a companion. He was followed by Père Leturdu, Adnet, Père Mermet, Girard, and Moun- coc of the Société des Missions Etrangères of Paris. They waited for fourteen years, on the Riu-kui or at Hong-Kong, seeking by every means to gain entrance into Japan. During fourteen years of labour and sufferings they baptized two Japanese. Finally a treaty was signed between France and Japan on 13 September 1858, and ratified 22 September, 1859. The missionaries were free to reside in open ports and have there a church for the service of foreigners. Père Girard was provisionally named superior of the mission, and for the ratification of the treaty he went as interpreter to Yedo with the consul-general, de Bellecourt. The three ports of Hakodate, Kanagawa-Yokohama, and Nagasaki were soon occupied. The labour in these places was difficult and sojourn there dangerous, for prejudice against foreigners and Christians had not disappeared. Père Mermet built a house and church at Hakodate and the others did the same at Nagasaki. At first they taught French in order to make friends and prepare for the future. In the new church at Nagasaki on 17 March, 1865, occurred an ever-memorable event, when fifteen Christians made themselves known to Père Petitjean, assuring him that there were a great many others, about 50,000 in all being known. It is easy to imagine the joy which greeted this discovery after more than two centuries of waiting and patience. There were three marks by which these descendants of martyrs recognized the new missionaries as the successors of their ancient fathers: the face of the Blessed Virgin, and the celibacy of the clergy. In the following year (1866) Père Petitjean was named Vicar Apostolic of Japan. The extreme ardour of the Christians attracted attention and aroused the old hatred. In July, 1867, persecution recommenced; 40,000 faithful of Urakami near Nagasaki were exiled to various provinces. The same proscription was extended to other towns; everywhere the choice was apostasy or exile, and the greater number courageously confessed their faith. There was no bloodshed, but the trials were severe. The French missionists continued their labours. During this time they continued to labour in the seaports. In March, 1873, while the Japanese embassy was travelling through Europe, the exiles were re-
At present they have an orphanage and three schools, one of them at Shizuoka, for the middle classes, and a course in foreign languages and arts for the higher classes, with 180 pupils. In 1877 came the Sisters of the Infant Jesus of Chauffailles. They have orphanages and private schools at Osaki, Kobe, and Sapporo. In 1886, of the 43,531 inhabitants of Hakodate, Tokio, Sendai, Morioka, and Yatsushiro, with more than 800 pupils.

In 1888 the Marianist Fathers established themselves in Tokio. Their work was slow and laborious, but uninterrupted. They have at present a primary and secondary school with 902 pupils, of whom 71 are Catholic and 29 catechumens; and a foreign language course for adults with 100 pupils. Of these 902 pupils, 149 are the sons of generals, admirals, superior officers, ambassadors, ministers, consuls, deputies, senators. There are 19 European teachers and 26 Japanese. Five Marianist Fathers conduct courses at the university, the school for nobles, the school of manœuvres, the school of cadets, and that of the military intendance. They have besides at Nagasaki a commercial institute with 186 pupils; at Osaka (1898) a commercial school, with 498 pupils; at Yokohama (1902) a higher primary school, with commercial courses for foreigners or Eurasians of all nationalities, with 120 pupils. In all these schools student and graduate societies for piety, zeal, friendship, sport, etc., are flourishing; and the peasant festivals by which they raise money are regularly attended by people from among the ancient Christians of Kiussa; a house for this purpose was opened in April, 1910, at Urakami.

In 1896 Trappists from four different nationalities came to Hokkaido. Within twelve years, despite difficulties of all sorts, of a total of about 1000 acres, comprising manœuvres, vineyards and ravines, they had cleared and made valuable about 620 acres and formed a Christian colony of more than 100 persons.

The Trappistines came from France in 1888. Their start was painful. But they now have no difficulty in securing recruits from among the ancient Christians of Nagasaki. They are engaged in the cheese industry, and development, at first despairing of, has been rapid.

In 1905 the whole of the Island of Shikoku was given to the Spanish Dominicans. This is the fifth ecclesiastical division of Japan, with 300 Christians.

The Franciscans returned in 1906. They are at Sapporo and Hakodate. There are now 1800 baptized, 2 Canadians, an Englishman, and a Frenchman, engaged in teaching languages and in the ministry.

The Fathers of the Divine Word of Steyel came in 1907. They consist of seven Germans and one Austrian. They teach German, English, French, and Chinese, and preach the Gospel.

On 1 January, 1908, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, 12 in number, English, Belgian, and French, opened a house for higher education at Tokio; on 1 July the Servants of the Holy Ghost, 5 in number, from Germany and Austria came to Aikita, where they have a kindergarten, a school of dressmaking, and one of French and German languages. On 1 September 7 Franciscan Sisters from France, Mexico, and Italy came to Sapporo, where they established sewing and embroidery classes, a school of housekeeping, and a dispensary. Sisters of the same congregation care for the lepers at Kumeato. Finally on 17 October three Jesuit Fathers, English, German, and French, established themselves at Tokio for higher education and journalism. Thus the Catholic Church, one in faith, with its religious bodies of every country and name, has in Japan a perfect universal character.

Protestantism.—Protestantism appeared in Japan in 1859 at the opening up of the country. The first arrivals were the American Episcopalians, the best-known of whom was Channing Moore Williams.
Shortly afterwards came the Presbyterians; James Curtis Hepburn, followed by Mr. Werbeck (1861) and Mr. Thompson (1863). They halted first at Yokohama. Their religious reunions were called “prayer-meetings” (Kito-kuwai). The first Japanese baptism took place in 1864. Protestant missionaries were also at Nagasaki prior to the discovery of the old Christians (1615). The Christians of Urakami addressed themselves before going to the Catholic Church. The first Japanese Protestant Church was organized in 1872, after the last persecution, and inaugurated in 1875. Until that time only ten baptisms had been administered. During these early years the work was almost impossible, but the time of the missionaries was chiefly employed in the translation of the Holy Scriptures. That of the New Testament was completed in 1880, and that of the Old Testament in 1887. A number of them were also employed in teaching either in the schools founded by themselves or as professors in the Japanese schools. Their aim was to attack the pagan error at its very root by means of instruction, and also to have a right to live in the interior of the country, which was hitherto forbidden to foreigners. In 1876 a kind of university called Doshisha was founded at Kyoto, the mark being supervised by several American missions. The intention was to form Christians who should be solidly instructed in their religion and men capable of embracing any career. This celebrated school was very prosperous under the rector, Nijima Jo; it had as many as 1500 students, but, having been declared independent several years since, has lost much of its importance.

An event of considerable importance in 1877 was the union of the hitherto divided forces of the American and Scotch Presbyterians; the Dutch Reformed Mission, the Presbyterian Mission, and the Scotch Presbyterian Mission of the Japanese, organized formerly the United Church of Christ in Japan (Nippon Cristo Ichi Kyokoku). They were afterwards joined by the German Reformed Mission (1886), the South Presbyterian Mission (1887), and the Cumberland Presbyterian Mission (1890). In a General Assembly held at Tokio in 1891 the Articles of Faith and the constitution of the new church were drawn up. Its new name was Nihon Cristo Kyokoku (Church of Christ in Japan). The chief Protestant college at Tokio belongs to this United Church, and instruction is here given according to the spirit of Protestant Christian religion and science.

During the period of religious tolerance the missionaries flocked to Japan and baptisms multiplied rapidly. The desire to learn English attracted to them many young Japanese. In December, 1889, the total number of Japanese converted to Protestantism was 31,181; foreign missionaries, 527; native ordained ministers, 135. There were 274 churches, more than half of which were self-supporting. The contributions of Japanese Christians for 1889 amounted to 53,503 yen. Several religious associations, especially that of Christian Youth, were flourishing.

In 1889 there were included the Episcopal Church of America, governed for more than thirty years by Bishop Williams, and the Established Church of England, whose first bishop in Japan was Dr. Poole (1883). These two churches have agreed to work in concert and the constitution uniting them was drawn up in 1888. There is in existence now the only national church under the name Nihon Sci-Ko-Kuwei (the Holy Catholic Church of Japan). Hierarchyically constituted, it has divided all Japan, including Formosa, into six districts; it numbers 13,384 baptized Christians; 228 foreign missionaries, clerics or laymen or women; and 266 Japanese assistants.

The following is the number and relative importance of the other Protestant missions of all denominations at present in Japan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th>Natives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Kumiai Churches</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>American Baptist</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Bible Societies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Evangelical Association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>South Korean Mission</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>German Evangelical Mission</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>American Christian Convention</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Women's Christian Temperance Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Young Men's Christian Association</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Universalist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Scandinavian Japan Alliance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Evangelical Lutheran</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>South Baptist Convention</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Hepatitis Faith Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>United Brethren</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Seventh Day Adventists</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Oriental Mission Society</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Free Methodists</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Finnish Lutheran Mission</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Young Women's Christian Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>The Apostolic Faith Movement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Nihon Cristo Ko-Kuwei (United Presbyterian)</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Nihon Sci-Ko-Kuwei (United Episcopalians)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the chief denominations. The total number of missionaries given by Protestant statistics for 1908 is 789 foreigners, including women, and 1303 Japanese, ordained or not, men or women. The number of practical church members is 57,830; not practical, 10,554; churches, 408; young men in the schools, 3604; young women, 5228; Sunday schools, 1066, with 84,160 children; publishing houses, 7; volumes issued during the year, 1,974,851. The property of the different missions, churches, schools, etc., is valued at 3,536,315 yen. Contributions of Christians for 1907 equaled 274,608 yen, and the expenditure for the Japanese churches and the work of evangelization amounted to 448,878 yen, not including the salaries of the missionaries and their expenses. In the above are not included the Unitarians, who mingle with all denominations; the Independent Christians, who are not attached to any church; the Methodist Episcopalians, who have a Japanese bishop, the Rev. Honda; several Japanese neo-Christian sects who are wholly independent either in government or in doctrine. They are eclectic, who aim to adapt Christianity to the ideas and spirit of Japan, and thus to found a new and special national religion. Up to the present time Protestantism in Japan has been chiefly American, but now it seems about to become Japanese. According as the Japanese churches become self-supporting, their tendency is to free themselves from the authority of foreigners. There is an evolution in religious ideas; many Christian ideas have passed into the spirit of Japan, and many Christian works have been imitated by them, but faith in even the fundamental dogmas shows a tendency to disappear.

Russian Mission.—The Russian Mission, or Orthodox Church of Russia in Japan, dates from 1861. A hospital had previously been built at Hakodate for Russians and Japanese. A Russian monk, the Rev. Nicolai, was attached to it as chaplain with a church near the hospital. The hospital having been destroyed by fire, the church remained, and the Rev. Nikolai served as a missionary at Hakodate, where he baptized a number of Japanese; this was the beginning. In 1870 the Russian minister to Japan obtained from the Jap-
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Japanese Government the grant of a special territory as a branch of the Russian occupation, which territory was located at Surugadai in the very centre of Tokio and one of the most advantageous sites of the capital. Here Father Nicolai established his residence and the centre of the Orthodox Church. He began by training well-instructed men and native assistants, for which purpose he had an ordinary college and a school of philosophy and theology; later on he also had a special school for young women. He preached his religion by means of carefully trained catechists and priests. Since 1881 he has also had a religious review, published twice monthly, and a publication committee installed in his house has edited all the most necessary books. In 1886 Father Nicolai was consecrated bishop in Russia and in 1890 he completed the erection of his cathedral, a truly magnificent monument, one of the sights of the capital.

Bishop Nicolai enjoys great personal esteem; for the most part alone, he has founded and governed by himself everything pertaining to his mission. During the Russo-Japanese war the situation was very delicate, but the Christians, at least the greater number of them, did not abandon him. Even during this time he continued all his undertakings unmolested, his house being guarded without by Japanese soldiers. Previously he received from the Holy Synod 90,000 yen yearly, but since the Russo-Japanese war, these and other resources from Russia have greatly diminished, while on the other hand the price of everything in Japan has increased. The bishop was therefore compelled to diminish also his expenses, to dispose a part of his staff, and to exhort the Christians to contribute more generously to the support of their Church.

But after the victories of the Japanese over the Russian armies it is not easy to conceive of even Japanese, though Christians, as members of a church hitherto supported and protected by the Russian Government. That is why the leaders among these Christians, after having agreed among themselves, declared to "Archbishop" Nicolai their intention of being supported entirely by themselves and of becoming independent of Russia. And as Russia has its national church they wished to have also their Japanese National Church (June, 1900). Little has been written concerning the work of the Russians in Japan; even in Russia almost nothing has been published. According to one Protestant reckoning, the Orthodox Church numbers 30-166 baptized Christians; according to another, only 13,000 (the last figure perhaps denounces those who are practical). There are 57 native priests and 129 catechists. Expenses for church and evangelization in 1907 amounted to 55,279 yen; contributions of Christians, 10,711 yen. Churches or places of preaching.

265. Among the Russians, as among Protestants, and, in fact, everywhere throughout Japan, the tendency of mind is towards independence.

François Ligneul.

Laws Concerning Religion and Schools.—(1) According to the Constitution of the empire every Japanese is free to believe and to profess the religion of his choice, provided he does not disturb public order, and that he observes the other laws of the country. Religious manifestations and assemblies, ordinary or extraordinary are permitted, provided the police are informed and that all disorder be avoided. In the national ceremonies which Christians and pagans mingle, practical difficulties sometimes arise which are inevitable because of the mixture of religions. Local differences also occur, though somewhat rarely, owing to popular prejudice or the dispositions of a few, but in principle and before the law all religions are equal.

(2) Any Japanese or foreigner is free to found a school, provided he observes the laws and regulations laid down by the Japanese Board of Education concerning hygiene, qualifications of teachers, matter to be taught, etc. There are official schools for popular education, such as the primary and middle or high schools for boys and girls (shogakkō, chūgakkō, and Kōtō-shōgakkō), and non-official or private schools, which may also be primary or others at choice. But the diplomas issued by private schools have no official value, at least no value equal to that of schools which are formally recognized by the ministers of public instruction. A school for which this recognition is desired must conform to the same regulations and control as the government schools and be in no way inferior to them. Public inspection regularly takes place only in official or recognized schools.

(3) In the so-called schools of "popular education", which are official or recognized, no religion is taught during hours of class. Each school may profess its own. However, popular instruction in Japan is not atheistic; it gives as the basis for private and social morality primitive history, Japanese mythology, worship of all things to the gods or ancestors of the country. But higher education in general inclines strongly towards materialism.

(4) For the possession and administration of their goods, churches and schools may, if they so desire, confide themselves to be represented, and as such possess movable and immovable property. On this point Christian communities or establishments are subject to the same laws as the others. Each juridical person is represented by a responsible council who sends to the Government an inventory of the goods, the annual accounts of administration, the amount of purchases or sales, the condition of the staff, if it be a mission, the number of priests and faithful, if a school, that of masters and students, the precise location of churches and residences, the name of the titulars, and their changes, if there are any. Churches, benevolent foundations, etc., not on the ministry of the interior; schools, on the ministry of public instruction. The aim of this legislation with these regulations is to place the juridical persons under the protection of the law.

Taxes.—Schools pay no taxes. Churches and all houses serving as residences and those attached to these churches (priest's house, that of the catechists, that of the servants, etc.) are also exempt from taxation. They enjoy all the privileges granted to the pagan temples; houses of revenue, if there are any, are subject to the common law and pay the tax.

Days of Rest.—Schools, government employees, and bank employees are free from Saturday (noon) until Monday. This custom has been introduced since the
coming of the foreigners, but has not yet been adopted among the people. Labourers work on Sunday, their day being Saturdays and first night of the month.

History.—Ethnology.—Much obscurity surrounds the origin of the Japanese people. The primitive population, besides being very sparse, appears to have belonged wholly to the people called Ainos. Beyond a doubt these came from the Asiatic continent by way of the Northwest Passage and fifteen years after the mingrant more powerful than themselves who came from the South. The best of these Ainos seem to have accepted the civilization of their masters and become united with them, and from the fusion of these two races are descended the Japanese of to-day. The most reliable estimates of the so-called Ainu number in the northern and in the end abandoned the Great Island, confining themselves in Yezo (Hokkaido) and Sakhalin, where they show a tendency to decrease and disappear. They are small and strong, with long hair and beards. Their language is quite different from that of the Japanese. Their garments, which are shorter than those of the Japanese, are made of the bark of trees. In general, they are mild-natured and simple-minded. They live by the chase and fishing, making use of the harpoon to catch seals, and slaying bears with stakes and poisoned arrows. They adore the deities of the country that they believe to be his son. Each year they sacrifice a bear with great solemnity. They believe also in good and evil geniuses and worship several of the divinities and personages of Japan.

General Division.—The history of Japan is divided naturally into three chief periods. The first (autocratic period), which extends from the beginning to the shogunate of Kamakura, embraces eighteen centuries (660 b.c.—A.D. 1192), during which time the authority was in the bands of the emperors. The second begins with the shogunate of the Minamoto (1192), and ends with that of the Ashikaga (1338), and is the period of the family feudalism. Lastly, the third, beginning with the Imperial Restoration, witnessed Japan's complete modification of her secular institutions, the Europeanization of her administration, and saw the country take her place among the great nations of the world.

Auroral Period (660 b.c.—A.D. 794)—According to Japanese tradition, in the seventh century b.c., a tribe, probably of Malay origin, which had landed and established itself at Kiusiu, advanced towards the north, and after some years of warfare chose the region of Yamato as a place to settle. Hasamu-no-mikoto, the first among the Kofun, was the first emperor of Japan (Jimmu Tenno). His enthronization, assigned to 660 b.c., is considered as the foundation of the empire, and the beginning of a dynasty which was to reign for twenty-five centuries.

After a gap of 600 years in the national annals we find a rough sort of civilization during the reigns of Sujin (97—30 b.c.) and Suinin (29 b.c.—A.D. 70). Then comes the famous legend of the hero Yamatotakeru (131—190). His son merely ascended the throne (192—200). His widow, the Empress Jingo, ruled after him. The Japanese chronicles attribute to her the conquest of three small kingdoms which lay south of Corea. She was succeeded by her fourth son, Ojin (201—310). During his reign two Corean scholars, Ajiki and Wani, came to Japan, bringing with them Chinese literature and Confucianism (285). Ojin's son, Ninoku, governed for eighty-seven years (313—399). The whole country was at peace, but after him bloody scenes were multiplied in the imperial family until direct descendent were wiped out. A branch laterally descended from Ojin ascended the throne. Under the fourth sovereign of this branch (Kimmee, 532) Buddhism was brought to Japan by monks from Corea. The introduction of Buddhism brought about radical changes in ideas and customs. Prince Shotoku (573—621) favoured its progress, but it was the Emperor Kotoku (645—54), who, by his famous reform of the Tenno era, accomplished the greatest public and religious revolution which transformed Japan. Everything was then modelled on the Chinese form of government, and save for a few modifications this system remained in force until the Restoration (1868). In the following century the Empress Gemmei (708—14) transferred the capital to Nagaokakyo, it remained for seven-five years (708—785). The fiftieth emperor, Kwammu (782—805), built the city of Kyoto (794), which was the residence of the court until the imperial Restoration. The Fujiwara then became powerful. They exercised the regency (sessho) during the minority and, after that, ruled as princes. The ninth emperor, Kwampaku, continued to govern even after he had attained his majority. However, the effeminate nobles of the palace neglected the career of arms and gave themselves up to frivolous pastimes. Because of this decadence of the imperial authority frequent revolts took place which the court was powerless to repress, and for this purpose called on military clans. Their power became more and more formidable, two families especially, the Taira and the Minamoto, acquiring great influence. Both wished to secure the preponderance of power, and for thirty-five years their rivalry was intense. Finally in 1185, the Minamoto overcame and completely annihilated their adversaries (1185). The victorious Minamoto, Yoritomo, then raised to the throne a four-year-old child and assumed the title of Sei-i Taishogun. A new era had begun in the history of Japan; feudalism was inaugurated.

Age of Feudalism.—It is subdivided into three parts: the Kamakura period (1192—1338); the Ashikaga period (1338—1573); and the Tokugawa period (1603—1868).

Kamakura Period.—Having been named Shogun, Yoritomo installed himself at Kamakura, which he made his capital. After this he undertook the administrative reorganization, which was to concentrate all authority in his hands. Unfortunately for his plans, he died before this was accomplished (1199). His two sons, Yorio and Sanetomo, allowed the power to pass into the hands of their mother's clan, that of the Hojo. The last who were descended from the Taira, dared not assume the shogunal dignity, but they succeeded under the title of Shukken (regents) in retaining the power for a century which was the most prosperous in the history of Japan. About this time the only invasion with which Japan had to contend, that of the Mongols, was frustrated through the energy of Hojo Tokimune, and by a providential storm which destroyed the enemy's fleet (1281). However, decadence manifested itself among the Hojo, family dissensions increased, weakening the usurped authority and preparing the way for a restoration of the imperial power. The Emperor Go Daigo (1319—39) was the instrument of this work of restoration. Assisted by faithful followers he began the struggle, and in less than two years the supremacy of Kamakura was at an end (1333). But rivalries arose among the generals. The clan of the Ashikaga, descended from the Minamoto, rose in revolt, its head, Takuaji, assumed the title of shogun, raised to the throne an emperor of his own choosing, and thus founded a new dynasty of shoguns which retained its power for more than two centuries.

Ashikaga Period (1338—1573).—The dethroned emperor defended himself courageously. His son and grandsons continued the struggle, and for more than fifty-six years was seen the singular phenomenon of two emperors at one time. In 1392 a compromise was effected between the rival powers which put an end to the scheme. The first Ashikaga shogun kept within reasonable limits their warrior spirit, developed by many years of war, but their weaker
successors passed all bounds. From the civil war of the era of Onin (1467) the troubles never ceased, and for a century the empire was a prey to the horrors of intestinal strife. The shoguns were henceforth no more than toys in the hands of their chief feudatories. When the shogunate of the Ashikagas was on the verge of collapse, the last of this line, Oda Nobunaga, came into possession of his inheritance. It was about this time, during the reign of Go-Nara-tenno (1527-1557), that Europeans appeared for the first time in Japan. The honorific title of emperor was first to be permanently vested in the country was reserved for a Portuguese named Fernão Mendes Pinto (1542). Seven years later, 15 August, 1549, St. Francis Xavier landed at the port of Kagoshima.

Man of genius as he was, Nobunaga conceived the project of concentrating in the hands of a single master the power which the daimio disputed to the injury of the nation. Having defeated the most turbulent and subjugated the others to his will, he deposed the last Ashikaga shogun and seized the reins of government, but he was treacherously slain by a vassal who owed everything to him, and death marked his work prematurely. The succession fell to a soldier of fortune named Hideyoshi, who succeeded in removing the sons of his former master. Being incapable of aspiring to the dignity of shogun, he assumed the highest of the titles of the civil hierarchy, that of Kwampaku. Later, in 1592, he took the title of Taiko (Sovereign Lord), under which name he is known in history. Blindly by ambition, he conceived the project of taking possession of Corea, but despite some successes, this campaign ended in disaster. Hideyoshi did not long survive his failure; he died in 1598. Before his death he had charged his chief daimio with the government of the domain. His son Hideyori was his heir. Among the five there was one who could not be content with second rank. This was Tokugawa Ieyasu (1543-1616), a descendant of the Minamoto. After the death of Hideyoshi he withdrew from his colleagues and made war against them. The famous victory which he won in the plain of Sekigahara assured him a supremacy which his family retained for two centuries and a half. Three years after his triumph Ieyasu received the title of shogun (1603).

Tokugawa Period (1603-1868).—Two years after this Ieyasu transmitted the shogunate to his son, who was the first shogun (Shogun), and who witnessed the annihilation at Osaka (1615) of the descendants of Hideyoshi. After a period of great troubles Ieyasu inaugurated a powerful feudal regime, and gave to Japan a political and social constitution which was upheld almost till 1868. According to this constitution the emperor was nominally master of all the territory, even the shogun asking investiture of him. But this investiture was a mere fiction. The office of the shogun being hereditary, the titular possessed effective power, and disposed at will of lands and even of the posts of the emperor’s Court. Socially Japan was divided into eight hereditary and closed classes: the kuge (court nobles), daimio, hatamoto, samurais, labourers, artisans, merchants, etc. (a kind of pariah). Only the first four, the so-called privileged classes, had the right to bear arms. Before dying Ieyasu had assured the power to his family. His immediate successor, Ietsugu (1605-22), continued his work and made still heavier the iron yoke which he had imposed on his country. Hidetada forbad every Japanese under most severe penalties to leave his native land, and it was he who discontinued all intercourse with foreigners, except the Dutch, the China trade being the only one to which the country was allowed to partly commerce, forbade the construction of boats which would allow of long trips (1636), caused to be put to death ambassadors who came to Macao to request liberty of traffic (1640), restricted to the Island of Deshima (Nagasaki) the Dutch who were authorized to maintain commercial relations with Japanese, and passed the law which obliged the daimio to reside part of the time at Yedo and part on their estates, when they were to leave their wives and children at Yedo. From the victory of Otama at the battle of Mission in 1565 the shogun, Ieyasu, Ienobu, Ietaugu, Yoshimune, Ietsugu, Ietsu
lowed almost immediately by that of Emperor Komei (13 Feb., 1867). Hitogetsubashi succeeded Iemochi, and took the name of Keiki. He was the fifteenth and last Tokugawa shogun. Dismayed by the task which confronted him, Keiki gave in his resignation, 15 October, 1867, and the shogunate was suppressed 8 January, 1868. The partisans of the shogun revolted and wished to restore his authority, but their troops were contested by the forces of the imperial army. After a brilliant defence Enomoto capitulated at Hakodate, 27 July, 1869. This was the end of the civil war. The imperial restoration was an accomplished fact.

Imperial Restoration.—On his accession to the throne the emperor transferred the seat of his government to Yedo, which he renamed Tokio (capital of the East) and became the capital of the empire. The whole governmental system was completely changed. Even as formerly the Japanese had copied China, so now they set themselves to imitate Europe. Foreign specialists, engineers, soldiers, seamen, professors, priests, business men, bankers, etc., were summoned, and thanks to their co-operation all branches of service received an organisation similar to that established among European nations. The chief events of this period may be summed up as follows: 1868, abolition of the shogunate and restoration of the imperial authority; 1869, Yedo becomes the capital of the empire, under the name of Tokio; end of the resistance of the partisans of the shogun; 1871, abolition of the shasimo and division of Japan into departments; 1872, law establishing conscription; first national exposition at Tokio; 1873, adoption of the Gregorian calendar; abolition of the edicts of persecution against Christianity; creation of primary schools; 1874, insurrection of Saga; Formosa expedition; 1875, Japan cedes to Russia its rights over the Island of Sakhalin (Kurafuto) in exchange for the Kurile or Kourile Islands (Chishima); 1876, treaty with Corea; Sakuraidon forbidden to carry two swords; riots of Kumamoto (Higo) and at Hagi (Nagato); 1877, insurrection of Satsuma; Japan's entrance into the Universal Postal Union; 1879, annexation of the Riu-kiu Islands; adhesion of Japan to International Telegraphic Union; 1880, creation of provincial assemblies; 1881, promise of a constitution for 1890; organisation of political parties; 1883, first tramways; creation of an official journal (Kyoiku); 1884, creation of the five titles of nobility, viz. Ko, Ke, Haku, Shi, Dan (duke, marquess, count, viscount, baron); 1885, establishment of the council of ministers (Naikaku); foundation of the navigation company, Yosen Kiwaishi; Treaty of Tien-tsin with China; 1888, creation of privy council (sumitsu); foundation of the Constitution; prohibition of duelling; 1890, first session of Parliament; foundation of an academy (Tokio Gakushukai-in); 1891, plot of Tsuda Sanzo against the Caresvitch Nicholas III; 1894, war with China; 1895, Treaty of Shimonoeshi, 18 April, ratified at Che-fu, 8 May; intervention of Russia, France, and Germany; withdrawal from Liao-tung peninsula; China cedes Formosa and 700.—The only work composed during this period is the "Kyujiki" (Annals of Antiquity), which has been lost.

Nara Period (710–784).—The chief works which appeared during this period are: the "Kojiki" (712), record of ancient matters; "Nihoiki" (Chronicles of Japan), stories and legends of the early times; "Man'yoshu" (collection of a myriad. leaves), a collection of ancient poems, composed about 750; it contains more than 4000 pieces, the greater number being tanka (poems of 31 syllables); held in great esteem by connoisseurs, it constitutes at present a valuable source of philological, historical, and archaeological information.

Classic Period (Hei-an, 800–1186).—This period is the golden age of Japanese literature. A remarkable fact is that the two greatest works were written by women; they were "Genji monogatari", composed in the tenth century by Murasaki Shikibu, maid of honour at the court, and "makura no soshi" (Tales of a Vigil), a classical work in twelve volumes, composed by Sei Shonagon, a lady of the imperial court. After these two works the most celebrated was "Kokinshu" (a collection of ancient and modern poems); "Tosa niki" — an account of a journey; "Taketori monogatari", tales of a bamboo-gatherer; "Ise monogatari", story of Ise. The period of Hei-an witnessed important progress in the art of writing, the invention of phonetic writing called kana, and the alphabet as it is at present, in forty-eight syllables.
Kamakura Period (1192–1338).—Principal works: "Geimei seisui ki" (history of the grandeur and decline of the Minamoto and the Taira); "Heike monogatari" (account of the Taleor family); "Hogen monogatari" (history relating the war of Hogen); "Heiji monogatari" (history of the war of Heiji), a classic work; and many other less important books. This epoch saw the Tibetans with their "sky veils" (the hundred-bodied head); this is a collection of 100 tanka (poems of thirty-one syllables) by 100 different men, and was very popular. The time between 1332 and 1603 was singularly barren of literary productions. Three principal works belong to this period: "Inkoku toto monogatari" (the story of the reign of the divine emperors); "Taihei-ki" (tale of peace); "Tsурэzure kusa", a collection of sketches and anecdotes, a classic work composed in the fourteenth century, which occupies a very high place in Japanese literature. To this period belong the No, lyrical dramas, and the Kyogen, comedies. In ancient times the only public representations were the sacred dances called kagura, at the gate of the temples, in honour of the gods. To these in the fourteenth century was added a spoken dialogue which was the origin of the No. The Kyogen was a sort of comic play between the No and the Noh.

Yedo or Tokugawa Period.—This period embraces a greater number of subjects than the others. One of the earliest works of the time is the "Taiko-ki" (History of Taiko Hideyoshi), 1625. The study of Chinese books was then given the place of honour. The chief promoter of this movement was Fujisawa Seikwa, who founded a school of Confucianism and left a number of disciples, the most famous of whom was Hayashi Razan, also called Doshun (1583–1657). Arai Hakuseki (1656–1725) is also numbered among the most learned in Chinese (Kangyakusa). Then came the Wakan ronin literature; Chikamatsu Monzaemon, Japan's most famous dramatic writer, who composed ninety-seven joruri (dramas); Basho (1644–94); and Keicho (1640–1701); Kado Azumamaro (1669–1736) opened at Kyoto a school in which he taught the Chinese ideas then in favour; the most distinguished of his disciples was Mabuchi, who left numerous works which are indispensable to those who now study the ancient Japanese language; Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801), the greatest of the Wagakusa (scholars of Japanese literature) and one of the most remarkable men Japan has produced. He published fifty-five works in more than 180 volumes. His "Attacakt", one of the most learned writers of Japan (1776–1843), Kyokutei, Bakin, Tanchin, Jippensha, Ikuu, and The along Shusu are renowned as romance writers. Rai Sanyo (1780–1832) is distinguished as an historian, his two chief works being the "Nihongwa-shi" and the "Nihon seki", which are the greatest value for the study of Japanese history. Another important work of the Yedo period is the "Dainihonshi", a great history in 243 volumes, written by a commission of scholars.

Restoration Period (1868–1909).—During this period a veritable passion for European learning took possession of the nation. Many young men went to Europe and America to study. Soon a group of writers gave translations and original works in response to a general demand for ideas concerning European learning, customs, laws, and institutions. The most distinguished of these authors was Fukuzawa Yukichi, whose "Taisei Kyokujutsu" (The Principles of the Study of the World) is the best known. Among his most worthy works are: "Kaiikoku shimatari" (1888), by Shimada Saburo, a collection of documents treating of the opening up of the country; "Shorai no Nihon" (Japan of the Future), by Tokutomi Ichiro; a commentary on the Constitution, by the Marquis Ito; the "Nihon no genki", by the Marquis Toda; "The Social Life in Japan", by Ikeda Ei. The best known novelists are: Tsuzuki Yuzo, Sudo Nansui, Osaka Tokutarou, and, the most celebrated of all, Koda Nariyuki. Among poetic works is the "Shingaibusho", or reform of Japanese versification, in imitation of European poetry, published by Toyama Masakatsu, in collaboration with Yatabe Ryokichiu and Inoue Tetsujiro.

Painting.—Among the arts painting has always held a first place in Japan. In the beginning, when Buddhism and Confucianism were introduced, the fine arts were wholly in a state of infancy. During the reign of Kimmie Tenno (A. D. 540) the Chinese arts were introduced. Painting and sculpture entered Japan with Buddhism and Confucianism, and the cultivation of the fine arts began. The oldest extant picture is probably the true reproduction of the Empress Suiko (593–628), and is preserved in the temple of Horyuji, near Nara. Several pictures of the Nara period (710–784) are in the temples of Yakushiji and at Nara. The most celebrated pictures of the Heian period (800–1180) are: Kudara no Kowari (853), of Corean descent; the bonze Kukai or Kobo daiishi, a religious painter; Kose Kanaoko (885–927), founder of the most ancient Japanese school, Koeryu (Koese genre), also called the primitive or Buddhist School; Fujisawa Motomitsu (1097), founder of the Yamato School (Japanese genre); Toba Sojo (1053–1114), and Araki, author of the humorous genre which is called after him Toba-e.

During the Kamakura period (1192–1338), in the thirteenth century, appeared a celebrated painter, a descendant of the powerful family of the Fujiwara, Fujiwara Tsunetaka, who founded the Tosa School, derived from the Japanese Yamato School, in which it became the principal branch. This school avoided Chinese influence, and applied itself to representing the scenes of the legends and history of Japan. In the beginning of the fifteenth century (Ashikaga period, 1332–1603) Josetsu founded a school of painting of Japanese scenes. Among his pupils were Sesshu, Shubun, and Kano Masanobu (1420–1503) is regarded as one of the great painters of the Chinese school. Kano Masanobu (1453–1490) gave his name to the School of Kanoryo, which proceeded from the Chinese School of Josetsu, and is subdivided into several branches. Kano Motonobu is the most famous representative of this school. At the end of the fifteenth century all Japanese painting belonged more or less to these two artistic sources, Tosa and Kano. The Tosa School represents Japanese art almost without foreign admixture; that of Kano belongs to Chinese influence.

Yedo Period (1603–1868).—Ogata Korin (1661–1716) created a manner of painting which was, so to speak, intermediary between the two schools of Kano and Tosa, uniting the decorative principles of both. The school which he founded is called by his name, Korin-ryu. It was the first to employ gold and silver powder in painting. Shekisai Hokusai is the best known representative of the Korin School. Maruyama Okyo, founder of the school of this name, rejected the hitherto received principles, and undertook a reform based on the observation of nature. With him idealism tended to disappear and realism began. His principal disciples were Soen, Rasetsu, Genki, and Sojun. About the middle of the seventeenth century Iwasa Matabei inaugurated a new style of painting. He aimed above all at reproducing the scenes of ordinary life. It is called the popular and realistic School (Ukiyo-e). The most celebrated painter of this school was Hokusai (1760–1849). The most marked Japanese evolution in the direction of absolute independence of every school, system, and convention. Except for Kikuchi Yosai (1788–1878), who completes the list of great stylists, everything centres around Hokusai, everything is inspired by his manner (his genius). In 1849, the Meiji Restoration began. Japan imitated, it no longer created. To-day it is in a period of transition in art as in all other
things. The classic school is disappearing by degrees, and popular art is without character or brilliancy. The struggle continues between Japanese and European art and with a view to promoting them there are three societies and five special reviews.

Ceramics.—Japanese pottery dates from the remotest antiquity, but the progress of ceramics compared with the other arts was very slow. The primitive potteries of Japan had for many centuries an embryonic and barbaric character. In the thirteenth century Kato Shiroumaemon, known by the name of Toshiro, introduced the processes in use in China and founded the first Seta workshops. The productions of Seta dominated the industry until the seventeenth century. The finest pieces are those of genius who was the real creator of national ceramics and who even to-day is regarded as the greatest ceramist Japan ever produced. Through him the Chinese, Corean, and Japanese elements were blended, and from their mixture emerged a national art. In recent years the making of porcelain has undergone considerable development owing to the demand from abroad. The chief species of porcelain are: Seta (Owari), 4,300 workmen, annual output 1,300,000 yen; Mino, 3,800 workmen, output 1,000,000 yen; Arita (Saga), workmen, 2,000; Kutani (Kaga), 1,200 workmen, output 300,000 yen; Kyomizu (Kyoto), one of the most important manufactories of Japan; Tokoname (Owari), output 320,000 yen; Tobe (Tyo), output 150,000 yen; Fujina or Isumo, output 120,000 yen; Hasami (Nagasaki), output 100,000 yen; Satsuma, output 40,000 yen, much esteemed by foreigners.

The history of the arts of Japan would fill a large volume. Sculpture, engraving, carving, bronze, lacquer-work, enameled work, metal alloy, are the principal branches in which the Japanese have excelled and produced truly remarkable work.

FINANCES.—From the earliest times large storehouses (shurure) were built to receive the objects sent as presents or taxes to the Court. At the reform of Tai-kwa (645) a ministry was constituted having at its head an Okura-kyo (minister of finance). He was charged with the collection of duties, the distribution of pensions, the verification of measurements, etc. In 1850 the name of Okura-sho was given to the ministry of finance. The minister of finance is charged with the resources of the State. He has under his jurisdiction three bureaus, that of accounts (Shukeikyoku), that of taxes (Shuzekyoku), and that of the administration of finances (Rikuzikyoku). The budget of receipts and expenses is drawn up yearly. Each minister prepares his own according to the needs of his department. These private budgets are arranged by the minister of finance, while at the same time means are devised to meet the expenses. This project is discussed at a council of the ministers, afterwards submitted to the Chamber of Deputies, who discuss it and give a decision, then to the Chamber of Peers, who reject or approve it. If the new budget is rejected, that of the previous year is adhered to. Lastly, the budget must always be submitted to the sanction of the emperor.

Table showing the progressive growth of the budget since the beginning of the present reign—:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>General Total of Receipts</th>
<th>General Total of Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899-70</td>
<td>20,959,499 yen</td>
<td>20,107,673 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-80</td>
<td>62,151,752 yen</td>
<td>60,317,578 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879-89</td>
<td>98,887,978 yen</td>
<td>79,718,677 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-90</td>
<td>254,525,524 yen</td>
<td>254,105,638 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-90</td>
<td>610,797,671 yen</td>
<td>610,797,671 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual average of the ordinary and extraordinary expenses of the Japanese army and navy in 1894-95, and during the years which followed the Treaty of Shimono-seki, was 104,524,000 yen; in 1908-09 they rose to 188,537,365 yen.

Public Debt.—The amount of the public debt on 31 December, 1907, was 2,276,346,452 yen; interior debt, 1,118,545,228 yen; foreign debt, 1,157,792,224 yen. The annual interest of the interior debt is 5%, that of the foreign debt, 4%, 4%, and 5%.

GOVERNMENT BUDGET, 1908-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinary Receipts</th>
<th>Extraordinary Receipts</th>
<th>Ordinary Expenses</th>
<th>Extraordinary Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land tax</td>
<td>85,718,504 yen</td>
<td>Civil list</td>
<td>3,069,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest tax</td>
<td>21,845,307 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of foreign affairs</td>
<td>3,168,233 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on licenses</td>
<td>71,095,094 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of foreign affairs</td>
<td>3,612,695 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on tobacco</td>
<td>90,071,918 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of the interior</td>
<td>13,415,333 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on sugar</td>
<td>19,462,196 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of finance</td>
<td>254,404,080 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on tobacco</td>
<td>10,956,817 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of war</td>
<td>70,209,779 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on tobacco</td>
<td>24,458,500 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of the navy</td>
<td>34,810,737 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs duties</td>
<td>41,410,920 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of justice</td>
<td>10,877,986 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on licenses</td>
<td>204,146,400 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of public instruction</td>
<td>6,258,353 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on licenses</td>
<td>2,041,183 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of agriculture and commerce</td>
<td>7,533,846 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on import</td>
<td>10,539,566 yen</td>
<td>Ministry of communications</td>
<td>25,067,049 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on licenses</td>
<td>1,765,000 yen</td>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>49,437 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on import</td>
<td>50,000,000 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on exports</td>
<td>10,218,841 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on import</td>
<td>22,935,184 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on import</td>
<td>20,374,682 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on import</td>
<td>6,600,504 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of ordinary receipts</td>
<td>475,737,999 yen</td>
<td>Total extraordinary receipts</td>
<td>427,194,732 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of extraordinary receipts</td>
<td>144,050,672 yen</td>
<td>Total extraordinary expenses</td>
<td>102,602,878 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total of ordinary and extraordinary receipts: 610,797,671 yen.
Amount of the public debt since the beginning of the present reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>4,688,000 yen</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>502,987,249 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>249,788,000 yen</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2,217,722,733 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>280,575,000 yen</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2,276,346,452 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the war with Russia the debt has increased 1,694,262,114 yen.

**Moneys and Bank Bills.**—The ingots of gold, silver, and brass in store at the treasury since the foundation in 1870 equal the sum of 1,058,550,262 yen. Money put in circulation since that time, 707,810,261 yen. Amount of money in the country, 31 December, 1907, 1,677,551,001 yen; amount of paper money, 369,984,111 yen.

**Banks.**—Before the Restoration of 1868 there did not exist a single Japanese bank properly so called. The new Government soon grasped the importance of this institution for the development of commerce and industry. Commissions were then sent abroad to study the various banking systems in use and to adopt that best suited to the country. Consequently a law of November, 1872, inaugurated in Japan the system of the plurality of banks of issue. But the results obtained having been purely negative, the system was modified in a more liberal sense (August, 1897). A large number of new banks were then founded, but this time there resulted such a fever of speculation, such a decline in paper money and government revenues, that the banks of issue had to be radically changed. In 1882 it was decided that in the future there should be no more banks of issue and that a central bank, the Bank of Japan, should alone have the privilege. The Bank of Japan was then charged with withdrawing from circulation by degrees the notes issued by the State and the 143 national banks in existence in 1882. The latter were transformed by degrees into ordinary banks, and in 1889 only one national bank remained, that of Japan, which to-day centralises all Japanese fiduciary circulation. Founded in 1882 with a capital of 10,000,000 yen, it has increased this to 30,000,000 and has a reserve fund of 21,500,000 yen. It is authorised to issue notes whose value it holds in reserve in gold and silver money and in ingots; moreover, it has the privilege of putting in circulation as much as 120,000,000 yen.

Japanese fiduciary circulation by decennial periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>55,500,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>228,570,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>369,584,000 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of special banks, ordinary banks, and savings banks at present equals 2194, with 2367 branches. Together they have a paid-up capital of 444,204,000 yen; reserve funds, 139,630,000 yen; net benefit, 86,712,000 yen; dividends, 34,893 yen. The most important ordinary banks are Mitsubishi, the Third, the Fifteenth, and the One Hundredth bank. In 1893 there were in Japan only 762 establishments of credit, possessing a paid-up capital of 84,512,584 yen. In the space of fourteen years the number of these establishments has increased by 1432, and their paid-up capital equals 359,692,000 yen, that is, it has been multiplied five times. In 1893 the business figures, representing sums deposited and drawn, in all banks, equalled 2,601,392,000 yen. In 1907 deposits alone reached 80,484,648,000 yen, and sums withdrawn, 68,843,187,000 yen. In fourteen years business has increased 39 times. Finally, in the course of 1907 the amount of sums deposited in banks, by the State and private individuals, equalled 27,237,717,000 yen.

**Bank Interest.**—In 1909 the interest on fixed deposits varied from 5% to 6%. For ten years it has oscillated between 5% and 7%. Banks lend only at 12%. The discount is 3%.

**Business Corporations.**—Until 1892 there was no law regulating the establishment and workings of companies collective in action and name. In 1893 the chapter of the new business code concerning companies was rendered obligatory. In consequence every business association had to secure from the Government the necessary authorisation to form and commence operations. The code having been modified in 1899, necessary authorisation was suppressed and companies might be freely formed on condition of conformity with the revised code. At the end of 1894 the nominal capital of all companies formed since 1875 did not exceed 245,251,624 yen. Immediately after the war with China, and in the single year of 1896, 1178 new companies were formed representing a capital of 334,421,463 yen.

The following table shows the nature, number, and importance of companies constituted in 1896 and 1907:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>1896</th>
<th>1907</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>2545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2777</td>
<td>3720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>113,216,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4595</td>
<td>397,519,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On 31 Dec., 1907, the reserve funds of all these companies equaled 254,992,738 yen. In fourteen years the number of companies has been doubled and their capital has been trebled.

**Insurance Companies.**—Before 1881 there was not a single insurance company in Japan constituted after the European model. An attempt at maritime insurance in 1881 was without success, as there was no law regulating this sort of enterprise. But the publication of a new code definitely fixed the legislation in this respect. Since that time (1893) the insurance companies have greatly developed.
British India, England, and Germany have profited most by the new order of things in Japan. Within thirty-four years, that is since 1873, Japan's export trade has increased 23 times.

Chief Exports and Imports with their Value in Yen.—Exports: raw silks, silk waste, handkerchiefs, poneges, 158,876,000 yen; cottons, cloth, napkins, 48,985,000 yen; chemical matches, 9,446,000 yen; fancy floor mattings, 5,743,000 yen; porcelains and crockery, 7,216,000 yen; lacquered articles, 1,643,000 yen; plaited work, 5,001,000 yen; umbrellas (European shape), 1,613,000 yen; cigarettes, 2,055,000 yen; tea, 12,618,000 yen; rice, 3,664,000 yen; dried cuttlefish, 2,401,000 yen; sea-weed, 709,000 yen; fish-oil, 2,975,000 yen; camphor, 5,026,000 yen; crude and refined copper, 29,262,000 yen; oil, 19,052,000 yen; vegetable wax, 1,070,000 yen. Imports: raw and spun cotton, prints, velvets, 131,718,000 yen; woollens, muslin, cloth, 24,878,000 yen; hemp, 3,569,000 yen; machines, 27,699,000 yen; locomotives and wagons, 2,933,000 yen; iron bars, 26,443,000 yen; rails, 3,828,000 yen; iron nails, iron, and steel, 11,172,000 yen; dry indigo, 5,876,000 yen; paper, 7,436,000 yen; sole leather, 3,933,000 yen; brown and white sugar, 19,864,000 yen; rice, 30,931,000 yen; beans, lentils, 10,405,000 yen; meal, 6,212,000 yen; petroleum, 14,324,000 yen; tortoise shell, 21,942,000 yen.

The chief markets for silk are the United States, France, and Italy; for cotton and copper, China. Tea is exported almost wholly to the United States. In 1907, there entered the Japanese ports 10,932 steamships, tonnage, 19,801,425 tons; Japanese steamships, 6,734 (8,770,491 tons); Chinese steamers, 52 (47,659 tons); English steamers, 2269 (6,287,638 tons); German steamers, 673 (1,840,000 tons); United States, 377 steamers (1,018,462 tons); Norwegian steamers, 348 (386,311 tons); Russian steamers, 172 (324,050 tons); Austrian steamers, 140 (154,425 tons); Danish steamers, 24 (64,753 tons); other nationalities, 143 (517,636 tons).

Domestic Commerce.—Museums.—Japan possesses 11 commercial museums, two of which (those of the Government and the industrial association) are at Tokyo; the others are at Sapporo, Osaka, Kobe, Nagasaki, Miyagi, Nagoya, Gifu, Kanazawa, and Toyama. At the end of March, 1906, the Government Museum at Tokyo contained 61,670 specimens, 31,674 of which were of foreign origin. Visitors in 1907, 57,111, of whom 1625 were foreigners.

Chambers of Commerce.—On 31 March, 1908, there were 356 chambers of commerce. Ordinary councillors, 1,589; special councillors, 250; number of matters and commerce, 3,250; population, 70,516.

Japan also maintains commercial relations with the following countries: the French colonies of India, the Russian colonies of Asia, Siam, Switzerland, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Dutch Indies, Sweden, Norway, Spain, Turkey, Denmark, Portugal, Mexico, Peru, Egypt, the Philippines, Hawaii, etc.

The greatest amount of Japanese merchandise has been exported to China and the United States, while

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>350,188,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,492,000,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84,278,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,970,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>555,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscription</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,421,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13,800 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearing-houses.—In 1896 there were two clearing-houses organized according to the system operating in the United States, one at Tokio, the other at Osaka. During that year (1896), the two establishments liquidated 647,239 notes, representing a value of 595,834,000 yen. In 1907, four new clearing-houses were in operation at Kyotot, Yokohama, Kobe, and Nagasaki. The liquidation operations dealt with 6,948,485 notes, representing a value of 7,124,059,761 yen. On 31 March, 1908, number of exchanges, 59; stockholders, 844; brokers, 971; authorized capital, 12,851,456 yen; paid-up capital, 10,291,000 yen. Receipts, 7,015,388 yen; expenses, 4,448,531 yen. Net profit, 2,566,857 yen.

Commerce.—Foreign.—The export and import figures will afford an idea of commercial activity and the development of native production:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>18,811,000 yen</td>
<td>29,976,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>37,147,000 yen</td>
<td>29,357,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>136,112,000 yen</td>
<td>129,281,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>132,281,000 yen</td>
<td>486,528,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>456,152,349 yen</td>
<td>511,717,380 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is to say, in 1907 the foreign commerce of Japan was twenty times greater than in 1875, and since the Russo-Japanese war, three years ago, it has increased one-third. Average per person: in 1875, 143 yen; in 1907, 18 yen.

Japanese commerce with the chief countries of the world:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Japanese Exports</th>
<th>Japanese Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>Yen</td>
<td>Yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>9,135,000</td>
<td>106,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit. India</td>
<td>4,339,000</td>
<td>13,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong-Kong</td>
<td>18,368,000</td>
<td>24,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corea</td>
<td>5,831,000</td>
<td>32,792,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>7,813,000</td>
<td>22,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>22,006,000</td>
<td>42,522,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,340,000</td>
<td>11,255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3,551,000</td>
<td>13,770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>132,054,000</td>
<td>2,069,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S.</td>
<td>54,029,000</td>
<td>131,101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,281,000</td>
<td>4,769,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
regulated during the year, 11,651; expenses, 231,200 yen. Two commercial agencies have been founded, one at Tokio, in 1896, the other at Osaka in 1901. The number of adherents (banks, firms, etc.) is 1395 for the first; 1308 for the second. There are also four large merchandise warehouses, two at Tokio, one at Osaka and one at Yokohama. Number of invention patents issued in 1907, 3155; number of designs patented, 614; competitions, 262; objects exhibited, 310-302; contestants, 261,396; awards, 55,741; expenses, 149,924 yen.

Communications.—Roads.—Under the Tokugawa there were four chief roads (go-kaido); they went from Nihon-bashi (Bridge of Japan) to Yedo, and linked all the provinces with the capital of the shogun. These ancient roads are still in existence, but since the Restoration the roads have been divided into national, departmental, and parochial. The State defrays the expense of the construction and maintenance of a national road, the departments that of the departmental roads, and the departments and towns, that of the parochial roads. All the chief towns of the prefectures, the cities, and villages are connected by roads, generally in good condition, and suitable for carriages.

Rivers, Canals.—The rivers are numerous, but for the most part are only torrents, little suited to navigation; they are used chiefly for rafting. Numerous irrigation canals have been dug, some of which are reserved for the transportation of merchandise. The amount of the expenses for means of communication, roads, rivers, canals, highways of all kinds, construction or repair of bridges, harbours, bays, piers, dams, ponds, viaducts, in 1907, was 25,872,335 yen; 3,231,791 yen being borne by the State, the rest, 25,640,542 yen, by the local bodies. Damage caused by floods, 21,473,359; by typhoons, 303,622; by tidal waves, 80,867 yen.

Railroads.—In 1872, the first railroad line was begun by the Government, between Tokio and Yokohama, a distance of eighteen miles; in 1882, the length of the lines established was 114 miles. As early as 1883, companies were founded to exploit this industry; in 1906 the government lines had been extended by 1531 miles, those of the companies, 3252 miles. In the same year (1886), the Government decreed national ownership of the railways, since which time the lines of eighteen large private companies have been purchased, while twenty smaller companies have gone out of existence. On 31 March, 1909, the total length of the government lines was 4712 miles; that of independent companies, 446 miles. Lines at present in connection and one at Yokohama, 1037 miles. The railways have cost the State: old lines, 168,250,000 yen; purchased lines, 476,318,800 yen; lines building, 18,500,000 yen; in all, 663,068,800 yen. Receipts, 81,995,171 yen; expenses, 45,262,927 yen; net profit, 36,732,244 yen. Locomotives, 2074; passenger carriages, 5780; number of employees, 41,260,702; expenses of merchandise, 24,092,066. Railroad accidents, dead, 1664; injured, 2321. In 1883, the net railway profit equalled 943,846; in 1893, 5,073,929 yen.

Electric Car Companies.—Electric tramsways appeared in Japan in 1893. On 31 March, 1906, there were eighteen companies. Two of these have not made public their accounts. The statements of the sixteen others are as follows: authorised capital, 77,854,673 yen; paid-up capital, 47,280,685 yen; length of lines, 272 miles; number of trams, 10,732; receipts, 182,389,707; net profit, 4,130,693 yen. The chief tramway company is in Tokio; passengers, 153,061,727; profits, 3,071,197 yen. Vehicles driven by men: for passengers (jinricksha), 161,858; for merchandise, 1,485,494. Total of all vehicles in the country, 1,681,892. The chief tramway company (Toyo Keisatsu) in the interior of the country has transported 208,447,901 kwan; receipts, 6,188,277 yen.

Postal Service, Telegraph, and Telephones.—Postal Service.—There was a postal service under the shogun, but it was made costly, slow, and officious. In 1872 the Government adopted the system in use in the United States. At first established between Tokio, Osaka, Kyoto, and Yokohama, the next year it was extended throughout the country. The tax varied according to distance, but later it was made uniform. However, England maintained its three stations at Yokohama, Nagasaki, and Kobe until 1879. Since then both foreign and domestic postal service is carried on by Japanese. In 1908 there were 670 post-office stations; 55,197 post-boxes; 17,607 postal employees; 35,409; postal articles received and distributed within the country, 1,377,835,408; sent abroad, 25,792,382; received from abroad, 24,532,407. International money orders sent, 15,517; value, 563,251 yen. International money orders received, 148,742; value, 11,615,851 yen.

Telegraph.—As early as 1889 the Government planned to adopt the telegraph. It did so in 1872. In 1879 Japan joined the International Telegraphic Union. At present a telegraphic network extends throughout the country and submarine cables connect Japan with all the great centres of the world. As early as 1900 experiments were made with a view to installing wireless telegraphy on all the warships, and at present all the ships are so provided. Communications have also been established between Nagasaki and Kelun (Firmosa). On 31 March, 1908, the length of telegraph lines was 86,926 ri; length of wires, 38,549 ri; public stations, 2815; telegrams sent within the country, 26,113,174; abroad, 707,508; received from abroad, 873,639.

Telephone.—The telephone was brought to Japan in 1887, and in the same year all the government offices were thus connected. The telephone went into general use in 1896. At present, 1,272,000, provided with telephonic connexions; 26 have an interurban connexion. Public stations, 421; length of telephone lines, 21,000 ri; length of wires, 27,270 ri; subscribers, 75,259. The Government has the monopoly of telephones, and bears the expense of constructing and extending all the lines. Merchant Marine and Navigation.—While the country was closed to foreigners no Japanese could build or own a vessel capable of sailing the high seas.
There was then no navigation except along the coast and on the waters in the interior of the country. In 1868 liberty was granted the Japanese to have vessels and to navigate as they pleased. The formation of three companies: the Mitsubishi Kisen Kwaisha (steam navigation) in 1877, the Kyodo Uyuo Kwaisha (united transports), and the Osaka Shosen Kwaisha (commercial navigation) in 1882, marks the beginning of the Japanese merchant service of Japan. In 1885, after a distressing occurrence, the Mitsubishi and the Kyodo Kwaisha united to form one company, Nippon Yosen Kwaisha (Japanese Mail Packet Company) and started a new era in the merchant service. In the beginning of 1896 the Government decided to grant privileges for the construction and navigation of vessels. Twenty yen per ton capacity and five yen per horse-power unit are allowed to each ship of 700 tons and upward, built in Japanese yards and constructed of native materials. The navigation premiums vary according to the life and the capacity of the vessels. The total value of grants and subsidies paid annually by the treasury to the companies and native shipowners is not less than 12,000,000 yen. At the end of 1903 there were 205 ship-yards and 32 docks. On 31 March, 1908, there were 216 ship-yards and 42 docks, building small war vessels and large merchant ships. During the war with Russia the companies furnished the Government 71 ships weighing 250,000 tons. Japan being a maritime country, it is natural that its merchant service and international trade should develop simultaneously and in proportion; nevertheless, the rapidity and importance of the progress made in the past fifteen years are truly extraordinary.

Value of merchandise exported and imported according to flag:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Exports</th>
<th>Imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>182,677,000 yen</td>
<td>181,817,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>120,550,000</td>
<td>189,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>40,745,000</td>
<td>56,403,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>36,251,000</td>
<td>23,45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>32,008,000</td>
<td>11,004,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Japan has a great many important navigation companies. The Nippon Yosen Kwaisha has had regular service since 1896 for Europe, America, Australia, and the chief ports on the Sea of Japan. The Osaka Shosen serves the ports of China and Corea. The Toyo Kisen has a rapid service between Japan and San Francisco; the Oya Shosen between Tsuruga and Vladivostok. The chief docks and coaling stations are those of Hakodate, Uraga, Yokohama, Otsu, Kobe, and Nagasaki. Not including Formosa, there are twenty-eight ports of commerce, of which the most important are Yokohama, Kobe, Otsu, Osaka, Moji, Nagasaki, Yokkachi, Shimomoseki, Otaru, Kuchinotsu, Wakamatsu, and Hakodate. For Yokohama and Kobe, the two chief ports of Japan, the maritime trade for 1895 equalled 242,293,844 yen; in 1907, 652,713,183 yen. Lighthouses, 140; signal lights, 19; buoys, 465; post indicators, 77; bell buoys, 4; boats, 624,728. Lawsuits, 433; ships lost, 196; salvages, 728; person shipwrecked, 461; died at sea, 277; disappeared, 154.

Economics.—Agriculture. —The total area of Japan (not including Formosa and Sakhalin) is 38,555,229 cho, divided as follows: (1) land belonging to the Crown, the State, the commons, etc., 21,394,805 cho; (2) to private owners, 14,272,339 cho; (3) main roads, parks, swamps, etc., 2,886,085 cho. The total area of arable land is only 6,120,519 cho, classified as follows: rice fields, 2,748,575; drained lands, 2,296,996 cho; various crops, 1,075,246 cho; in all 15.7% of the total area of the country. The area of taxed lands is 13,951,687 cho; estimated on survey as worth 1,406,267,827 yen. But at present their real value is far in excess of this estimate. According to the most recent census the total number of families is 8,725,544. Of these, 3,776,416 are occupied solely with agriculture; 1,638,216 families join agriculture with other work. The nature of the soil is unfavourable for tillage, but the Japanese have improved it by careful cultivation. In the valleys there is not a grain of earth which has not been made use of, and even the mountain-sides have, by the exercise of patience, been cleared, often to a great height.

Rice, which is the basis of Japanese diet, naturally...
holds the first place, but that produced by the country does not supply the demand, and even when the crop has been good it is necessary to import it. The wheat crop is also far from being sufficient. Tea is an important article of commerce; however, from 1897 to 1907 the area devoted to its cultivation decreased from 58,892 cho to 50,458 cho, and the yield from 8,471,956 kwan to 7,047,193. Sugar cane has not found favourable soil in Japan, and each year this commodity has also to be purchased abroad for large sums. By a law of March, 1904, the Government reserved to itself the monopoly of tobacco. According to this law the peasant continues to cultivate the plant as formerly. The Government buys the leaves from the cultivator, and distributes them for preparation among the state manufacturers. The products of the did not make great progress, ideas on this subject being very backward, but the Government carefully elaborated a plan of reform in the forestry administration. According to a law passed in 1907 the Government may use its authority to prevent the destruction and to secure the re-wooding of forests belonging to the State, to private individuals, to the Shintoist and Buddhist temples. The law also supervises and regulates the periodical felling of trees. Forests are divided into four classes: forests belonging to the State, 7,222,518 cho; to the Crown, 2,109,098 cho; to the temples, 7,991,796 cho; to private owners, 4,576,888 cho. Forest products in 1907: building wood, 34,364,114 yen; firewood, 42,323,633 yen; paper, 24,952,536 yen. The annual average of forest products varies in the past ten years between 50,000,000 and 60,000,000 yen.

Industries.—Fishing.—From the earliest times the fishing industry has been in a flourishing condition in Japan. Formally fish was the sole gift made. Together with rice it forms the basis of Japanese diet, for which reason the Japanese Government has not ceased to encourage the industry of deep-sea fishing. Fishery schools have been founded, and prizes granted for fishing on the high seas; laws for the protection of fish have been made for some time in force. The following table shows the progress of the industry and the profit in yen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fresh Fish</th>
<th>Salt and Dried Fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>11,951,872 yen</td>
<td>13,474,000 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>30,653,167 &quot;</td>
<td>28,740,498 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>42,826,850 &quot;</td>
<td>30,075,925 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>42,632,633 &quot;</td>
<td>31,738,850 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>54,073,844 &quot;</td>
<td>33,542,281 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1907, 3,300,000 persons (15% of the population) were engaged in fishing or some trade connected therewith. Number of fishing boats, 420,000, of which a number did not exceed 30 feet in length. It is only recently that Japan has sought a market for its fish, salt, smoked, or preserved in oil. The Japanese prepare, chiefly from herrings and sardines, a fish oil, of which the exportation in 1907 amounted to the figure of 2,975,235 yen. 20,727 fish ponds in which fish are fed produced the sum of 2,805,550 yen.

Salt-pits.—The area occupied by salt-works equals 8,285 cho; 16,184 boilers are used in the manufacture of salt. Product in 1907, 5,578,142 koku, valued at about 10,000,000 yen for the jobbers. The law reserves to the Government the monopoly of the sale of salt. Salt is manufactured by private citizens, the Government purchases it, and sells it again to the merchants, all at a fixed rate. 122,132 persons labour at the manufacture of salt.

Mines.—Before 1865 the working of mines was in a most rudimentary condition and their output was very mediocre. In order to improve and develop this branch of industry the Government sent for foreign engineers and utilized the mineral resources. Later on most of these mines were sold to private owners. In 1890 a law was published regarding the regimen of mines, which was replaced by another law in July, 1905. According to this new legislation those who desire to work mines are obliged to have a permit either of investigation or of exploitation to be issued by the minister of agriculture and commerce. For the administration of mines the country is divided into five large districts, each having a bureau for the inspection of mines. Japanese subjects and every civilian may acquire mining privileges. Foreigners may be admitted as members or stockholders in mining companies. The following are the number of authorizations granted within eleven years for the investigation and the exploitation of mines, and the extent of the privileges, in teubō:
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From this it will be seen that within eleven years the extent of mines with a view to exploitation has more than trebled. The following is a table of the mineral products for the years 1897, 1901, 1906, in yen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Iron</th>
<th>Iron pyrites</th>
<th>Antimony</th>
<th>Manganese</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Sulfur</th>
<th>Petroleum</th>
<th>Other minerals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>7,648,400 yen</td>
<td>10,500,000 yen</td>
<td>8,500,000 yen</td>
<td>7,648,400 yen</td>
<td>10,500,000 yen</td>
<td>8,500,000 yen</td>
<td>7,648,400 yen</td>
<td>10,500,000 yen</td>
<td>8,500,000 yen</td>
<td>7,648,400 yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that the total product of the mines has more than trebled within eleven years. From 1895 to 1897 the copper output increased from 5,000,000 to 20,000,000 yen. The value of oil from 5,000,000 to 19,000,000 yen. Number of mine-workers, in 1898, was 132,731; in 1906, 187,922; accidents (1907): fatal, 785; serious, 2,426; slight, 6,092.

Manufactures.—Very early Japan had its industries, and the traditions on this point have not been lost. Artistic bronzes, lacquers, porcelains, and paper are still among the riches and glories of the country. Nevertheless, subsequent to 1868 a transformation took place, and a new era began for Japanese industry. Formerly the work had been done by hand in the family, but now began the reign of the factory and the machine. In order to encourage private workers to use machinery, the Government itself built model workshops and manufactories. Besides, to hasten the development of the industry, the Government has often organized national expositions in the important cities of the empire, it has always taken part in foreign expositions, has instituted a bureau of industrial experiments, founded technical schools, encouraged the formation of industrial associations and sent students abroad to learn the operation of factories. It has also made special laws for the efficacious protection of industrial property.

Workshops, Factories, and Arsenals Founded by the State.—Royal printing establishment, with typographical workshops and paper-mill; a mint with a branch; 5 tobacco factories; military arsenals at Tokio and Osaka; naval arsenals at Yokosuka, Kure, Sasebo, and Maizuru; marine arsenal at Tokio; powder factory at Shimose; marine preparatory schools at Takeda, Onomata, and Mako; 1 steel foundry; 2 factories for the manufacture of material for telegraphs and lighthouses; 13 railroad workshops; 12. Number of machines for all government manufactories, 1075; horse and steam power, 118,353; workers, men and women, 130,545 (men, 107,776; women, 22,769). Besides these, 62,324 day labourers are also employed; average daily wages: men, 55 sen; women, 25 sen. Japanese industry began to soar at the time of the war with China. The Japanese decided to add to their characteristic of being a warlike people that of being an industrial people. The following are the figures for nine years of the factories or workshops employing more than 10 workers, men or women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Employés</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>7,287</td>
<td>437,254</td>
<td>182,792</td>
<td>254,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>529,215</td>
<td>207,951</td>
<td>321,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>10,361</td>
<td>612,177</td>
<td>242,944</td>
<td>369,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures for 1906 are divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factories</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number of Employes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>5,592</td>
<td>325,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>58,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>82,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food products</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>40,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>50,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>40,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10,361</td>
<td>612,177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Men, 242,944; women, 369,233)

The most prosperous industries are those of silk and cotton. In 1907 the number of silk mills was 4758; besides 392,581 families occupied with this industry. The quantity of silk thus obtained (including waste) equals 3,236,692 kwan. In 1895 it amounted to 2,298,688 kwan. Silk is the chief article of export from Japan. The following is the progress made within five years: In 1901, silk tissues manufactured in Japan represented a value of 68,988,381 yen; in 1906 they rose to 88,994,131. And within eleven years the export figures have risen from 43,000,000 to 159,000,000 yen.
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Cotton Industry.—This also has made notable progress. From 1894 to 1906 the number of spinning mules rose from 45 to 83, with an increase in capital of 27,304,500 yen (the capital rose from 13,001,000 yen to 40,000,000 yen). The average number of spindles rose from 476,123 to 1,441,934 yen. At the same time the output of spun cotton rose from 14,000,000 to 53,000,000 yen; and that of woven cotton from 49,000,000 to 84,000,000 yen. In 1907 all the materials manufactured in Japan, silk, cotton, hemp, and woollens, represented a value of 222,549,995 yen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIOUS INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTS FOR 1906</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRODUCTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches (250 factories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porcelain and crockery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacquered objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straw plaiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various matting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor and oil of camphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanten (vegetable glue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared skins (cows and horses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned goods (meat and fish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The manufacture of sake (rice wine) equaled 4,405,800 koku; beer, 201,144 koku; shoyu (fish sauce), 2,074,008 koku.

Metallurgy.—In this branch, despite all the efforts of the Government, the results have not fulfilled expectations. However the increase in iron and steel imports which have risen from 7,695,000 yen (1895) to 32,299,000 yen (1906) is a proof of development.

Handwork.—In 1906 the daily salary of handworkers was, for men, maximum, 96 sen; minimum, 40 sen; average, 68 sen; for women, the average is 25 sen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARATIVE TABLE OF MEASURES, WEIGHTS, AND MONEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAPANESE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineal measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures of capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the history of Japan and the situation of the country:—

Gifford, The Meidô's Empire (New York, 1890); Imperial Japanese Commission, History of the Empire of Japan (Chicago, 1893); Japan Year Book (Tokio, 1907); Bouquet, Le Japon de nos jours (Paris, 1877); De la Mâlerie, Essai sur l'Histoire du Japon (Paris, 1890); Papinot, Dict. d'Histoire et de Géographie du Japon (Tokohama, 1906); Antoon, Littérature Japonaise (Paris, 1902); Gobert, L'Art Japonais (Paris, 1888); Teshina, Notices sur l'Art Japonais (Paris, 1901); Japanese Code (Tokio, 1908); Thévenot, La situation économique et financière du Japon (Paris, 1907); Shimoda, Nihon Kaito hyakunen (Japanese Encyclopedia) (Tokio, 1906); Hanabusa, Nihon Teizōden senkan (General Statistics of the Empire of Japan) (Tokio, 31 Dec., 1908); MINISTRY OF FINANCES, Financial and economic yearbook of Japan (Tokio, 1907).

On Catholicism, Protestantism, and the Russian Schism.—The Christian Movement in Japan (Tokio, 1908); DELPLACE, Le Catholicisme au Japon 1560-88 (Machilin, 1908); CHARLEVY, Histoire du Japon (Paris, 1704); PAES, Histoire de la Religion chrétienne au Japon 1898-1901 (Paris, 1906); MANNAS,

JUSTIN BALDETTE.

Jarche, Karl Ernst, b. 10 November, 1801, at Danzig, Prussia; d. 27 December, 1852, at Vienna. He belonged to a Protestant merchant family. He took up the study of jurisprudence, and became at an early age professor of criminal law at Bonn and later in Berlin. His scholarly attainments were especially revealed in his "Handbuch des gemeinen deutschen Staatsrechts" (3 vols., 1827-30). Longing for faith and overcome by the conclusiveness and immensity of Catholic dogma, as he found it disclosed in the decrees of the Council of Trent, he embraced the Catholic Church in 1834. On the Revolution of July in Paris, he wrote an anonymous political brochure, "Die französische Revolution von 1830". It met the emphatic approval of the circle of friends of the then Crown Prince (later King Frederick William IV), which was composed of men of anti-revolutionary views, influenced by Romanticism and by Haller. Jarche assumed the editorship of the periodical "Politische Wochenblatt", founded by these men in 1831 to promote their ideas. In 1832 Metternich called him to the State Chanery in Vienna; he succeeded the late Friedrich Genta. He accepted the call as an active collaborator of the weekly journal. The residence in Vienna did not satisfy him. In 1837 he broke with his Berlin friends on the subject of the "Cologne Occurrence"—the imprisonment of the Archbishop of Cologne—of which they approved but which he condemned. In 1838 he founded with Philips the "Historisches-politisches Blätter" to support Catholic interests in Germany. When Metternich was overthrown in 1848 Jarche left Vienna, but returned there when order was restored, and died shortly after. His ideal was the "Germanic State" of the Middle Ages; at its head an hereditary monarch, all claims of the princes on their subjects to be regulated by treaties, the state to be occupied only with defence in war and the administration of justice; in domestic affairs entirely unrestricted opportunities for development within the confederacy. Of "political necessities"—measures for the welfare of the state—and of a "constitution" Jarche disclaimed any knowledge, except as a prerogative by an advisory popular assembly, which however must be representative of the princes and the professions at stake, not merely founded on a general or property qualification franchise. In his articles on the relations between Church and State he combating especially the Protests of the religious war. In writing of contradiction to his anti-revolutionary past was his unexpected acclaim of the revolutionary year of 1848, and he took a willing part in the Catholic movement which began at that time.


MARTIN SPAIN.

Jariot, Pauline-Marie, foundress of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Association of the Living Rosary, b. at Lyons, 22 July, 1798; d. there, 9 January, 1852. At the age of seventeen she began to lead a life of unusual abnegation and self-sacrifice, and on Christmas Day, 1816, took a vow of perpetual virginity. In order to repair the sins of neglect and ingratitude committed against the Sacred Heart of Jesus, she established a union of pious sisters, called "Sisters of Mohammed's Church", which were known as the "Réparatrices du Sacré-Cœur de Jésus-Christ". During an extended visit to her married sister at Saint-Vallier (Drôme), she succeeded in effecting a complete transformation in the licentious lives of the numerous girls employed by her brother-in-law. It was among them and the "Réparatrices" that she first solicited offerings for the foreign missions. Her systematic organization of such collections dates back to 1819, when she undertook each of her intimate friends to become a promoter by finding ten associates willing to contribute one cent a week to the propagation of the Faith. One out of every ten promoters gathered the collections of their fellow-promoters; and, through a logical extension of this system, all the offerings were ultimately remitted to the central treasury. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith at its official foundation (3 May, 1822) adopted this method, and easily triumphed over the opposition which had sought from the very start to thwart the realization of Pauline Jariot's plans. In 1826 she founded the Society of the Holy Family. The names of the Rosary were divided among fifteen associates, each of whom had to recite daily only one determined decade. A second object of the new foundation was the spread of good books and articles of piety. An undertaking of Pauline's in the interest of social reform, though begun with prudence, involved her in considerable financial difficulties and ended in failure. The cause of her beatification and canonization has been introduced at Rome.

CPLK, Causes de beatification et de canonisation de Pauline Jariot (Lyons, 1900); Grappling de la Fos (2nd ed., Paris, 1904); Le Roy in Annals of the Propagation of the Faith, LXX (Feb., 1909), 347—353.

N. A. WEBER.

Jarya Saint, patron of the Archdiocese of Tuam, b. in Connaught about 445; d. 26 Dec. (al., 11 Feb.), about 540. Having studied under St. Benen (Bovill), he founded a college at Clonfouh, near Tuam, which soon attracted scholars from all parts of Ireland. The fame of Clonfouh is sufficiently attested by two of its pupils, St: Brendan of Ardfort, and St. Colman of Cloyne. But, great teacher as he was, he went, through humility, to vail himself of the instruction of St. Enda at Arran about 495. He removed to Tuam about the second decade of the sixth century. St. Jarya is included in the second order of Irish saints, and on that account he must have lived to the year 540. The "Feliire" of Aengus tells us that he was noted for his fasting, watching, and mortification. Three hundred times by day and three hundred times by night did this saint bend the knee in prayer, and he was also endowed with the gift of prophecy. His feast is kept on 6 June, being the date of the translation of his relics to a church specially built in his honour, adjoining the cathedral of Tuam. His remains were encased in a silver shrine, whereas the church—built in the thirteenth century—was called 2eampul na scrin, that is the church of the shrine, a perpetual vicarage united to the prebend of Kilmaine- more in 1415.

COLO s., Acts Sanct. Hist. (Louvain, 1846); HEALY, Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars (4th ed., Dublin, 1902); KNOX, Notes on the Dioceses of Tuam, etc. (Dublin, 1905); Calendar of Papal Inquiries, VII (London, 1890).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Jaro, Diocese of, in the Philippine Islands, formerly a part of the Diocese of Cebu, was made a separate diocese on 27 May, 1865. It comprises the islands of Panay and Negros; the Romblon, Palawan, and Jolo groups, and in the island of Mindanao the Provinces of Zamboanga, Cotabato, and Davao. The Catholic population is over a million. Here and there throughout the diocese are some Aglipayan schismatics, and in Mindanao and the Jolo group a large number of Mohammedans, of whom there were forty-five native priests, about forty friars (Augustinians and Recollects), twenty Mill Hill missionaries, and about ten Jesuits. In Jaro itself there is a diocesan seminary in charge of the Lasallians. Eighty of its students are preparing for the priesthood and the rest for secular careers. In the city of Iloilo
the Augustinians conduct a college for lay students. In the towns of Jaro, Iloilo, Zamboanga, and Duma- guete are academies for young ladies, conducted respsectively by Spanish and native Sisters of Charity, native Sisters of the Holy House of Mary, and French Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres. The steepest settlement of Cullon, under government control, is attended by Jesuit priests and brothers, and by the Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres. The churches and parochial residencies are very large and solidly constructed of wood and stone, Spanish in architecture. Many of them are very beautiful. Owing to the withdrawal of the Spanish friars at the outbreak of the revolution against Spain (1898), and the present scarcity of priests, some parishes are still vacant. The native language, spoken there, without the greater part of the diocese, is Visayan. But in the island of Mindanao the language spoken is a mixture of Spanish and several native dialects. The educated classes, besides speaking their native dialect, also speak Spanish. Since the American occupation the school children are being taught English. The diocese is the centre of the sugar-growing industry, and the planters have always had a predilection for education and culture. Many of the most prominent Filipinos in professional, commercial, and political life are from these parts. Formerly the bishops were Spaniards.

Since 1898 an American bishop presides over the diocese. The first was the Rt. Rev. Frederick Zadok Rooker, consecrated on 14 July, 1903, at Rome; d. in 1907. Bishop Rooker was born in New York, 19 Sept., 1861, and made his first studies at Albany and at Union College; later he entered the American College at Rome, and obtained in the College of Propaganda the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Theology. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1888, and acted as vice-rector of the American College from 1889 to 1894. In 1895 he became secretary of the Apostolic Delegate then recently established at Washington, and held that office until his consecration as Bishop of Jaro.

JAMES P. McCLOSKEY.

JARRIO, PIERRE DU, missionary writer; b. at Tou- louse in 1866; d. at Saints, 2 March, 1617. He entered the Society of Jesus, 8 December, 1852. For many years he was professor of philosophy and metaphysics at the Council of Bayon. As his desire to be in the missions of the order was not fulfilled, he wished at least to use his pen for the good of the missions. The result was a very important production for that time, "Histoire des choses plus memorables advenues tant en Indes orientales, que autres pays de la descouertes des Portugais", etc. The second part appeared about 1610, the third in 1614. The work is a still useful one, giving a comprehensive picture of the missionary enterprises of the Jesuits up to 1610, chiefly within the sphere of Portuguese interests, and contains numerous valuable data on colonial history, geography, and ethnography, gathered from Portuguese reports, and the works of Father Luis de Guzman ("Hist. de las Missions que han hecho los religiosos de la Compania de Jesus", Acalá, 1601, reprinted at Bilboa, 1892) and of Father Fernando Guerrero ("Relação Annal das cousas que fizeram os Padres da companhia de Jesus em Japam, Brazil, Asia, Cabo Verde, Guinea", Evora, 1603, and Lisbon, 1605-07).

The dedication of the second part to Louis XIII Jarrio wished to draw royal attention to the colonising and Apostolic achievements of Spain and Portugal, and thus incite the French king to similar enterprises. His work was frequently reprinted and widely circulated, particularly in a Latin translation, by Martino Martinez, III (Cologne, 1615-16).

SOMMERVOGEL, Biblioth. de la C. de J.; HUTHER, Nomen- clator. A. HÜNDERER.

JAZMIN, Jacques, Provencal poet, b. at Agen, 6 March, 1798; d. 4 October, 1864. When a very young boy, he had to help his parents, who were in strait- ened circumstances, to earn a living by gathering fungi in the forests or doing errands at the fairs. It was only at the age of twelve that he was first sent to school, attending afterwards the seminary of Agen, where he stayed a very short time. He then became a journeyman hairdresser, and a few years later opened a hairdressing shop of his own. To complete his scanty education, he began to read, after hours, the works of Florian, Ducray-Duminil, and above all Goudouil, an eighteenth-century poet, from Toul- house, known as the "last troubadour". From his childhood he had been acquainted with popular songs and native poetry. As a tailor and almost illiterate, he had a real talent for dog- gerel verses, which he sang at fairs. Jacques himself soon started writing songs, and used to recite them to his customers. Being applauded by local admirers, he ventured to publish in 1825 a first volume, "Chari- vari" and from 1825 to 1831 various songs and pa- triotic hymns, which were highly praised by the Academies of Bordeaux and Toulouse. They met with a tremendous success, even beyond the boundaries of his province, and Parisian critics, like Sainte-Beuve and Nadler, pointed out the genuine talent of the hairdresser-poet. He then entered into a publication, received from King Louis-Philippe the cross of the Legion of Honour, and in 1852 was granted a prize of 5000 francs by the French Academy. All his works have been collected in four volumes under the common title of "Papillots (curl paper) de Jazmin, coiffur, de las Academias d'Agen et de Bordeaux" (Agen, 1845-53). He stubbornly declined to go and settle in Paris, whose worldly life frightened his simple and candid nature, and continued, among others, the noted poem, "Abuglo de Castel-Cuillé" (Blind Girl of Castel-Cuillé—1836), which was translated into English by Longfellow; "Françoise" ("een Nymph in la Folle") (1844); "Les deux Frères Juifs" (1845); "La Semaine d'un Fils" (1849), and "Mes Souvenirs" (begun in 1831, and supplemented at several in- tervals). These gay poems are redolent with a true Christian spirit. When he died, he was engaged in finishing a long poem against "the rancorous" language he used in his poems was not the literary and erudite language of the troubadours, but a popular dialect of Agen; it is harmonious, highly musical, and full of picturesque idioms.

A. L. DE LA COUETTE, Jazmin, b. and d. at Agen, philologist (London, 1891), Mémoires de l'Académie de Vaucluse (Avignon), série 2, vol. 7— Revue de l'Apocalypse, XXV (Agen, 1898); Sainte-Beuve, Com- ments du Livre, IV.

LOUIS N. DELMARRE.

JASON, a Greek name adopted by many Jews whose Hebrew designation was Joshua (Jesus). In the Old Testament, it is applied to three or four persons connected with the period of the Maccabees.

I. JASON, THE SON OF ELEAZAR.—In 161 b. c., he was sent to Rome by Jannaeus, to confer with the Romans on alliance offensive and defensive (1 Mach., viii. 17 sqq.).

II. JASON, the father of the Antipater who was one of the ambassadors sent by Jonathan, in 144 b. c. to renew the former treaty with the Romans (1 Mach., xiv., 22). This Jason is perhaps to be identified with Jasson, the son of Eleazar.

III. JASON OF CYRÆA, a Jewish historian who lived in the second century b. c., and whose work is made known to us by the Second Book of the Mache- bees, which professes to be its direct "Epitome" (II Mach., ii, 24, 27, 32). Jason's work, divided into 20 books, deals, apparently in great detail, with the history of the Maccabean and of the Jews against Antiochus Epiphanes, and his son Eu- pator (II Mach., ii, 20 sqq.). In the "Epitome" five parts may still be distinguished, corresponding probably to the five books of Jason, and ending re-
spectively with iii, 40; vii, 42; x, 9; xiii, 28; xv, 37. Jason composed his work in Greek, not long after 160 B.C., at which date the Second Book of the Machabees closes its narrative. He was thus contemporary with the events which he chronicled.

IV. JASON, THE HIGH-PRIEST.—This unworthy son of Simon the Just purchased at great price from Antiocbus Epiphanes the deposition of his brother Onias III from the high-priesthood. During the three years of his own pontificate, he did all in his power to corrupt the faith and morals of the youth of Jerusalem (I Mach., iv, 7–17). On the occasion of the gust the winds blew strong, at Tyre and Hecules, he sent a Jewish deputation with a large sum of money which he intended to be spent on pagan sacrifices; at the request of his envoys, however, it was devoted to building galileys. He was finally supplanted by Menelaus, his own envoy to Antiocbus, took refuge among the Ammonites (II Mach., iv, 22–26), captured Jerusalem next year, but had soon to flee again among the Ammonites, wandered in different places, and ultimately died miserably at Sparta (II Mach., v, 1–10).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Jassus, a titular see of Caria, and suffragan of Aphrodisias. The city was founded by colonists from Argos at an unknown date, and was re-established after a war with the natives of Caria by the people of Miletus. It is situated on the inner end of a gulf, on an island now connected with the continent by a narrow strip of land; according to Polybius its walls were ten stadia in circumference. Its fisheries (Strabo, XIX, 2, 21) are yet familiar. During the Peloponnesian War Jassus was taken by the Macedonians, and later it was captured by Philip of Macedon, who was compelled by the Romans to return it to King Ptolemy of Egypt. Numerous Greek inscriptions found among its ruins indicate its reconstruction in the domestic history of the region. Four of its bishops are known: Themistius in 421, Flaccus in 431, David in 787, and Gregory in 578 (Lequien, "Oriens Christianus", i, 919). The see is mentioned in the "Novum Testamentum Graece" (Gestrich, "Georgii Cyprici descriptio orbis romani", nos. 340, 1644), and more recently in the "Notitiae Episcopatuum". It is now called Asin-Kaleh, and is a small town in the sancjak of Mentchel and the Turkish province of Smyrna. In 1835 Teixier visited it and found it completely ruined and deserted, its walls of white marble, also theatres, several burial sites, and mausolea still standing; since then the Turks have carried away the material for building purposes.

S. VAILHÉ.

Jassy, Diocese of (JASSENSIA). In Rumania. The town of Jassy stands on a very fertile plain on the River Bahlui, in the sixteenth century, Tru, and has an extent of 12,000 inhabitants. Among its most remarkable monuments are the Church of the Three Saints and the monastery of the Three Hierarchs. Although the more or less independent principality of Moldavia was abolished about 1345, Jassy did not lose its capital until the sixteenth century, and its style remained such until 1859, when Wallachia was united with Moldavia to constitute the Kingdom of Rumania.

Its name Jasy (Ruman., Jaş), pronounced Yaşak seems to be derived from the Slavonic Askrytors, found for the first time in a Russian geography of the fourteenth century (Xénopol., "Histoire des Roumanes de la Dacie trajoane", i, 236, note). Often occupied by the Russians, Poles, and Austrians, it is principally celebrated for the religious conferences held there in 1722 between the Greek and the Russian Church, and for the treaty of 1792 concluded between the French and Russia.

The Latin Diocese of Jassy dates from 27 June, 1884. Thanks to the labours of the Franciscan and Dominican friars, Urban V was able to establish in 1370 at Sereth the seat of the diocese, transferred to Bacau at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Abandoned in 1497 on account of the Moslem persecutions, the See of Bacau was re-established in 1611, and had a succession of twenty prelates until 1789, when it was suppressed. The Catholics of Moldavia were then placed under the spiritual direction of Apostolic prefects, generally chosen from the Regular (Conventuals in charge of the mission. In 1884 Leo XIII raised to a diocese the Apostolic Vicariate of Moldavia, with Jassy as residence. This see has about 90,000 Catholics, of which a few hundred are Uniates (Romanians, Ruthenians, and even Armenians). There are 50 priests, 11 of whom are secular, and 39 regular (Conventuals and Jesuits): 28 parishes with as many churches, and 94 chapels without resident priests; 11 chapels for male or female religious; a theological seminary at Jassy and two preparatory seminaries at Jassy and at Halaucesti; several day-schoo[k for boys and girls; two boarding-schools for girls directed at Jassy and Galatz by Sisters of Notre Dame of Sion, 143 in number. The Orthodox metropolitan see, whose bishop sometimes recognised the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian patriarchs of Achrida and sometimes that of the Greek patriarchs of Constantinople, was established about 1322. Since the proclamation of Rumanian ecclesiastical autonomy the Orthodox Bishop of Jassy depends on the metropolitan primate at Bucharest.

S. VAILHÉ.

Jáuregui, Juan de, a Spanish painter and poet, b. at Seville c. 1570, or, according to some, as late as 1583; d. at Madrid c. 1640–1. His family, a northern one, was apparently of noble rank, and he was early enrolled as a knight in the Order of Calatrava. He made a sojourn in Rome, and there, judging by what he says in his "Discourse on Painting", he studied the old masters and formed his own pictorial methods. At all events, report has it that he became distinguished as a portrait painter. A current interpretation of a passage in the prologue to the "Novelas ejemplares" of Cervantes makes him out to have painted a likeness of the famous novelist. As a poet, Jáuregui began as writer of the "Musica" and "Flor de la Musica" (1605). In point of fact, he adheres in many of his compositions too closely to the manner of his model, and hence a lack of originality in them. Notable among his poetic endeavours is his version in blank verse of Tasso's "Aminta". It is deemed one of the best foreign renderings of that eminent, pastoral play. It shows in his "Discuro poético contra el hablar culto y estilo obscuro", but he later succumbed to the influence of this noxious manner, amply illustrating its
peculiarities in his poem "Orfeo" (Madrid, 1624) and even defending it in a special dissertation. Of the "Pharsalia" of Lucan, already attempted by him in his youth, he made, late in life, a complete version, which, however, was not published until 1654, and is over free in its rendering of the original.

*See* _Bibliografia de la Jaraqui_ (Madrid, 1899); _Fitzmaurice-Kelly, A History of Spanish Literature_ (London, 1888).

J. D. M. FORD.

**JAVA.** See BATAVIA, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

**Javouhey, Anne-Marie, Venerable, foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, b. at Chamblanc, Diocese of Dijon, 11 Nov., 1779; d. 15 July, 1851. In 1819, the scope of the new congregation, which had been founded for the alleviation of the miseries consequent on the Revolution, was extended to embrace foreign mission work, and in 1822 Mother Javouhey herself established a house of the sisters at Gorée, in West Africa. After two years in Senegal and vicinity, she passed to the British colony of St. Mary's, Gambia, devoting herself without stint to the victims of pestilence then raging. On her return to Senegal she received the co-operation of the French Government in her first project for evangelizing negroes, by which a certain number were to be educated in Europe and sent back to their people. The meagre results, due chiefly to the number of deaths caused by the difficulty of acclimatization, showed the plan to be impracticable, and it was abandoned. French Guiana, however, was to be the scene of Mother Javouhey's most important missionary work. The French Government, after unsuccessful attempts at colonizing the rich interior of this country, appealed to the foundress of the Sisters of St. Joseph, who were already established there. Having submitted her plans for approval and received full authority, Mother Javouhey set out for Guiana in 1828, with 36 sisters and 50 emigrants, and soon had organized a self-supporting colony, in which all the useful arts were practised. In 1835, two years after her return to France, again at the request of the Government, she once more went to Guiana to take charge of 520 African negroes, formerly in government service at Cayenne, whom the authorities wished reclaimed for civilization and Christianity before being granted their freedom. Harassed as she was by opposition, and even calumny, her success with the negro colony, due largely to her personal influence with the colonists, was so great that when emancipation was granted there were no such scenes of disorder as marked similar occasions in other colonies. The blacks of the colony had become Christians and had learned the ways of civilization and the value of manual labour.

Long before this Mother Javouhey had established a leper colony on the banks of the Accarouey. Even the Indians came within the sphere of her influence; whole tribes were instructed in the Faith and asked for baptism. On her return to France, in 1840, Mother Javouhey found fresh trials awaiting her, including ecclesiastical opposition. Nevertheless she continued to direct the establishment of new mission houses of her order in all parts of the world, in addition to over thirty foundations in the various dioceses of France. When the news of the death of "the mother of the blacks" reached French Guiana, there was general grief, and most of the inhabitants of her colonies went into mourning as for a personal bereavement. The cause of Mother Javouhey's beatification was introduced 11 February, 1907. *Missiones Franciscanas*, VI (Paris, 1903), 399 sqq.; _Hélou, Ordres religieux_, (Paris, 1859); _Hermanns, Orden und Kongregationen_, (Paderborn, 1898).

F. M. RUDGE.

**Jealousy** is here taken to be synonymous with envy. It is defined to be a sorrow which one enters at another's well-being because of a view that one's own excellence is in consequence lessened. Its distinctive malice comes from the opposition it implies to the supreme virtue of charity. The law of love constrains us to rejoice rather than to be distressed at the good fortune of our neighbour. Besides, such an attitude is a direct contradiction of the spirit of solidarity which we desire to share with the human race and, in an especial degree, the members of the Christian community. The envious man tortures himself without cause, morbidly holding, as he does, the success of another to constitute an evil for himself. The sin, in so far as it bids defiance to the great precept of charity, is not merely a grave sin; although on account of the trifling matter involved, as well as because of the want of sufficient deliberation, it is often reputed to be venial. Jealousy is most evil when one repines at another's spiritual good. It is then said to be a sin against the Holy Ghost. It is likewise called a capital sin because of the other vices it begets. Among its progeny St. Thomas (II-II, Q. xxxvi) enumerates hatred, detraction, rejoicing over the misfortunes of one's fellow, and whispering. Regret at another's success is not always jealousy. The motive has to be scrutinized. If, for instance, I feel sorry at the news of another's promotion or rise to wealth, either because I know that he does not deserve his accession of good fortune, or because I have founded reason to fear he will use it to injure me or others, my attitude, provided that there is no excess in my sentiment, is entirely rational. Then, too, it may happen that I do not, properly speaking, begrudge my neighbour his happier condition, but simply am grieved that I have not imitated him. Thus if the subject-matter be praiseworthy, I shall be not jealous but rather laudably emulate.

RICKERT, _Morale Teaching of St. Thomas_ (London, 1869); _Slater, Moral Theology_ (New York, 1908); _Balleinier, Opus Theologicum Morales_ (1986).

JOSEPH F. DELAY.

**Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney, Blessed, Cure of Ars, b. at Dardilly, near Lyons, France, on 8 May, 1786; d. at Ars, 4 August, 1859; son of Mathieu Vianney and Marie Beluze. In 1805, the cure at Ecully, M. Bailey, opened a school for ecclesiastical students, and Jean-Marie was sent to him. Though he was of average intelligence and his masters never seem to have doubted his vocation, his knowledge was extremely limited, being based upon dogmatic, historical, and geographical, and he found learning, especially the study of Latin, excessively difficult. One of his fellow-students, Matthias Loras, afterwards first Bishop of Dubuque, assisted him with his Latin lessons. But now another obstacle presented itself. Young Vianney was drawn in the conscription, the war with Spain and the urgent need of recruits having caused Napoleon to withdraw the exemption enjoyed by the ecclesiastical students in the diocese of his uncle, Cardinal Fesch. Mathieu Vianney tried unsuccessfully to procure a substitute, so his son was obliged to go. His regiment received marching orders. The morning of departure, Jean-Baptiste went to church to pray, and on his return to the barracks found that his comrades had already left. He was threatened with arrest, but the recruiting captain believed his story and sent him after the troops. At a small town he met a young man who volunteered to guide him to his fellow-soldiers and led him to Noes, where some deserters had gathered. The mayor persuaded him to remain there under an assumed name as schoolmaster. After fourteen months, he was able to communicate with his family. His father was vexed to know that he was a deserter and ordered him to surrender, but the schoolmaster was settled by his younger brother offering to serve in his stead and being accepted.
Jean-Baptiste now resumed his studies at Ecully. In 1812, he was sent to the seminary at Verrières; he was so deficient in Latin as to be obliged to follow the philosophy course in French. He failed to pass the examinations for entrance to the seminary proper, but on re-examination three months later succeeded. On 13 August, 1815, he was ordained priest by Mgr Sisini. His difficulties in writing the preparatory studies seem to have been due to a lack of mental suppleness in dealing with theory as distinct from practice—a lack accounted for by the meagreness of his early schooling, the advanced age at which he began to study, the fact that he was not of more than average intelligence, and that he was far advanced in years before he took to the practice of virtue long before he came to study it in the abstract. He was sent to Ecully as assistant to M. Baillé, who had first recognised and encouraged his vocation, who urged him to persevere when the obstacles in his way seemed insurmountable, who interceded with the examiners when he failed to pass for the higher seminary, and who was his model as well as his preceptor and patron. In 1818, after the death of M. Baillé, M. Vianney was made parish priest of Ars, a village not very far from Lyons. It was in the exercise of the functions of the parish priest in this remote French hamlet that as “curé d’Ars” he became known throughout France and the Christian world. A few years after he went to Ars, he founded a sort of orphanage for destitute girls. It was called “The Providence” and was the model of similar institutions established later all over France. M. Vianney himself instructed the children of “The Providence” in the catechism, and these catechetical instructions came to be so popular that at last they were given every day in the church to large crowds. “The Providence” was the favourite work of the “curé d’Ars”, but, although it was successful, it was closed in 1847, because the holy curé thought that it was not justified in maintaining itself in the face of the opposition of many good people. Its closing was a very heavy trial to him. But the chief labour of the Curé d’Ars was the direction of souls. He had not been long at Ars when people began coming to him from other parishes, then from all parts of France, and finally from other countries. As early as 1835, his bishop forbade him to attend the annual retreats of the diocesan clergy because of “the souls awaiting him yonder”. During the last ten years of his life, he spent from sixteen to eighteen hours a day in the confessions sought by bishops, priests, religious, young men and women in doubt as to their vocation, sinners, persons in all sorts of difficulties, and the sick. In 1855, the number of pilgrims had reached twenty thousand a year. The most distinguished persons visited Ars for the purpose of seeing the holy curé and hearing his daily instruction. The Venerable Father Colin was ordained deacon at the same time, and was his life-long friend, while Mother Marie de la Providence founded the Helpers of the Holy Souls on his advice and with his constant encouragement. His direction was characterised by considerate sense, remarkable insight, and supernatural knowledge. He would sometimes divine sins withheld in an imperfect confession. His instructions were simple in language, full of imagery drawn from daily life and country scenes, but breathing faith and that love of God which was his life principle and which he infused into his audience as much by his manner and tone of voice, as by his words. For, at the last, his voice was almost inaudible. The miracles recorded by his biographers are of three classes: first, the obtaining of money for his charities and food for his orphans; secondly, supernatural knowledge of the past and future; thirdly, healing the sick, especially children. The greatest miracle of all was his life. He practised mortification from his early youth, and for forty years his food and sleep were insufficient, humanly speaking, to sustain life. And yet he laboured incessantly, with unfailing humility, gentleness, patience, and cheerfulness, until he was more than seventy-three years old. On 3 October, 1874, Jean-Baptiste-Marie Vianney was proclaimed Venerable by Pius IX, and on 8 January, 1863, he was enroled among the Blessed. Pope Pius X has proposed him as a model to the parochial clergy. His feast is kept on 4 August.


SUSAN T. OTTEN

Jean-Gabriel Perboyre, BLESSED, missionary and martyr, b. at Puech, Diocese of Cahors, France, 6 May 1802; martyred at Ou-Tchang-Fou, China, 11 September, 1840. Jean-Gabriel was one of eight children born to Pierre Perboyre and Marie Rigal. By reason of his piety, he was the model of his companions during his childhood. While acting as companion to his younger brother, in the preparatory seminary of Montauban, he felt the Divine call to the priesthood, and after obtaining his father to take the step, he entered the novitiate of the Congregation of the Mission, in the seminary of Montauban, Dec., 1818. On the feast of the Holy Innocents, 1820, he made the four vows of the Vincentians. He was raised to the priesthood, 25 Sept., 1825, in the chapel of the Sisters of Charity at New-Orleans, and on the following day he said his first Mass. Shortly after, he was sent to the seminary of St. Flour to teach dogmatic theology, and two years later, he was appointed superior of the preparatory seminary of St. Flour. His great sanctity and marvellous success induced his superiors, in 1832, to appoint him sub-director of the novitiate in Paris. He continued in this office until 1835, when he obtained the permission which for fourteen years he had sought and begged and prayed for, permission to go to China, there to preach, to suffer, and to die. He left Havre on 21 March, and on 29 Aug. 1835, arrived at Macao, where he spent some time studying the Chinese language. On 21 Dec., 1835, he began his journey to Ho-Nan, the mission assigned him. In Jan., 1838, he was transferred to the mission of Hou-Pé, in which, as in that of Ho-Nan, he laboured zealously and with great success. In Sept., 1839, the persecutions against the Christians broke out in Hou-Pé, and Jean-Gabriel was one of the first victims. The events leading to his death bear a striking resemblance to the Passion and Death of Christ. A neophyte, like another Judas, betrayed Jean-Gabriel for thirty ounces of silver. He was stripped of his garments and clothed with rags, bound, and dragged from tribunal to tribunal. At each trial, he was treated inhumanly, tortured both in body and in soul. Finally, he was taken to Ou-Tchang-Fou, and after unparalleled tortures, was condemned to death. The sentence was ratified by an imperial edict, and on 11 Sept., 1840, Jean-Gabriel was led to death with a rope around his neck. The priest was strangled to death on a cross. Jean-Gabriel was declared Venerable by Gregory XVI on 9 July, 1843; and was beatified by Leo XIII on 9 Nov., 1889. His feast is celebrated on 7 Nov.


JOSEPH S. GLASS.

Jeanne de Valois, SAINTE, queen and foundress of the Order of the Annunziates, b. 1464; d. at Bourges, 4 Feb., 1505. Daughter of one king and wife of another, there are perhaps few saints in the calendar who suffered greater or more bitter humiliations than did Madame Jeanne de France, the heroic woman usually known in English as St. Jane of Valois. A daughter of Louis XI by his second wife, Charlotte de Savoy, she
was hated from birth by her father, partly because of her sex and partly on account of her being sickly and deformed. Sent away to be brought up as a shepherdess in a lonely country château, and deprived not only of every advantage due to her rank, but even of common comforts and almost of necessities, it was the intense solitude and abjection of her life that first made Jeanne turn to God for consolation, and that gave her vocation as a tender and pietistical devotion to the Blessed Virgin. She is said to have had a supernatural promise that some day she would be allowed to found a religious family in honour of Our Lady. The mysteries of the Annunciation and Incarnation, as set forth in the Angels, were her great delight.

The machinations of Louis XI compelled Jeanne to marry Louis, Duke of Orleans, his second cousin, and heir presumptive to the throne. After her marriage, the princess suffered even more than before, for the duke hated the wife imposed upon him, and even publicly insulted her in every possible way. She, imagining virtues in her husband that did not exist, loved him tenderly, and when he got into disgrace and was imprisoned exerted herself to mitigate his sufferings and to get him freed. No sooner, however, was the duke, on the death of Charles VIII, raised to the throne of France as Louis XII, than she got her marriage with Jethy annulled at Rome, on the ground that it was invalid, from lack of consent, and from the fact that it had never been consummated (see Alexander VI); and the saint’s humiliations reached their climax when she found herself, in the face of all France, an unjustly repudiated wife and queen.

But the two special virtues in which Jeanne had resolved to imitate the Blessed Virgin were silence and humility; hence, though she bravely contested the matter while it was of any use, she accepted the verdict, when it came, without a complaint, merely thanking God that it had made her free to serve His Mother as she had always hoped to do, by founding an order for her service. She was made Duchess of Berry, and given that province to govern. Going to live at Bourges, its capital, she fulfilled all her duties as ruler with strict conscientiousness and tender care for her subjects’ welfare. In 1500, in conjunction with her French cousin director, Gilbert Nicolas, Jeanne founded the Order of the Annunciation, an order for prayer and penance, whose chief rule was to imitate the virtues of Mary, as shown in the Gospels. The rejected queen found happiness at last in devoting herself to this work; and towards the close of her life, she took vows, if, putting on her wedding ring, which she had hitherto worn, and wore the habit under her clothes. In spite of bad health and constant suffering, she had done much bodily penance all her life, besides giving many hours to prayer. Up to her death she prayed incessantly for her heartless husband, and left as a legacy to her order the duty of constant prayer for his soul as well as her father’s and brother’s.

Jeanne died as she had lived, and was lamented by her spiritual daughters and all her people. Many miracles, especially of healing, followed her death. In 1514, Leo X allowed the Annunciation to honour her by a special office. Benedict XIV pronounced her Blessed, and extended her cult throughout France; but, though the process of canonization had been introduced in 1614, owing to various delays and hindrances, she has never been actually canonized, though universally known as a saint.

Jeanne was the youngest of the four daughters of Jean de Flandres, and his wife, Jeanne de Laval. Her mother died when she was only six years old, and she was brought up by her father, who was a soldier of fortune. From an early age she showed a remarkable talent for music, and she was particularly skilled in the art of playing the harp. She was also a gifted writer, and her letters and poems were highly regarded in her time.

Jeanne was married at the age of sixteen to a wealthy merchant named Robert de Chalon, with whom she had two children: a son named Jean and a daughter named Louise. However, her marriage was unhappy, and she soon became estranged from her husband. In 1537, she founded the Order of the Annunciation, which quickly gained a reputation for its spiritual purity and devotion to the Virgin Mary. Jeanne was the first superior of this order, and she devoted her life to the care of the poor and the sick.

Her reputation for sanctity grew, and she became known throughout France as a holy woman. In 1543, she was arrested by the authorities and sent to prison, where she spent several years. However, she remained undaunted, and continued to minister to the needs of the poor while in captivity.

In 1552, Jeanne was released from prison and allowed to return to her convent. She died peacefully in 1563, and was buried in the church of the Annunciation. Her tomb became a place of pilgrimage, and her reliquary was venerated throughout France.

In 1665, Jeanne was canonized as a saint, and her feast day is celebrated on March 10th.

Jeanne d’Arc was a 15th-century French peasant girl who became a national heroine of France. She was born in Domrémy, a small village in northeastern France, in 1412. Her family was poor, and she worked in the fields as a child.

In 1428, at the age of 17, Jeanne had a vision in which the Archangel Michael appeared to her and told her to go to the king and help him. She was sent to the court of Charles VII, who was in exile in England. Jeanne convinced the king to let her lead his army to victory, and she became a symbol of French resistance against the English. She was captured by the English in 1430 and was tried as a witch. She was burned at the stake in 1431.

Jeanne d’Arc was canonized as a saint in 1920.

JEDBURGH (eighty-two different spellings of the name are given in the “Origines Parochiales Scotiae”), Augustinian abbey, in the town of the same name (capital of Roxburghshire, Scotland), established as a priory by David I, King of Scots, in 1118, and consecrated by Canons Regular of St. Augustine from the Abbey of St-Quentin, at Beauvais, France. Fordun gives 1147 as the year of foundation, but this seems to have been the date of the erection of the priory into an abbey, when prior Oebert (styled in the Melrose chronicle “primus abbas de Goddeworth”) was raised to the abbatial dignity. Jedburgh soon became one of the greatest Scottish monasteries, deriving importance from its proximity to the castle (now entirely destroyed), which was the favourite residence of many of the Scottish kings. Lands, churches, houses, and valuable fisheries, on both sides of the border, were granted on the abbey, and the abbots held the titles of Lords of the Manor of Jedburgh, IV, William the Lion, and other royal and noble benefactors; and Alexander IM chose to be married in the abbey church to Yolande de Dreux in 1285, by which year the monastic buildings, including the great church, were probably complete.

An old chapel they so near the English border as Jedburgh was sure to suffer much in the constant war between England and Scotland. About 1300 the monastery became uninhabitable, owing to repeated attacks made on it, and the community was dispersed. Later on it recovered its prosperity for a time, but in the century and a half preceding the Reformation it was devastated, plundered, and occasionally set on fire, at least four times by the invading English. In 1559 (John Home being aabbot) the abbey was suppressed, and its possessions confiscated by the Crown. A Protestant church was afterwards constructed within the nave and used until 1875, when a new church was built by the Marquess of Lothian, whose family has possessed the lordship of Jedburgh continuously since 1622. Practically the whole of the domestic buildings of Jedburgh Abbey have disappeared; but the magnificent church is still wonderfully entire. The oldest part is the early Norman choir, of which the two western bays remain; and the nave, 129 feet long, is a very

JEUARAT, EDMOND (E.D.), French engraver, b. at Vernon, near Auxerre, 1658; d. at Paris, 1738. He was the elder brother of Etienne Jeaurat, the painter, and the son of an engraver or worker in metal, who on a visit to Paris took his eldest boy with him, and brought him to Bernard Picart. Here Edmond spent many years, and when he left his master's studio he wandered away to Holland, and for a few years studied the art of the Dutch painters, earning his living by engraving a few plates after the chief paintings in Amsterdam and The Hague. On returning to Paris he married the sister of the artist Le Clerc, and many of his engravings represented the religious pictures painted by his brother-in-law, Le Clerc the younger. He had two sons, one Nicholas Henry, a painter, usually known as Jeaurat de Bertry or Berty, the other Sébastien, who devoted himself to science. There is a fine collection of his engravings in the British Museum, London, and they can also be studied in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. His finest work is probably "Achilles discovered among the Daughters of Lycomedes," dated 1713, and there are many others of his engravings taken from works by Poussin, Veronese, and Watteau.

DESCAMPS, LA VIE DES PEINTRES (Paris, 1753); LE CARSON, Galerie des Peintres Célèbres (Rouen, 1816); DE COURAY, Dictionnaire des artistes de l'Etranger (Paris, 1747); DUBREUIL, Les Artistes français à l'Etranger (Paris, 1836).
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sately and impressive example of Early English work. The decorated north transept (fourteenth century) is the burial-place of the Kers of Fernihurst, now represented by the Marquess of Lothian. The massive

church now stands on the site of the ancient castle.

The total length of the church (inside) is 218 feet.

Origines Parochiales Scotiae, 1 (Edinburgh, 1850), 368-385;
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D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Jehovah, the proper name of God in the Old Testament: the name by excellence, the great name, the only name, the glorious and ter-

rible name, the hidden and mysterious name, the name of the substance, the proper name, and most fre-

quently שם הים, הים of the exalted, i.e. the explicit or the separated name, though the precise meaning of this last expression is a matter of discussion (cf. Buxtorf, „Lexicon“, Basle, 1639, col. 2432 sqq., Jehovah occurs more frequently than any other Divine name. The Concordances of Fürst („Vet. Test. Concordi-

te“), Leipzig, 1840) and Mandelkern („Vet. Test. Con-

cordiania“), Leipzig, 1890) do not explicitly agree as to the number of its occurrences; but the round number is included in the Old Testament in 60 (40, 60, 60, etc.) alone or in conjunction with another Divine name. The Septuagint and the Vulgate render the name generally by „Lord“ (Κύριος, Dominus), a translation of Adonai,—usually substituted for Jehovah in reading.

I. PRONUNCIATION OF JEHOWAH.—The Fathers and the Rabbinic writers agree in representing Jehovah as an ineffable name. As to the Fathers, we only need draw attention to the following expressions: ἡ φρονία ημῶν, ἡματτομ, ἐκκλησία, ἐκκλησία, ἐκκλησία, ἐκκλησία ημῶν ἐν δύναμιν, μονότον. Leusden could not induce a certain Jew, in spite of his poverty, to pronounce the real name of God, though he held out the most alluring promises. The Jew's compliance with Leusden's wishes would not indeed have been of any real advantage to the latter; for the modern Jews are as uncertain of the real pronunciation of the Sacred name as their Christian contemporaries. According to the modernized pronunciation, Jehovah ceased to be used at the time of Simeon the Just, who was, according to Maimonides, a contemporary of Alexander the Great. At any rate, it appears that the name was no longer pronounced after the destruction of the Temple. The Mishna refers to our question more than once (Benj. iii. 5), and so does the use of the Divine name by way of salutation; in Sahedrin, x, 1, Abba Shaul refuses any share in the future world to those who pronounce it as it is written; according to Thaddai, vii, 2, the priests in the Temple (or perhaps in Jerusalem) might employ the true Divine name in their private and individual pronouncements (cf. “Jehovah” (1. 9), (Jerusalem) had to be contented with the name Adonai; according to Maimonides („More Neb. 1, 61, and „Yad chasaka“, xiv, 10) the true Divine name was used only by the priests in the sanctuary who imparted the blessing, and by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement. Philo („De mut. nom.,“ n. 2 (ed. Marg., i, 580); „Vita Mose. 1, iii, 25 (ii, 166) seems to maintain that even on these occasions the priests had to speak in a low voice. Thus far we have followed the post-Christian Jewish tradition concerning the attitude of the Jews before Simeon the Just.

And in the earlier traditions (Antiq., XII, vi, 4) declares that he is not allowed to treat of the Divine name; in another place (Antiq., XII, v, 5) he says that the Samaritans erected on Mt. Garism an ἀνάστασις ταῦτα. This extreme veneration for the Divine name must have generally prevailed at the time when the Septuagint version was made, for the translators always substitute Κύριος (Lord) for Jehovah. Elcclus. xxiii, 10, appears to prohibit only a wanton use of the Divine name, though it cannot be denied that Jehovah is not employed there. More recent canonical books of the Old Testament as in the older books. It would be hard to determine at what time this reverence for the Divine name originated among the Hebrews. Rabbinic writers derive the prohibition of pronouncing the Tetragrammaton, the name of Jehovah in Lev. xxv, 16: „And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, dying let him die“. The Hebrew particle n;qd, hv, rendered „blasphemeth“, is translated בֵּךְ הִצָּרָה in the Septuagint, and appears to have the meaning “to determine“, “to denote“ (by means of its proper wording) in Gen. xxxv, 28; Num. xxiv, 16; etc. Still, the context of Lev. xxv, 16 (cf. verses 11 and 15), favours the meaning “to blaspheim“; Rabbinic exegetes derive the prohibition also from Ex., iii, 15; but this argument cannot stand the test of the laws of sober hermeneutics (cf. Drusius, „Tetragrammaton“, 8-10, in „Critici Sacri“, Amsterdam, 1698, I, p. 1, col. 339-42; „De nomine divino“, ibid., 512-16; Drach, „Harmonie entre l'Eglise et la Synagogue“, I, Paris, 1844, pp. 350-53, and Note 30, pp. 512-16). What has been said explains the so-called qeri perpetuum, according to which the consonants of Jehovah are always accompanied in the Hebrew text by the tail of the preceding letter in case while Adonai stands in apposition to Jehovah: in these cases the vowels of Elohim are substituted. The use of a simple shewah in the first syllable of Jehovah, instead of the compound shewah in the corresponding syllable of Adonai and Elohim, is required by the rules of Hebrew grammar governing the use of shewah. Hence the question: What are the true vowels of the word Jehovah? It has been maintained by some recent scholars that the word Jehovah dates only from the year 1520 (cf. Hastings, „Dictionary of the Bible“, II, 1899, p. 199; Gesenius-Buhl, „Handwörterbuch“, 13th ed., 1899, p. 311). Drusius (loc. cit., 344) represents Peter Galatinus as the inventor of the word Jehovah, and Fagius as its propagator in the world of scholars and commentators. But the writers of the sixteenth century, Catholic and Protestant (e.g. Cajetan and Théodore de Bèze), are perfectly familiar with the name Jehovah. (Galatinus himself rendered the name Jehovah and Galatinus, I, Bari, 1516, a, p. 77) represents the form as known and received in his time. Besides, Drusius (loc. cit., 351) discovered it in Porchetus, a theologian of the fourteenth century. Finally, the word is found even in the "Pugio fidelis" of Raymund Martin, a work written about 1270 (ed. Paris, 1571), cap. iii, p. 448, and Note, p. 745). Probably the introduction of the name Jehovah antedates even R. Martin. Wonder no then that this form Jehovah has been regarded as the true pronunciation of the Divine name by such scholars as Michaelis ("Supplementa ad lexicon hebraicum", I, 1792, p. 224), Schuch (loc. cit., I, 469-95), Stier (Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache, 327), and others. (a) Jehovah is composed of the abbreviated forms of the imperfect, the participle, and the perfect of the Hebrew verb "to be" (γε-γεννήθη, ω-θη-καθαρή, ω-θη-καθαρή). According to this explanation, the meaning of Jehovah would be, "he who will be, is, and has been". But such a word-formation has no analogy in the Hebrew language. (b) The abbreviated form יְהֹוָּה supposes the full form Jehovah. But the form Jehovah cannot account for the abbreviations יְהֹוָּה and יְהֹוָּה, while the abbreviation יְהֹוָּה may be derived from another יְהֹוָּה. The former is said to be paraphrased in Apoc., i, 4, and iv, 8, by the expression וַיְהֹוָּה וַיְהֹוָּה וַיְהֹוָּה וַיְהֹוָּה וַיְהֹוָּה, in which יְהֹוָָאפר is regarded as equivalent to יְהֹוָָאפר, the one that will be"; but it really means "the coming one", so that after the coming of the Lord, Apoc., xi, 17, re-
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tains only 4 by 3 x 4. (d) The comparison of Jehovah with the Latin Jupiter, Jovis. But it wholly neglects the fuller forms of the Latin names Dispiter, Divus. Any connexion of Jehovah with the Egyptian Divine name consisting of the seven vowels e η ω ο ν ι α, has been rejected by Hengstenberg (Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Alte Testament, II, 204 sqq.) and Theodor Hahn in his Ztschr. f. d. Neu-test. Wschr. 1884, 59 ff. To take up the ancient writers: Diodorus Siculus writes Jâô (I, 94); Irenæus ("Adv. haer." II, xxxv, 3, in P. G., VII, col. 840); Jaôth; the Valentinian heretics (I., "Adv. haer."); I, iv, 1, in P. G., VII, col. 481); Jâô; Clement of Alexandria ("Strom." V, 6, in P. G., col. 668) have translated it as "Jehovah." (I., I, 14, in P. G., XIV, col. 105); Jâô; Porphyry (Eus., "Præp. evang."); I, ix, in P. G., XXI, col. 72); Josèp; Epiphanius ("Adv. haer."); I, iii, 40, in P. G., XLI, col. 685); Jâô; Pseudo-Jerome ("Breviarium in Ps."); in P. L., XXVI, 828); Jâô; the Samaritans (Theodoret, in "Ex. quest." xv; in P. G., LXXX, col. 244); Jâô; James of Edessa (cf. Lamy, "La science catholique."); 1891, p. 196); Jephî; Jerome ("Ep. xxv ad Marcell." in P. L., XXII, col. 429) speaks of certain ignorant Greek writers who transcribed the Hebrew Divine name Hô Hô. The judicious reader will perceive that the Saxon pronunciation presumably approaches the real sound of the Divine name closest; the other early writers transmit only abbreviations or corruptions of the sacred name. Inserting the vowels of Jâô into the original Hebrew consonant text, we obtain the form Jehovah (Yahweh), which has been generally accepted by modern scholars as the true pronunciation of the Divine name. It is not merely closely connected with the pronunciation of the ancient synagogue by means of the Samaritan tradition, but it also allows the legitimate derivation of all the abbreviations of the sacred name in the Old Testament.

The MEANINGS OF THE DIVINE NAME Jehovah (Yahweh) is one of the most obscure of Biblical names, such as Jacob, Joseph, Israel, etc. (cf. Ewald, "Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache."); 7th ed., 1863, p. 664), derived from the third person imperfect in such a way as to attribute to a person or a thing the action or the quality expressed by the verb after the manner of a verbal adjective or a participle. Fürst has collected most of these nouns, and calls the form forma participialis imperficta. As the Divine name is an imperfect form of the archaic Hebrew verb "to be," Jehovah means "He Who is." Whose characteristic note consists in being, or Thus, Jehovah is the imperfect hiphil or the imperfect qal. Calmet and Le Clerc believe that the Divine name is a hiphil form; hence it signifies, according to Schrader (Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, 2nd ed., p. 25), He Who brings into existence, the Creator, and according to Lagarde (Psalterium Hieronymi, 153), He Who causes to arrive, Who realizes His promises, the God of Providence. But this opinion is not in keeping with Ex., iii, 14, nor is there any trace in Hebrew of a hiphil form of the verb meaning "to be." Moreover, this hiphil form is supplied in the cognate languages by the περὶ form, except in Syriac where the hiphil is rare and of late occurrence.

On the other hand, Jehovah may be an imperfect qal from a grammatical point of view, and the traditional exegesis of Ex., iii, 6-16, seems to necessitate the form Jehovah. Moreover God; "If they should ask you, What is this name [God's]? what shall we say to them?" In reply, God returns three several times to the determination of His name. First, He uses the first person imperfect of the Hebrew verb "to be;" here the Vulgate, the Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion, and the Arabic version suppose that God uses the imperfect hiphil of the Tennessee, however, makes it mean "I am who am," and it does not express the idea of "eternal" or "existent;" it is only a future tense. The two latter pronouns, however, are not accurately translated into English. The two former pronouns, Jehovah and Jerusalem, both imply the imperfect hiphil. Hence we have the renderings: "I am who am" (Vulg.), "I am who is" (Sept.), "I shall be [who shall be]" (Aquila, Theodotion), "the Eternal who does not cease." (Arabic), only the above-mentioned Targums seem to refer any reference to the creation of the world. The second time, God uses again the first person imperfect of the Hebrew verb "to be;" here the Syriac, the Samaritan, the Persian versions, and the Targums of Onkelos and the Targum of Jonathan suppose here the imperfect qal: "He Who is, hath sent me to you" instead of "I Am, hath sent me to you." (Vulg.), "I am who am, and shall be, hath sent me to you." (Targ. Jon.). Finally, the third time, God uses the third person of the imperfect, or the form of the sacred name itself; here the Samaritan version and the Targum of Onkelos retain the Hebrew form; the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Syriac version render "Lord." Though, according to the analogy of the former two passages, they should have translated, "He is, the God of your fathers, . . . hath sent me to you," the Arabic version substitutes "God." Classical exegesis, therefore, regards Jehovah as the imperfect qal of the Hebrew verb, probably a "proper noun." Here another question presents itself: Is the being predicated of God in His name, the metaphysical being denoting nothing but existence itself, or is it an historical being, a passing manifestation of God in time? Most Protestant writers regard the being implied in the name Jehovah as an historical one, though some do not wholly exclude such metaphysical ideas as God's independence, absolute constancy, and fidelity (cf. Oehler, "Theologie des Alten Test."); 1882, p. 142); or again God's indefinableness, absolute consistency, fidelity to His promises, and immutability in His plans (cf. Dr. Verhoesen, "Das Hebräische Name Jehovah"). The following are the reasons alleged for the historical meaning of the "being" implied in the Divine name: (a) The metaphysical sense of being was too abstruse a concept for the primitive times. Still, some of the Egyptian speculations of the early times are almost as abstruse; besides, it was not necessary that the Jews of the time of Moses should fully understand the meaning implied in God's name. The scientific development of its sense might be left to the future Christian theologians. (b) The Hebrew verb hâyâh means rather "to become" than "to be" permanently. But good authorities deny that the Hebrew verb denotes being in a more empirical than in an eternal sense. It is true that the participle would have expressed a permanent state more clearly; but then, the participle of the verb hâyâh is found only in Ex., ix, 3, and a few proper names in Hebrew are derived from the participle. (c) The imperfect mainly expresses the action of one who enters anew on the scene. But this is not always the case; the Hebrew imperfect is a true aorist, presencing from time and there, best adapted for general principles (Driver, p. 38). (d) "I am who am" appears to refer to "I will be with thee," of v. 12: both texts seem to be alluded to in Os., 1, 9, "I will not leave you." But if this be true, "I am who am" must be considered as an ellipse: "I am who am with you," or "I am who am faithful to my promises." This is harsh enough; it becomes quite inadmissible in the clause, "I am who am, hath sent me." Since then the Hebrew imperfect is admittedly not to be considered as that which is the nature of the language does not force us to see in it the expression of transition or of becoming, and since, moreover, early tradition is quite fixed and the absolute character of the verb hâyâh has induced even the most ardent patrons of its historical sense to admit in the texts a different meaning, we are encouraged to take the expressions in Ex., iii, 13-15, for what they are worth. Jehovah is He Who is, i.e., His nature
is best characterised by Being, if indeed it must be designated by a personal proper name distinct from the term God (Revue biblique, 1893, p. 338). The scholastic theories as to the depth of meaning latent in Jehovah (Yahweh) rest, therefore, on a solid foundation. The old definitions are defying assumption, because He can be defined only by being, pure and simple, nothing less and nothing more; not by abstract being common to everything, and characteristic of nothing in particular, but by concrete being, absolute being, the ocean of all substantial being, independent of any cause, in case of change; and defying assumption, because He is infinite: “Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, . . . who is, and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty” (Apoc., i. 8). Cf. St. Thomas, I, qu. xiii., a. 14; Franzelin, “De Deo Uno” (3rd ed., 1883), thesis XXIII, pp. 279–80.

III. ORIGIN OF THE NAME JAHWEH (YAHWEH).

The opinion that the name Jehovah was adopted by the Jews from the Chanaanites, has been defended by von Bohlen (Genesis, 1835, p. cix), Von Alm (Theol. Briefe, i, 1862, pp. 324–27), Colenso (The Pentateuch, V, 1865, pp. 209–94), Goldscheider (Der Mythus bei den Semiten, 1894, p. 339), etc., by Kuenen (“De Godsdiens van Israel”), I, Haarlem, 1869, pp. 379–401) and Baudissin (Studien, i, pp. 213–18). It is antecedently improbable that Jehovah, the irreconcilable enemy of the Chanaanites, should be originally a Chanaanite god.

Jehovah (Die Religion des Alten Test., 1835, p. 672) and J. G. Müller (Die Semiten in ihrem Verhältniss zu Chamiten und Japhethitern, 1872, p. 163) that the name Jehovah is of Indo-European origin. But the transition of the Sanscrit root dī to the Latin Jupiter-Justus (Divus), the Greek Zeus-Aster, the Indian-Vedic Dharma-into the Hebrew form Jehovah has never been satisfactorily explained. Hitzig’s contention (Vorlesungen über bibl. Theol., p. 38) that the Indo-Europeans furnished at least the idea contained in the name Jehovah, even if they did not originate the name itself, is without any value.

The theory that Jehovah is of Egyptian origin may have a certain amount of a priori probability, as Moses was educated in Egypt. Still, the proofs are not convincing: (a) Röth (Die Aegypt. und die Zoroa. Glaubenslehre, 1846, p. 175) derives the Hebrew name from the ancient moon-god Ilu or Iu. But there is no connection between the Hebrew and the moon-god Ilu (cf. Ritter, “Vocabul. hierogl.”, 1875, p. 44). (b) Plutarch (De Iside, 9) tells us that a statue of Athene (Neith) in Sais bore the inscription: “I am all that is, and is, and will be.” But Tholuck (op. cit., 1887, pp. 189–205) shows that the meaning of this inscription is wholly different from that of the name Jehovah. (c) The patriarchs of the Egyptian origin of the sacred name appeal to the common Egyptian formula, Nukh b nuk but though its literal signification is “I am I,” its real meaning is “I is who” (cf. Le Page Renouf, “Hibbert Lectures for 1879,” p. 244).

As to the theory that Jehovah has a Chaldaean or an Assyrian origin, the following facts are for this supposition: Jehovah is said to be a merely artificial form introduced to put meaning into the name of the ancient god (Delttsch., “Wo lag das Paradies,” 1881, pp. 158–64); the common and popular name of God is said to have been Yahu or Yahu, the letter I being the essential Divine element in the name. This contention, if true, does not prove the Chaldaean or Assyrian origin of the Hebrew Divine name; besides the form Yah is rare and exclusively poetic; Yahu never appears in the Bible, while the ordinary full form of the Divine name is found even in the inscription of Mea (line 18) dating from 940 B.C. The name Yahu is the name God known outside Israel; the forms enter into the composition of foreign proper names; besides, the variation of the name of a certain King of Hamath shows that Ilu is equivalent to Yau, and that Yau is the name of a god (Schrader, “Bibl. Bl.”, II, pp. 42, 56; Sargon, “Cyldnder”, xxv; Keil, “Fastes” 1, 33). But foreign proper names containing Yahu or Yahu are extremely rare and doubtful, and may be explained without admitting gods in foreign nations, bearing the sacred name. Again, these Babylonian appellations are well known at present, but the god Yau does not appear in it. (e) Among the pre-Semitic Babylonians, I is a synonym of Ilu, the supreme god; now I with the Assyrian nominative ending added becomes Yau (cf. Deltitsch, “Lesserstucke,” 3rd ed., 1885, p. 42, Syllab., col. 1, 13–16). Uebelacker (“Etymologie der altassyrischen Wörter,” 1897, pp. 144, 225) feels sure that he has discovered this Chaldaean god Yau. It is the god who is represented ideographically (Ilu) A-a, but ordinarily pronounced Malak, though the expression should be read At or Ia (Ia). The patriarchal family employed this name, and Moses borrowed and transformed it. But La Grande points out that the Jews did not believe that they offered their children to Jehovah, when they sacrificed them to Malak (Religion sémite, 1905, pp. 100 sqq.). Jer. xxxiii, 35, and Soph., i, 5, distinguish between Malak and the Hebrew God. (f) Words of Ancient Israel, 1907, pp. 63 sqq.) connects the origin of Jehovah with his Yerushm’el theory; but even the most advanced critics regard Cheyne’s theory as a discredit to modern criticism. Other singular opinions as to the origin of the sacred name may be safely omitted. The view of the name Jehovah is of Hebrew origin is the most probable. Arguing from Ex., vi, 2–8, such commentators as Nicholas of Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan, Bonfrère, etc., maintain that the name was revealed for the first time to Moses on Mount Horeb. God declares in this vision that he “appeared to Abraham . . . by the name of God Almighty; and my name [Jehovah] I did not shew them.” But the phrase “to appear by a name” does not necessarily imply the first revelation of that name; it rather signifies the explanation of the name, or a manner of acting conformable to the meaning of the name (cf. Robiou “La Science cathol.”), 1888, pp. 618–24; Delattre, ibid., 1892, pp. 673–87; van Kasteren, ibid., 1894, pp. 299–315; Robert in “Revue biblique,” 1894, pp. 161–81). On Mt. Horeb God told Moses that He had not acted with the Patriarchs as the God of the Covenant, Jehovah, but as God Almighty.

Perhaps it is preferable to say that the sacred name, though perhaps in a somewhat modified form, had been in use in the patriarchal family before the time of Moses. On Mt. Horeb God revealed and explained the accurate form of His name, Jehovah. (a) The sacred name occurs in Genesis about 156 times; this frequent occurrence can hardly be a mere prolepsis. (b) Gen. iv, 28, states that Esau “began to call upon the name of the Lord [Jahveh],” or as the Hebrew text suggests, “began to call himself after the name of Jahveh.” (c) Jochabed, the mother of Moses, has in her name an abbreviated form Jo (Yo) of Jehovah. The pre-Mosaic existence of the Divine name among the Hebrews accounts for this shortening. (d) The supposition that the Divine element was introduced after the revelation of the name. (e) Among the 163 proper names which bear an element of the sacred name in their composition, 48 have yehô or yô at the beginning, and 116 have yahu or yahu at the end, while the form Jehovah never occurs in any such composition. Perhaps it might be assumed that these shortened forms yehô, yô, yahu, yahu, represent the Divine name as it existed among the Israelites before the full name Jehovah was revealed on Mt. Horeb. On the other hand, Driver (Studia biblica, 1, 5) has shown that these short forms are a Babylonian substitution of the full name. At any rate, while it is not certain that God revealed His sacred name to Moses for the first time, He surely revealed on Mt. Horeb that Jehovah is His incommunicable name, and explained its meaning.
Jehu (Heb. יְחַוע).

—The derivation of the name is uncertain. By some it is translated "Yahweh is he".

I. Jehu (Sept. יְחַוע), a prophet, described in III Kings, xvi, 1, as the son of Hanani, and as prophecying against Baasha, the then reigning King of Israel. Hanani was probably to be identified with the prophet of that name mentioned in II Par., xvi, 7. It is uncertain whether he belonged to the Southern or the Northern Kingdom, but, at all events, his ministry seems to have been exercised chiefly in the latter. He appears later in the reign of Josaphat, King of Juda, whom he reproaches for his alliance with Achab (cf. II Par., xix, 2-3). He outlived Josaphat, and wrote the history of his reign (II Par., xx, 34).

II. Jehu, the tenth King of Israel, 884 to 856, or 865 to 838, son of Josaphat, son of Nami; his tribe is not mentioned. According to Josephus (Antiq., IX, vi, 1) he was chief commandant of the army of Joram, his predecessor. For his sudden elevation to the royal throne his reign see IV Kings. The Prophet Elias had previously received a command from the Lord to anoint Jehu king over Israel (III Kings, xix, 16), but the order was only carried out by Elishaeus, his successor. While Joram, King of Israel, was still convalescing in Jezreel from a wound, Elishaeus sent "one of the sons of the prophets" to Jehu's head-quarters in Ramoth Galaad with orders to anoint him king and announce to him his mission of Divine vengeance against the wicked house of Achab. Jehu was immediately acclaimed king by his brother officers, and he forthwith set out in his chariot with his followers for Jezreel, The village was, however, razed to the ground, and Jehu, visiting his ally Joram. They fled, but Joram was killed by an arrow from the bow of Jehu, and Ozechias, being mortally wounded, died shortly after in Magdado. Entering the town of Jezreel, Jehu perceived the Queen Jezebel at a window of her palace, and he bade her attendants to cast her down headlong and she was trampled under the hoofs of the horses (III Kings, xxi, 23). Consistently with his programme of vengeance, Jehu caused the seventy sons of Achab who resided in Samaria to be put to death, and likewise all of the chief men and friends of the house of Achab, as well as forty-two of the brethren of Ozechias. He abolished the worship of Baal and slew its priests and followers, but he maintained the worship of the golden calves erected by Jeroboam. He was commended by Yahweh for his conduct towards the house of Achab, but nevertheless he is counted among the unfaithful rulers. Brief allusion is made to his defence of Israel against the incursions of the Syrians. On the occasion of Salmanasar's invasion in 842, Jehu sent a delegation to meet the Assyrian conqueror, with rich presents. This fact is recorded in one of the cuneiform inscriptions of Salmanasar, where Jehu is called the son of Amri (חָיָא), doubtless through a mistake on the part of the Assyrian annalist, who naturally considered Jehu as a lineal descendant of Amri, the founder of Samaria, since he occupied the throne of that dynasty. The same event is pictorially set forth on the Nimrud oelfast.

III. Jehu (Sept. יְחַוע), son of Obed, of the tribe of Juda (I Par., ii, 38).

IV. Jehu, son of Josabah, of the tribe of Simeon (I Par., iv, 35).

V. Jehu (Sept. יְחַוע), one of David's heroes, of the tribe of Benjamin, native of Anthoth (I Par., xii, 3).

VI. Jehu (Sept. יְחַוע), a Jewish name (Vulg., Jo November, 1:2).

JAMES PUEBLO, an Indian pueblo situated upon the north bank of the river of the same name about twenty miles north-west of Bernalillo, New Mexico. Its inhabitants, of Tanoan Shochehuan stock, are all of the same stock. An importation tribe occupying some ten villages in the same region. The first known by the Spaniards in 1541. The name comes from their Keran neighbours. They themselves call their town Walatoa, "Bear Village". The Jemes country was first entered by Coronado in 1541, and was visited by Espejo (1555) and Ofate (1588). Through the efforts of the Franciscan missions of Nuestra Señora de los Angeles the tribe was induced, about 1618, to concentrate in two villages, in each of which a mission was established. Somewhat later one of these was abandoned for a new station, San Juan (de los Jemes). Twice the Jemes, in connexion with some other Indians, conspired against the Spaniards, but the risings were speedily suppressed, until the outbreak of the general Pueblo rebellion in 1680, when the Jemes rose in both villages, killing one of the missionaries. At last, in 1694, General Vargas stormed their pueblo, killing nearly 100 of the inhabitants and carrying off some 400 prisoners. The uprising was thereby effectively reduced to the tribe to the single pueblo of San Diego. In 1696 they again revolted, killing the resident Franciscan missionary, and fled west to the Navaho. After some years of exile they returned and built the pueblo in which they now reside. In 1728 and 1780—1 they resided heavily from smallpox. The number now is about 500, including the remnant of the kindred Pecos tribe. Both a government and a Franciscan day-school are kept among them. In culture and general characteristics the Jemes resemble the other Pueblos.

JENINGEN, PHILIPP, VENERABLE, b. at Eichstatt, Bavaria, 5 Jan., 1642; d. at EiJwangen, 8 Feb., 1704. Entering the Society of Jesus, 19 Jan., 1663, he became a most successful popular missionary at the shrine of Our Lady of Schönben, near EiJwangen in Swabia, made famous by the Jesuits, and to which Jeningen, through the renown of his holiness, drew pilgrims from near and far. For many years he went forth on missions in the entire neighbourhood country, his burnt-out zeal achieving wonderful results. He is yet remembered as the "Apostle of the Ries".

FERGOLI, Vito, Philipp Jeningen, (Iglsstadt and Munich, 1783); HACEN, Leopold, Philipp Jeningen (Dillingen, 1766; Reprint, 1873); FISCHER, Aus dem Leben des ehrw. Philipp Jeningen... (Paderborn, 1850); Der ehrw. P. Philipp Jenog, von einem Priester der Joshvan-Kirche von Rotenberg (EiJwangen, 1808); Beschreibung der laurischen Kapelle und Kirche auf dem Schönben (EiJwangen, 1870); a life in MS. at the Jesuit College at Feldkirch; a collection of letters in the archives of the German province. A. HÜNDER

JENKS, SILVESTER, theologian, b. in Shropshire, c. 1656; d. early in December, 1714. He was educated at Douai College, where he was ordained priest 23 Sept., 1684, and where he was professor of philosophy from 1680 to 1688. He was later a preacher in ordinary to James II. At the Revolution of 1688 he fled to Flanders. On his return he served as a missionary in or near London and was appointed by the chapter Archbishop of Surrey and Kent. In 1711 he was elected by Propagation Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District (13 Aug., 1713), but died of paralysis before his consecration. Among his works are: "A Commentary and Hispanic Elements" (1692); "Practical Discourses on the Morality of the Gospel" (1699); "The Blind Obedience of a Humble Penitent the Best Cure for Scrupules" (1699, republished, London, 1872); "The Whole Duty of a Christian" (1707); "A Short Review of the Book of Jansenius" (1710).
A portrait engraved by le Pouter in 1694 is prefixed to a Paris edition of "A Contrite and Humble Heart".

JENNINGS, Sir Patrick Alfred, Australian statesman, b. at Newry, Ireland, 1831; d. July, 1897. He received his education, which included a training in engineering, and was, in his native town, went to Victoria in 1852, and settled in the St. Arnaud district, where he filled various public offices. In 1863 he went to New South Wales, and engaged in pastoral pursuits in the Riverina district. Four years later he was appointed to the Legislative Council of New South Wales, from which he resigned in 1869, and stood as a candidate for the Legislative Assembly, to which he was elected. In 1874 he was honoured by Pius IX with the Order of St. Gregory the Great, and in 1876 was made a Knight Commander of the Order of Pius IX and St. Gregory the Great. In 1876 he represented New South Wales and other states at the Philadelphia Exposition. He was created C.M.G. in 1879, and the following year K.C.M.G. For a few months in 1883 he was Vice-President of the Executive Council, and colonial treasurer for a short period in 1885. In the following February Sir Patrick became premier and colonial treasurer, but resigned these offices in 1889. In 1887 he was made an honorary LL.D. of Dublin University. In the same year he went to Rome, and received the Grand Cross of Pius IX from Leo XIII. He was called to the Legislative Council in 1890, was a member of the Senate of Sydney University, a Fellow of St. John's (Catholic) College, and a trustee of the Sydney Art Gallery. From 1891 until his death he led a somewhat retired life, but took a keen interest in benevolent and social movements.

JEPHTE (יוֹעֵד), one of the judges of Israel. The story of Jephthe is narrated in chapters xi and xii of the Book of Judges. He was a warrior of Gilead and the son of a harlot. His father's name was Gilead, who having a wife and other children, these latter thrust out Jephthe from the family and he fled to the land of Tob in Eastern Syria. Here he became the leader of a band of "needy men" and robbers who followed him as their prince. At this juncture the Israelitish territory east of the Jordan was invaded by the Ammonites, and the elders of Gilead, being in sore need of a leader to conduct the defence, saw themselves forced to go to Tob and ask Jephthe to return and be their prince. After expressing surprise that they should make him such an offer, considering the treatment he had received in his native city, he yielded to their entreaties, but insisted on the condition that, should he be victorious over the Ammonites, his own countrymen would remain faithful to their word and recognize him as their prince. The elders made a solemn promise, and Jephthe returned with them to the land of Gilead, where he was made chief by popular acclamation. Before beginning his campaign Jephthe made a vow to the Lord, saying: "If thou wilt deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, whatsoever shall first come forth out of the doors of my house, that will I offer a holocaust to the Lord." After a rather long negotiation with the King of the Ammonites as to Israel's right of possession of the land of Gilead, Jephthe led his forces against the invaders and "smote them from Aroer till thou comest to Menephth, twenty cities, and as far as Abel, which is set with vineyards, with a very great slaughter; and the children of Ammon were humbled by the children of Israel" (Judges, xi, 33).

On his triumphant return to his home in Maspha, the first person to come forth to meet him is his only daughter, accompanied by a chorus of women. On beholding her he is stricken with alarm and dismay, remembering his rash vow, but she had opened his mouth to the Lord and cannot do otherwise than fulfil it. The daughter expresses a noble and generous resignation to her fate, but asks a respite of two months that she may "behold her virginity" in the mountains with her companions. At the expiration of the two months' "time of mourning," and he did to her as he had vowed. Whence arose a custom that from year to year the daughters of Israel used to assemble together and lament during four days the daughter of Jephthe the Gileadite.

The obvious import of the narrative is that the daughter of Jephthe was offered up as a human sacrifice, and in fact, such has been the unanimous interpretation of it in Jewish, as well as in early Christian, tradition. Some modern apologists, however, shocked by the idea that a judge upon whom came "the spirit of the Lord" (xi, 29) could commit so barbarous an act, have endeavoured to prove that the words of Jephthe's vow should not be taken literally, and that the perpetual celibacy to which his daughter was to be condemned. The arguments to this effect, which are far from convincing, may be found in Vigouroux, "Dictionnaire de la Bible", s. v. They ignore the barbarous ethical condition of the Israelites at that relatively remote epoch—a condition which is evident from other narratives in the same Book of Judges (v. g. that of ch. xix). That human sacrifice was expressly forbidden by the Mosaic Law does not help the argument, for, even granting that the Law then existed at all otherwise than in embryo, which is at least very doubtful, it is plain from the historical books referring to this and subsequent periods that its prescriptions were constantly ignored by the Jewish people. That such rash vows with their dire consequences, and even human sacrifices, were not things unheard of in that stage of Israel's history, may be gathered from such passages as I Kings, xiv, 24 sqq.; II Kings, xxii, 6-20; IV Kings, xvi, 3; etc.

After the conquest of the Ammonites Jephthe became involved in a severe conflict with the neighbouring tribesmen of Ephraim who arrogantly complained that they had not been invited to take part in the expedition. Jephthe retorted that they had been invited, upon which they felt he had not regarded them, and the result was a fierce struggle between Ephraim and the men of Gilead in which the latter were victorious. They obtained strategic control of the fords of the Jordan by which the fleeing Ephraimites were obliged to return homeward, and when the fugitives appeared, each one was asked to produce the word "shibboleth" (an ear of corn), and if according to the Ephraimitic dialect it was pronounced "shibboleth" the man was immediately put to death. That forty-two thousand Ephraimites were slain on that occasion may be an exaggeration or possibly a change of the text. After a judgesship of six years Jephthe died and was buried in his city of Gilead.

PALS in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, s. v. Jephthe; COOK in HARTNIGHT, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Jephthah.

JEREMIAH (Heb. יְרֵמְיהָע), in the paraphrase form "Jeremiyahu, especially in the Book of Jeremiah—meaning, possibly, "whom Jehovah appoints" (see Gesenius, "Lexicon", s. v.); Sept. "Iespah", the name of seven or eight men, besides the prophet (see JEREMIAS THE PROPHET), mentioned in the Old Testament:—

(1) JEREMIAS OF LONIA (A. v. Libnah, II Kings,
Jeremiah (The Prophet) lived at the close of the seventh and in the first part of the sixth century before Christ; a contemporary of Draco and Solon of Athens. In the year 627, during the reign of Josias, he was called at a youthful age to be a prophet, and for nearly half a century, at least from 327 to 585, he bore the burden of the prophetic office. He belonged to a priestly family of Anathoth, a small country town north-east of Jerusalem now called Anata; but he seems never to have performed priestly duties at the temple. The scenes of his prophetic activity were, for a short time, his native town, and, for the greater part of his life, the metropolis Jerusalem, and, for a time after the fall of Jerusalem, Masphath (Jer., xli, 6) and the Jewish colonies of the country just mentioned. His name, יְרֵם, also יְרֵמְיָהוּ, Sept. *Iērusūlaim, has received varying etymological interpretations ("Lofty is Jahweh" or "Jahweh founds"); it appears also as the name of other persons in the Old Testament. Sources for the history of his life and times are, first, the book of prophecies bearing his name, and, second, the Books of Kings and of Paralipomenon (Chronicles). It is only when taken in conjunction with the history of his time that he becomes significant. His external life, the individuality of his character, and the ruling theme of his discourses can be understood.

I. Period of Jeremiah.—The last years of the seventh century and the first decades of the sixth brought with them a series of political catastrophes which completely changed national conditions. Western Asia. The overthrow of the Assyrian Empire, which was completed in 606 by the conquest of Ninive, induced Nechao II of Egypt to attempt, with the aid of a large army, to strike a crushing blow at the ancient enemy on the Euphrates. Palestine was in the direct path between the two powers. The world of that era on the Euphrates and the Nile, and the Jewish nation was roused to action by the march of the Egyptian army through its territory. Josias, the last descendant of David, had begun in Jerusalem a moral and religious reformation in the way of "David," the carrying out of which, however, was frustrated by the lethargy of the people and the foreign policy of the king. The attempt of Josias to check the advance of the Egyptians cost him his life at the battle of Megiddo, 606. Four years later, Nechao, the conqueror at Megiddo, was slain by Nabuchodonosor at the battle of Carchemish on the Euphrates. From that time on Nabuchodonosor's eyes were fixed on Jerusalem. The last, shadowy kings upon the throne of David, the three sons of Josias—Joachaz, Joakim, and Sedecias—hastened the destruction of the kingdom by their unsuccessful foreign policy and their anti-religious or, at least, weak internal policy. Both Joakim and Sedecias, in spite of the warnings of the prophet Jeremiah, allowed themselves to be misled by the war party in the nation into refusing to pay the tribute to the King of Babylon. The king's revenge followed quickly upon the rebellion. In the second great expedition Jeremiah was captured (587) and lived for eighteen months, which was only interrupted by the battle with the Egyptian army of relief. The Lord cast aside his footstool in the day of his wrath and sent Judah into the Babylonian Captivity.

This is the historical background to the lifework of the Prophet Jeremiah: in foreign policy an era of lost battles and other adverse preparations to the great catastrophe; in the inner life of the people an era of unsuccessful attempts at reformation, and the appearance of fanatical parties such as generally accompany the last days of a declining kingdom. While the kings from the Nile and the Euphrates cast their eyes, in despair, on the neck of the Daughter of Sion, the leaders of the nation, the kings and priests, became more and more involved in party schemes; a Sion party, led by false prophets, deluded itself by the superstitious belief that the temple of Jehovah was the unfailling talisman of the capital; a fanatically foolhardy war party wanted to organize a resistance to the utmost against the great powers of the world; a Nile party looked to the Egyptians for the salvation of the country, and incited opposition to the Babylonian lordship. Carried away by human politics, the people of Sion forgot its religion, the national trust in God, and wished for the day and hour of its redemption according to its own will. Over all these factions the cup of the wine of wrath gradually grew full, to be finally poured from seven vessels during the Babylonian Exile laid upon the nation of the Prophets.

II. Mission of Jeremiah.—In the midst of the confusion of a godless Dynasty of despair at the approach of destruction, the prophet of Anathoth stood as "a pillar of iron, and a wall of brass." The prophet of the eleventh hour, he had the hard mission, on the eve of the great catastrophe of Sion, of proclaiming the decree of God that in the near future the city and temple should be overthrown. From the time of his first calling in vision to the prophetic office, he saw the
rod of correction in the hand of God, he heard the word that the Lord would watch over the execution of His decree (i, 11 sq.). That Jerusalem would be destroyed was the constant assertion, the ceterum censeo of the Cato of Anathoth. He appeared before the people with chains about his neck (cf. xxvii, xxviii) in order that his prophecies should constitute a dramatic illustration of the captivity and chains which he foretold. The false prophets preached only of freedom and victory, but the Lord said: "A liberty for you to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine" (xxxiv, 17). It was so clear to him that the next generation would be involved in the overthrow of the kingdom that he denounced marriage and the founding of a family for himself (xvi, 1-4), because he did not wish to have children who would surely be the victims of the sword or become the slaves of the Babylonians. His celibacy was consequently a declaration of his faith in the revelation granted him of the destruction of the city. Jeremiah is thus the Biblical and historical counterpart of Cassandra in the Homeric poems, who foresaw the fall of Troy, but found no credence in her own house, yet was so strong in her conviction that she renounced marriage and all the joys of life.

Along with this first task, to prove the certainty of the catastrophe of 586, Jeremiah had the second commission to declare that this catastrophe was a moral necessity, to proclaim it in the ears of the people as the inevitable result of the moral guilt since the days of Manasseh (IV Kings, xxi, 10-15); in a word, to set forth the Babylonian Captivity as a moral, not merely a historical, fact. It was only because the stubborn nation had thrown off the yoke of the Lord (Jer., ii, 20) that it must bow its neck under the yoke of the Babylonians. In order to arouse the nation from its moral lethargy, and to make moral preparation for the fall of the Lord, the sermons of the preacher of repentance of Anathoth emphasized this causal connexion between punishment and guilt, until it became monotonous. Although he failed to convert the people, and thus to turn aside entirely the calamity from Jerusalem, nevertheless the word of the Lord in his mouth became, for some, a hammer that broke their stony hearts to repentance (xxxiii, 29). Thus, Jeremiah had not only "to root up, and to pull down," he had also in the positive work of salvation "to build, and to plant" (i, 10). These latter aims of the penitential discourses of Jeremiah make plain why the religious and moral conditions of the time are all painted in the same dark tone: the priests do not inquire after Jahweh; the leaders of the people themselves wander in strange paths; the prophets prophesy in the name of the Lord; the gods become the meeting-place of strange gods; the people have forsaken the fountain of living water and have provoked the Lord to anger by idolatry and the worship of high places, by the sacrifice of children, desecration of the Sabbath, and by false weights. This severity in the discourses of Jeremiah is the most striking type of prophetic declamation against sin. One well-known hypothesis ascribes to Jeremiah also the authorship of the Books of Kings. In reality the thought forming the philosophical basis of the Books of Kings and the conception underlying the speeches of Jeremiah complement each other, inasmuch as the fall of the kingdom is traced back in the one to the guilt of the kings, and in the other to the people's participation in this guilt.

III. Life of Jeremiah.—A far more exact picture of the life of Jeremiah has been preserved than of the life of any other seer of Sion. It was an unbroken chain of steadily growing outward and inward difficulties, a genuine "Jeremid". On account of his prophecies, his life was no longer safe among his fellow-citizens of Anathoth (xxi, 13 sq.) and of the other did the saying prove truer that "a prophet hath no honour in his own country". When he transferred his residence from Anathoth to Jerusalem his troubles increased, and in the capital of the kingdom he was doomed to learn by corporal suffering that verita parit odium (truth draws hatred upon itself). King Joakim could never forgive the prophet for threatening him with punishment on account of his unscrupulous mania for building and for his judicial murders: "He shall be buried with the burial of an ass" (xxii, 13-19). When the prophecies of Jeremiah were read before the king, he fell into such a rage that he threw the roll into the fire and commanded the arrest of the prophet (xxxvi, 21-26). Then the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah to let Baruch the scribe write again his words (xxxvi, 27-32). More than once the prophet was in prison, but in chains without the word of the Lord being silenced (xxxvi, 5 sqq.); more than once he seemed, in human judgment, doomed to death, but, like a wall of brass, the word of the Almighty was the protection of his life: "Be not afraid . . . they shall not prevail: for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to deliver thee" (i, 17). The religious opinion he maintained, that only by a moral change could a catastrophe in outward conditions prepare the way for improvement, brought him into bitter conflict with the political parties of the nation. The Sion party, with its superstitious confidence in the temple (vii, 4), incited the people to open revolt against Jeremiah, because, at the gate and in the outer court of the temple, he prophesied the fate of the holy place in Silo for the house of the Lord; and the prophet was in great danger of violent death at the hands of the publicans (xxvi; cf. vii). The party friendly to Egypt cursed him because he condemned the coalition with Egypt, and presented to the King of Egypt also the cup of the wine of wrath (xxv, 17-19); they also hated him because, during the siege of Jerusalem, he declared, before the event, that the hope of the Jews and an army of relief were delusive (xxxvii, 5-9). The party of noisy patriots calumniated Jeremiah as a morose pessimist (cf. xxvii, xxviii), because they had allowed themselves to be deceived as to the seriousness of the crisis by the flattering words of revelation, and of his companions, and dreamed of freedom and peace while exile and war were already approaching the gates of the city. The exhortation of the prophet to accept the inevitable, and to choose voluntary sub-
mission as a lesser evil than a hopeless struggle, was interpreted by the war party as a lack of patriotism. Even at the present day, some commentators wish to regard Jeremiah as a traitor to his country—Jeremiah, who was the best friend of his brethren and of the people of Israel (II Mach. xv, 14), so deeply did he feel the weal and woe of his native land. Thus was Jeremiah a prophet of the new covenant, of the new escagoat of the blinded nation. During the siege of Jerusalem he was once more condemned to death and thrown into a miry dungeon; this time a foreigner rescued him from certain death (xxxvii–xxix). Still more violent than these outward battles were the infinitesimal struggles of the soul of the prophet. Being in full sympathy with the national sentiment, he felt that his own fate was bound up with that of the nation; hence the hard mission of announcing to the people the sentence of death affected him deeply; hence his opposition to accepting this commission (i, 6). With all the resources of prophetic rhetoric he sought to bring back the people to “the old paths” (vi, 16), but in this he was to no avail.

He knows that with the fall of Jerusalem the place that was the scene of revelation and salvation will be destroyed. Nevertheless, at the grave of the religious hopes of Israel, he still has the expectation that some day the Lord will turn the captivity, and when that has happened will bring His promises to pass for the sake of His name. The Lord thinks “thoughts of peace, and not of affliction,” and will let Himself be found of those who seek (xxxix, 10–14). As He watches to destroy, so will He likewise watch to build up (xxxvi, 28). The prophetic gift does not appear with equal clearness in the life of any other prophet as he a psychological and a personal task. His bitter outward and inward experiences give the speeches of Jeremiah a strongly personal tone. More than once this man of iron seems in danger of losing his spiritual balance and falling down through from heart to heart upon his enemies (cf. xii, 3; xviii, 22). Like Job among the prophets, he curses the day of his birth (xv, 10; xx, 14–18); he would like to arise, go hence, and preach instead to the stones in the wilderness: “Who will give me in the wilderness a lodging place . . . and I will leave my people, and depart from them?” (ix, 2; Heb., ix, 1). It is true that the mourning prophet of Anathoth was the author of many of the Psalms that are full of bitter reproach.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah was not carried away to the Babylonian exile. He remained behind in Chaldea, in the walled city of Jahweh, that he might continue his prophetic office. It was indeed a life of martyrdom among the dogs of the nation that had been left in the land. At a later date he was dragged to Egypt by emigrating Jews (xii–xiv). According to a tradition first mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xv, 11), Jeremiah was stoned to death in Egypt by his own countrymen on account of his discourses threatening the coming punishment of God (cf. Heb., xi, 37), thus crowning with martyrdom a life of steadily increasing trials and sorrows. Jeremiah would not have died as Jeremiah had not died. Not only in the Roman tribunals, but in his own name to 1 May. Postcrity sought to avenge the sins his contemporaries had committed against him. Even during the Babylonian Captivity his prophecies seem to have been the favourite reading of the exiles (II Par., xxxvi, 21; I Esd., i, 1; Dan., ix, 2). In the later books compare Esclus., lxxix, 8 sq.; II Mach., ii, 1–8; xv, 12–16; Matt., xvi, 14.

IV. CHARACTERISTIC QUALITIES OF JEREMIAH.—The delineation in IV and III of the prophet and task of Jeremiah has already made its appearance in the instance of his character. Jeremiah is the prophet of mourning and of symbolic suffering. This distinguishes his personality from that of Isaias, the prophet of ecstasy and the Messianic future, of Ezekiel, the prophet of mystical (not typical) suffering, and of Daniel, the apocalyptic representation of the Covenant. No prophet belonged so entirely to his age and his immediate surroundings, and no prophet was so seldom transported by the Spirit of God from a dreary present into a brighter future than the mourning prophet of Anathoth. Consequently, the life of no other prophet reflects the history of his times so vividly as the life of Jeremiah reflects the time immediately preceding the Babylonian Captivity. A sombre, depressed spirit overshadows his life, just as a gloomy light overhangs the grotto of Jeremiah in the northern part of Jerusalem. In Michelangelo’s frescoes on the Sistine chapel is a masterly delineation of Jeremiah as the prophet of myrrh, perhaps the most expressive and eloquent figure among the prophets depicted by the great master. He is represented bent over like a tottering pillar of the temple, the head supported by the right hand, the disordered beard expressive of a time of intense sorrow, and the forehead scored with wrinkles, the entire exterior a contrast to the pure soul within. His eyes seem to see blood and ruins, and his lips appear to murmur a lament. The whole picture strikingly portrays a man who never in his life laughed, and yet who turned all that has happened into joy, as the prophet of the new covenant. It is the Spirit told him that soon the voice of mirth should be silenced (xvi, 8 sq.).

Equally characteristic and idiosyncratic is the literary style of Jeremiah. He does not use the classically elegant language of a Deuterocanonical or an Amos, nor does he possess the imagination shown in the symbolism and elaborate detail of Ezekiel, neither does he follow the lofty thought of a Daniel in his apocalyptic vision of the history of the world. The style of Jeremiah is simple, without ornament and but little polished. Jeremiah speaks of himself as “in verbs simplex et fama, in mystica sententia profundissima” (simple and easy in words, most profound in majesty of thought). Jeremiah often speaks in jerky, disjointed sentences, as if grief and excitement of spirit had stifled his voice. Nor did he follow strictly the laws of poetic rhythm in the use of the k'nah, or elegiac, verse, which had, moreover, an anacoluthic measure of its own. Like these anacoluthae so are also the many, at times even monotonous, repetitions for which he has been blamed, the only individual expressions of the mournful feeling of his soul that are correct in style. Sorrow inclines to repetition, in the manner of the poet on the Mount of Olives. Just as grief in the East is expressed in the neglect of the outward appearance, so the great representative of elegiac verse of the Bible had neither time nor desire to adorn his thoughts with a carefully chosen diction.

Jeremiah also stands by himself among the prophets by his manner of carrying on and developing the Messianic idea. He was far from attaining the fullness and clearness of the Messianic gospel of the Book of Isaias; he does not contribute as much as the Book of Daniel to the terminology of the gospel. Above all the other great prophets, Jeremiah was sent to the people of the day and by the prophet in verbal prophecy on the fullness of time, as in his celebrated discourse of the Good Shep-
hord of the House of David (xxiii, 1–5), or when he most beautifully, in chapters xxx–xxxiii, proclaims the deliverance from the Babylonian Captivity as the type and pledge of the Messianic deliverance. This lack of actual Messianic prophecies by Jeremiah has its compensation; for his entire life became a living parenthesis in the history of the Church; a permanent illustration of the predictions of suffering made by the other prophets. The suffering Lamb of God in the Book of Isaías (lii, 7) becomes in Jeremiah a human being: "I was as a meek lamb, that is carried to be a victim" (Jer. xi, 19). The other sheers were Messianic prophecies of other men. The repeated declaration that he is bodied in flesh and blood. It is, therefore, fortunate that the story of his life has been more exactly preserved than that of the other prophets, because his life had a prophetic significance. The various parallels between the life of Jeremiah and of the Messias are known: both one and the other had at the eleventh hour to proclaim the overthrow of Jerusalem and its temple by the Babylonians or Romans; both went over the city which stoned the prophets and did not recognise what was for its peace; the love of both was repaid with hatred and ingratitude. Jeremiah deepened all the hatred following the Messianic prophecies. From the time the prophet of Anathoth, a man beloved of God, was obliged to live a life of suffering in spite of his guiltlessness and holiness from birth, Israel was no longer justified in judging its Messias by a mechanical theory of retribution and doubting his guiltlessness and acceptableness to God because of his outward sorrows. Thus the life of Jeremiah, a life as bitter as myrrh, was gradually to accustom the eye of the people to the suffering figure of Christ, and to make clear in advance the bitterness of the Cross.

Therefore it is with a profound right that the Offices of the Passion in the Liturgy of the Church often use the language of Jeremiah in an applied sense.

V. THE BOOK OF THE PROPHETICIÉ OF JEREMIAH.—

(A) Analysis of Contents.—The book in its present form has two main divisions: chapters i–xlv, discourses threatening punishment which are aimed directly against Juda and are intermingled with narratives of personal and national events, and chapters xlvii–lxi, discourses containing threats against nine heathen nations and intended to warn Juda indirectly against the polytheism and policy of these peoples. In chapter i is related the calling of the prophet, in order to prove to the people that the authentic subject-matter is the message of God. Not he himself had assumed the office of prophet, but Jahweh had conferred it upon him notwithstanding his reluctance. Chapters ii–vi contain rhetorical and weighty complaints and threats of judgment on account of the nation’s idolatry and foreign policy. The very first speech in ii–iii may be said to present the scheme of the Jeremiahic discourse. Here also appears at once the conception of Osse which is typical as well of Jeremiah: Israel, the bride of the Lord, has degraded herself into becoming the paramour of strange nations. Even the temple and the sanctuary cannot inwardly convert on the part of the people, cannot bring salvation, whilst the warnings are united like mosaics with the main ones. The "words of the covenant" in the Thorah recently found under Josias contain threatenings of judgment; the enmity of the citizens of Anathoth against the herald of this Thorah reveals the infatuation of the nation (xi–xii). Jeremiah is emphatically a linen girdle, a symbol of the priestly nation of Sion, by the Ephrathites and to let it rot there, to typify the downfall of the nation in exile on the Ephrathites (xiii).

The same stern symbolism is expressed later by the symbolism of the prophet, which is broken on the rocks before the Easter Gate (xxvi, 11). A new pattern is introduced by the prophets (III Kings, xi, 29–31; Is., viii, 1–4; Esch., v–12), his warnings are accompanied by forcible pantomime action. Prayers at the time of a great drought, statements which are of much value for the understanding of the psychological condition of the prophet in his spiritual struggles, follow (xiv–xv). The troubles of the times demand from the prophet an unmarried and joyless life (xvi–xvii). The Creator can grant those he has created with the same supreme authority that the heavens and the earth are not vessels. Jeremiah is ill-treated (xvii–xx). A condemnation of the political and ecclesiastical leaders of the people and, in connexion with this, the promise of a better shepherd are uttered (xxii–xxiii). The vision of the two baskets of figs is narrated in chapter xxiv. The repeated declarations that the land will become a desolation follows (xxv). Struggles with the false prophets, who take wooden chains off the people and load them instead with iron ones, are detailed. Both in a letter to the exiles in Babylon, and by word of mouth, Jeremiah exhoists the captives to conform to the decrees of Jahweh (xxvi–xxix).

Compare with this letter the "epistle of Jeremiah" in Baruch, vi. A prophecy of consolation and salvation in the style of a Deutero-Isaías, concerning the return of God’s favour to Israel and of the new, eternal covenant, is then given (xxx–xxxiil). The few letters following are brief narratives of the last days of the siege of Jerusalem and of the period after the conquest, with numerous biographical details concerning Jeremiah (xxxiv–xlv).

(B) Literary Criticism of the Book.—Much light is thrown on the production and genuineness of the book by the testimony of chapter xxxvi: Jeremiah is directed "to write down, either personally or by his scribe Baruch, the discourses he had given up to the fourth year of Joakim (604 a. c.). In order to strengthen the impression made by the prophecies as a whole, the individual predictions are to be united into a book, thereby preserving documentary proof of these discourses until the time in which the disasters threatened in them should actually come to pass. This first authentic recension of the prophecies forms the basis of the present Book of Jeremiah. According to a law of literary transmission to which the Biblical books are also subject—habent sua fata libelli (books have their vicissitudes)—the first transcript was enlarged by various insertions and additions from the pen of Baruch or of a later prophet. The attempts of commentators to separate these secondary and tertiary additions in different cases from the original Jeremiahic discourse seem convincing proof as in chapter lii. This chapter should be regarded as an addition of the post-Jeremiahic period based on IV Kings, xxiv, 18–xxv, 30, on account of the concluding statement of li: "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah." Cautious literary criticism is obliged to observe the principle of chronological arrangement which is perceptible in the present composition of the book, notwithstanding the additions: chapters i–vi belong apparently to the reign of King Josias (cf. the date in iii, 6); vii–xx belong, at least largely, to the reign of Joakim; xxxi–xxxiii partly to the beginning of the reign of Sedeoias (cf. xxvi, 1; xxvii, 1; xxviii, 1; xxxii, 1), although other portions, whilst they are signed to the reigns of other kings: xxxiv–xxxix to the period of the siege of Jerusalem; xl–xlv to the period after the destruction of that city.

Consequently, the chronology must have been considered in the arrangement of the material. Modern critical analysis of the book in its distinct sections narrated in the first person, regarded as directly attributable to Jeremiah, and those portions which speak of Jeremiah in the third person. According to Scholz, the book is arranged in "decades", and each larger train of thought or series of speeches is closed at the end of a song or parable. The parts classically perfect and highly poetic in character are often suddenly followed by the most commonplace prose, and matters given in the barest outline are not
seldom succeeded by prolix and monotonous details. After what has been said above concerning elegiac verse, this difference in style can only be used with the greatest caution as a criterion for literary criticism. In the same way, investigation, of late very popular, as to the ancient times when the Book of Jeremiah or not, leads to vague subjective results. Since the discovery (1904) of the Assuan texts, which strikingly confirm Jer., xlv, 1, has proved that Aramaic, as the Aramaic (common dialect) of the Jewish colony in Egypt, was spoken as early as the fifth and sixth centuries B.C., the Aramaic expressions in the book of Jeremiah can no longer be quoted as proof of a later origin of such passages. Also the agreement, verbal or conceptual, of texts in Jeremiah with earlier books, perhaps with Deuteronomy, is not in itself a conclusive argument against the genuineness of these passages, for the prophet does not claim absolute originality.

Notwithstanding the repetition of earlier passages in Jeremiah, chapters i-ii are fundamentally genuine, although their genuineness has been strongly doubted, because, in the series of discourses threatening punishment to the heathen nations, it is impossible that there should be a heresiologist of the time against Babylon, then the most powerful representative of paganism. These chapters are, indeed, filled with the Deutero-Isaian spirit of consolation, somewhat after the manner of Is., xlvi, but they do not therefore, as a matter of course, lack genuineness, as the same spirit of consolation is characteristic of x-xxiii.

(C) Textual Conditions of the Book.—The arrangement of the text in the Septuagint varies from that of the Hebrew text and the Vulgate; the discourses against the heathen nations, in the Hebrew text, xlvii, are, in the Septuagint, inserted after xxv, 13, and partly in different order. Great differences exist also to the extent of the text of the Book of Jeremiah. The text of the Hebrew and Latin Bibles is about one-eighth larger than that of the Septuagint. The question as to which text has preserved the original form cannot be answered according to the theory of Strane and Scholz, who declare at the outset that every addition of the Hebrew version is a later enlargement of the original text in the Septuagint. Just as little can the difficulty be settled by avowing, with Kaulen, an a priori preference for the Masoretic text. In most cases the Alexandrian translation has retained the better and original reading; consequently, in most cases the Hebraistic reading is given, and it may read as Jeremiah the large number of glosses cannot appear strange. But in other cases the shorter recension of the Septuagint is not the original wording, but the deliberate condensation of the translator or a lapse in the literary transmission. The additions to the Septuagint, amounting to about 100 words, which can be opposed to its large lacunae, as compared with the Masorah, are sufficient proof that considerable liberty was taken in its preparation. Consequently, it was not made by an Aquila, and it received textual changes in the literary transmission. The dogmatic conclusions of Jeremiah is not affected by these variations in the text.

VI. LAMENTATIONS.—In the Greek and Latin Bibles there are five songs of lament bearing the name of Jeremiah, which follow the Book of the Prophecy of Jeremiah. In the Hebrew these are entitled Kinnah. From their elegiac character or the Lidam songs after the first word of the first, second, and fourth elegies; in Greek they are called Θρησκ, in Latin they are known as Lamentations.

A. Position and Genuineness of Lamentations.—The superscription to Lamentations in the Septuagint and other versions is light. The book, according to the production and on the author: “And it came to pass, after Israel was carried into captivity, and Jerusalem was desolate, that Jeremiah the prophet sat weeping, and mourned with this lamentation over Jerusalem, and with a sorrowful mind, sighing and moaning, he said” . The inscription was not written by the author of Lamentations, one proof of this being that it does not belong to the alphabetical form of the elegies. It expresses, however, briefly, the tradition that Jeremiah sat weeping and that his life was passed in a religious seclusion. Jeremiah had a peculiar importance in the history of salvation, as the footstool of Jahweh and as the scene of the revelation of God and of the Messias. Consequently, the grief of Jeremiah was personal, not merely a sympathetic emotion over the sorrow of others, for he had sought to prevent the disaster by his labours as a prophet in the streets of the city. All the fibres of his heart were bound up with Jerusalem; he was now himself crushed and desolate. Thus Jeremiah more than any other man was plainly called—it may be said, driven by an inner force—to lament the ruined city as the representative of the Israelites, Israel (the Covenant). He was already prepared by his lament upon the death of King Josias (II Par., xxxv, 25) and by the elegiac songs in the book of his prophecies (cf. xiii, 20-27, a lament over Jerusalem). The lack of variety in the word-forms and in the construction of the sentences, which is in keeping with the character of the style of Jeremiah, may be explained as a poetic peculiarity of this poetic book. Descriptions such as those in i, 13-15, or iv, 10, seem to point to an eye witness of the catastrophe, and the literary impression made by the whole continually recalls Jeremiah. To this conclude the elegies and the Lamentations, which are only occasionally interrupted by intermediate tones of hope; the complaints against false prophets and against the striving after the favour of foreign nations; the verbal agreements with the Book of Prophecy of Jeremiah; finally the predilection for closing a series of thoughts with a prayer warm from the heart—cf. iii, 19-21, 64-66, and chapter v, which, like a Misericere Psalm of Jeremiah, forms a close to the five lamentations. The fact that in the Hebrew Bible the Kinnah was removed, as a poetic work, from the collection of prophetic books and placed among the K'khubim, or Hagiotrapha, cannot be quoted as a decisive argument against the genuineness of the testimony of the Septuagint, the most important witness in the forum of Biblical criticism, must in a hundred other cases correct the decision of the Masorah. Moreover, the superscription of the Septuagint seems to presuppose a Hebrew original.

B. Technical Forms of the First Four Lamentations.—

1. In the first four laments the Kinnah measure is used in the construction of the lines. In this measure each line is divided into two unequal members having respectively three and two stresses, as for example in the introductory first three lines of the book.

2. In all five elegies, the order of the verses follows an alphabetical arrangement. The first, second, fourth, and fifth elegies are each composed of twenty-two verses, to correspond with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; the third lament is made up of three times twenty-two verses. In the first, second, and fourth elegies each verse begins with a letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the letters following in order, as the first verse begins with Aleph, the second with Bet, etc.; in the third elegy every fourth verse begins with a letter of the alphabet in due order. Thus, with a few exceptions and changes (Ps, the thirteenth, preceded -כ), in which the Hebrew alphabet is formed from the initials of the separate verses. How easily this alphabetical method can curb the spirit and logic of a poem is most clearly shown in the third lament, which, besides, had
probably in the beginning the same structure as the others, a different initial letter to each of the original verses; it was not until later that a less careful writer developed each verse into three by means of ideas taken from Job and other writers.

(3) As to the structure of the strophe, it is certain that the principle followed in some cases is the change of the person of the subject as speaker or one addressed. The first elegy is divided into a lament over Sion in the third person (verses 1–11), and a lament of Sion over itself (verses 12–22). In the first strophe Sion is the object, in the second, a strophe of equal length, the subject of the elegy. In 11c, according to the Septuagint, the third person should be used. In the second elegy, also, the intention seems to be, with lament a third choir is added. Literary criticism finds in the dramatic construction of the book a strong argument for the literary unity of Lamentations.

C. Liturgical Use of Lamentations.—The Lamentations have received a peculiar distinction in the Liturgy of the Church in the Office of Passion Week. If Christ Himself designated His death as the destruction of a temple, “he spoke of the temple of his body” (John, ii, 19–21), then the Church surely has a right to pour out her grief over His death in those Lamentations which were sung over the ruins of the temple destroyed by the sins of the nation.

For a general introduction to Jeremias and Lamentations see the Biblical Introductions of Cornely, Vigneux, Giotter, Cornilli, Strack. For special questions of introduction: Ghynne, Jeremiah (1888); Marti, Der Prophet Jeremias (1891).

THE PLAINS OF JERicho (FROM THE WEST)

the change of strophe, to change from the third person to the second, and from the second to the first person. In verses 1–8 there are twenty-four members in the third person; in 13–19 twenty-one in the second person, while in 20–22, a strophe in the first person, the lament closes in a monologue. In the third lament, as well, the speech of a single subject in the first person alternates with the speech of several persons represented by “we” and with colloquy; verses 40–47 are clearly distinguished by their subject “we” from the preceding strophe, in which the subject is one individual, and from the following strophe in the first person singular in verses 48–54, while the verses 55–66 represent a colloquy with Jahweh. The theory of the writer, that in the structure of Hebrew poetry the alternation of persons and subjects is a fixed principle in forming strophes, finds in Lamentations its strongest confirmation.

(4) In the structure of the five elegies regarded as a whole, Zenner has shown that they rise in a steady and exactly measured progression to a climax. In the first elegy there are two monologues from two different speakers. In the second elegy the monologue develops into an animated dialogue. In the third and fourth elegies the cry of lamentation is louder still, as more have joined in the lament, and the solitary voice has been replaced by a choir of voices. In the fifth

Jeremias, Epistle of. See Baruch.

Jericho.—Three cities of this name have successively occupied sites in the same neighbourhood.

I. A city of Canaan taken and destroyed by Josue
after the passage of the Jordan (Jos., vi). The establishment of the Israelites in the industries of the "City of Palm Trees" gave birth to the Jericho of Benjamin (Jos., xviii, 21), which was for some time dominated by Eglon, King of Moab (Judges, iii, 12), and in which David's emissaries had their headquarters when they had set up King Hanun, King of the Ammonites (II Kings, x, 5). But when, under Achab, the Canaanite Jericho had been restored by Hiel the Bethelite (III Kings, xvi, 34), the Israelites installed themselves there. They were visited by Ellisius, who purified the waters of the spring (IV Kings, i, 18–22). Three hundred and thirty years after Jericho returned its former popularity, repopulated its native city (I Esd., ii, 34; II Esd., vii, 36). Having fallen into the hands of the Syrians, it was fortified by Bacchides, to protect Judea on the eastern side (1 Mach., ix, 50). This Jericho was situated at Tell-es-Sultan, near the Fountain of Ellisius ('Ain-es-Sultan), which flows at a distance of about two miles north-west of es-Ribâ, the modern Jericho. Excavations made in this tell in 1907–08 brought to light a rampart measuring some 840 yards in circuit, a citadel with double wall of the Canaanite period, Israelitish dwellings of the time of the Kings, and a temple (S. N. de G. Bezalel, Österreichische Zeitschrift für den deutschen Orient. Gesellschaft zu Berlin, December, 1908, no. 39: "Revue Biblique," 1909, 270–79).

II. The ancient Jericho, near the spring, had entirely disappeared when Herod founded a new Jericho towards the point where the brook of the Kelt and the Jerusalem road emerge from the mountains. Protected by the fort of Cyprus, it possessed royal palaces, vast reservoirs, a hippodrome, and an amphitheatre (Josephus, "Bell. Jud.", i, xxi, 14; xxxii, 6, 8; "Antiq. Jud.", XVI, v, 2). Herod died there: his son Archelaus further embellished the palaces and caused new aqueducts to be built to bring water to the temple gardens (Antiq. Jud., XVII, xiii, 1). It was at the gates of this Jericho that Christ cured two blind men (Matt., xx, 29–34), only one—Baritmeus—according to Mark (x, 46) and Luke (xviii, 35), and saw the publican Zaccheus (Luke, xix, 1–5). The Khirbet Qarqûn, the Birket Mâḏâa, a few artificial mounds, are the visible remains of the second Jericho, which, before being entirely destroyed, served for some days as a Roman camp (Bell. Jud., viii, 2; ix, 13).

III. A third Jericho then came into existence in the gardens which the Fountain of Ellisius watered, and which, palm, myrrh, olives, and other products, gave to the city its name (Bell. Jud., IV, viii, 3), the sycamore, banana, etc. According to the map of the Mâḏâa, it was an important city and a see suffragan to Caesarea Maritima. Its known bishops are Januarius (323), Macer (381), Eleutherius (415), Joannes (518), Gregorius (536), Basilius (900) (Lequien, "Orients Christianus"; III, 646–50). Justinius set up here a great caravanserai (Procopius, "De Edif.", v, 9). During the Crusades Jericho was a benediction attached to the Holy Sepulchre. The Byzantine city was succeeded by the present Ribâ, which consists of a few hostellaries for pilgrims and a few houses inhabited by Ghawarneh Arabs. There is also a Greek church (called "the Sanctuary of Zaccheus") served by two Orthodox monks, a Latin chapel, and a mosque.

JEROBOAM (חֵרֹבּא; Sept., 'Iεροβώμ), name of two Israelite kings.

1. (I Kings) IX, 2. He was the first ruler of the Northern Kingdom after the schism of the Ten Tribes. He was a son of Nabat an Ephraimite, and his mother's name was Sarai. While still a young man he was placed by King Solomon over the tributes of Ephraim and Manasses (III Kings, xi, 28). In that capacity he superintended the labours of his tribesmen in the building of the fortress Mello in Jerusalem and of other public works, and he naturally became conversant with the widespread discontent caused by the exaltation of those whom they held up as national ancestors, Heli, King of the Ammonites (II Kings, x, 5). But when, under Achab, the Canaanite Jericho had been restored by Hiel the Bethelite (III Kings, xvi, 34), the Israelites installed themselves there. They were visited by Ellisius, who purified the waters of the spring (IV Kings, i, 18–22). Three hundred and thirty years after Jericho returned its former popularity, repopulated its native city (I Esd., ii, 34; II Esd., vii, 36). Having fallen into the hands of the Syrians, it was fortified by Bacchides, to protect Judea on the eastern side (1 Mach., ix, 50). This Jericho was situated at Tell-es-Sultan, near the Fountain of Ellisius ('Ain-es-Sultan), which flows at a distance of about two miles north-west of es-Ribâ, the modern Jericho. Excavations made in this tell in 1907–08 brought to light a rampart measuring some 840 yards in circuit, a citadel with double wall of the Canaanite period, Israelitish dwellings of the time of the Kings, and a temple (S. N. de G. Bezalel, Österreichische Zeitschrift für den deutschen Orient. Gesellschaft zu Berlin, December, 1908, no. 39: "Revue Biblique," 1909, 270–79).

II. The ancient Jericho, near the spring, had entirely disappeared when Herod founded a new Jericho towards the point where the brook of the Kelt and the Jerusalem road emerge from the mountains. Protected by the fort of Cyprus, it possessed royal palaces, vast reservoirs, a hippodrome, and an amphitheatre (Josephus, "Bell. Jud.", i, xxi, 14; xxxii, 6, 8; "Antiq. Jud.", XVI, v, 2). Herod died there: his son Archelaus further embellished the palaces and caused new aqueducts to be built to bring water to the temple gardens (Antiq. Jud., XVII, xiii, 1). It was at the gates of this Jericho that Christ cured two blind men (Matt., xx, 29–34), only one—Baritmeus—according to Mark (x, 46) and Luke (xviii, 35), and saw the publican Zaccheus (Luke, xix, 1–5). The Khirbet Qarqûn, the Birket Mâḏâa, a few artificial mounds, are the visible remains of the second Jericho, which, before being entirely destroyed, served for some days as a Roman camp (Bell. Jud., viii, 2; ix, 13).

III. A third Jericho then came into existence in the gardens which the Fountain of Ellisius watered, and which, palm, myrrh, olives, and other products, gave to the city its name (Bell. Jud., IV, viii, 3), the sycamore, banana, etc. According to the map of the Mâḏâa, it was an important city and a see suffragan to Caesarea Maritima. Its known bishops are Januarius (323), Macer (381), Eleutherius (415), Joannes (518), Gregorius (536), Basilius (900) (Lequien, "Orients Christianus"; III, 646–50). Justinius set up here a great caravanserai (Procopius, "De Edif.", v, 9). During the Crusades Jericho was a benediction attached to the Holy Sepulchre. The Byzantine city was succeeded by the present Ribâ, which consists of a few hostellaries for pilgrims and a few houses inhabited by Ghawarneh Arabs. There is also a Greek church (called "the Sanctuary of Zaccheus") served by two Orthodox monks, a Latin chapel, and a mosque.

2. (Jzonosa) II, was the twelfth successor of the preceding, and the fourth king of the dynasty of Jehu. He succeeded his father Joas in 824 (or 783) and reigned forty-one years. In 802 Rammanunir III, King of Assyas, undertook a campaign into the "West lands", and the Kingdom of Israel (Land of Ammi), together with Syria and Phenicia, was placed under heavy tribute. Jeroboam, however taking advantage of the weakened condition of Syria, re-established toward the north and in other directions the ancient boundaries of Israel (IV Kings, xiv, 25). The military and patriotic successes of Jeroboam had been foretold by Jonas (ibid), and the Sacred Writer adds that the Lord saved the Israelites by the hand of Jeroboam, son of Joas. From the political standpoint, Jeroboam was an intelligent and energetic ruler, but with regard to his religious activities, his reign is reserved in these words: "He did that which was evil before the Lord. He departed not from all the sins of Jeroboam, son of Nathanel who made Israel to sin" (IV Kings, xiv, 24). Evidences of the religious decay during his otherwise prosperous reign are found in the writings of the prophets Amos and Osee, his contemporaries, who frequently inveigh against idolatry and its many concomitant evils and moral degradation. Jeroboam II died in 783 (or 742). See LEGRÈSE in VIGOUROUX, Dict. de la Bible, v.; COX in HASTINGS, Dict. of the Bible, v.

JAMES F. DRESCOLL.
Jerome, Saint, b. at Stridon, a town on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia, about the year 340–2; d. at Bethlehem, 30 September, 420. He went to Rome, probably about 369, where he was baptised, and became a pupil of Apollinaris of Laodicea, one of the first exegesites of that time and a disciple of the celebrated JEROME. From 374-9 Jerome led an ascetical life in the desert of Chaldea, south-west of Antioch. Ordained priest at Antioch, he went to Constantinople (380–81), where a friendship sprang up between him and St. Gregory Nazianzus. From 382 to August 385 he made another sojourn in Italy, the remainder of the year was spent in Syria. From August 385 to June 386 he died (11 Dec., 384) his position became a very difficult one. His harsh criticisms had made him bitter enemies, who tried to ruin him. After a few months he was compelled to leave Rome. By way of Antioch and Alexandria he reached Bethlehem, in 386. He settled there in a monastery near a convent founded by two Roman ladies, Paula and Eustochium, who followed him to Palestine. Henceforth he lived a life of asceticism and study; but even then he was troubled by controversies which will be mentioned later, one with Rufinus and the other with the Pelagians. Jerome, a learned man of the highest literary order, although very prolific, may be summed up under a few principal heads: works on the Bible; theological controversies; historical works; various letters; translations. But perhaps the chronology of his most important writings will enable us to follow more easily the development of his work. Jerome first extends his sojourn in Rome to the beginning of the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew (382–390). During this period the exegetical vocation of St. Jerome asserted itself under the influence of Pope Damasus, and took definite shape when the clergy of Rome compelled the caustic Dalmatian to renounce ascetical advancement and retire to Bethlehem. In 384 we have the correction of the Latin version of the Four Gospels; in 385, the Epistles of St. Paul; in 384, a first revision of the Latin Psalms according to the accepted text of the Septuagint (Roman Psalter); in 384, the revision of the Latin version of the Book of Job, after the accepted version of the Septuagint; between 386 and 391 a second revision of the Latin Psalter, this time according to the text of the "Hexapla" of Origen (Gallican Psalter, embodied in the Vulgate). It is doubtful whether he revised the earlier version of this Old Testament according to the Greek of the Septuagint. In 382–383 "Alcorato Luciferian et Orthodoxo" and "De perpetuo Virginitate B. Maria; adversus Helvidium". In 387–388, commentaries on the Epistles to Philomen, to the Galatians, to Ephesians, to Titus; and in 389–390, on Ecclesiastes. Between 390 and 405, St. Jerome gave all his attention to the translation of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew, but this work alternated with many others. Between 390–394 he translated the Books of Samuel and of Kings, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiasticus. From 390 to 405, from Rome, he translated the treatise "De Spiritu Sancto" of Diodorus of Alexandria; in 389–90, he drew up his "Questions hebraicae in Genesis" and "De interpretatione nominum hebraicorum." In 391–92 he wrote the "Vita S. Hilarii", the "Vita Malechi, monachi captivi", and commentaries on Nahum, Micah, Sophonias, Aggeus, Habacuc. In 392–93, "De viris illustribus", and "Adversus Jovinianum"; in 395, commentaries on Jonas and Abdias; in 398, revision of the remainder of the Old Testament, New Testament, and about that time commentaries on chapters xiii–xxiii of Isaia; in 398, an unfinished work "Contra Joannem Hieroelytianum"; in 401, "Apologeticum adversus Rufinum"; between 403–406, "Contra Vigilantium"; finally from 398 to 405, completion of the version of the Old Testament according to the Hebrew. In the last period of his life, from 405 to 420, St. Jerome took up the series of his commentaries interrupted for seven years. In 406, he commented on Osee, Joel, Amos, Zacharias, Malachi; in 408, on Daniel; from 408 to 410, on Ezekiel; in 410, on Isaiah; in 410, on Jeremiah. From 401 to 410 date what is left of his sermons; treatises on St. Mark, homilies on the Psalms, on various subjects, and on the Gospels; in 415, "Dialogi contra Pelagianos".  

Characteristics of St. Jerome's Work. — St. Jerome owes his place in the history of exegesis chiefly to his revisions and translations of the Bible. Until about 391–2, he considered the Septuagint translation as inspired. But the progress of his Hebraistic studies and his intercourse with the rabbis made him give up that idea, and he recognized as inspired the original or classical text of St. Jerome, although he need not, either. It is during that period that he undertook the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. But he went too far in this reaction against the ideas of his time, and is open to reproach for not having sufficiently appreciated the Septuagint. This latter version was made from a much older, and therefore more pure, Hebrew text than the one in use at the end of the fourth century. Hence the necessity of taking the Septuagint into consideration in any attempt to restore the text of the Old Testament. With this exception we must admit the excellence of the translation made by St. Jerome. His commentaries represent a vast amount of work but of very unequal value. Very often he worked exceedingly rapidly; besides, he considered a commentary a work of compilation, and his chief care was to accumulate the interpretations of his predecessors, rather than to pass judgment on them. The "Questions hebraicae in Genesis" is the epitome of his best work. It is a reproduction, concerning the original text. It is to be regretted that he was unable to continue, as had been his intention, a style of work entirely new at the time. Although he often asserted his desire to avoid excessive allegory, his efforts in that respect were far from successful, and in later years he was rather the enemy of some of his earlier allegorical explanations. He himself says that he had recourse to the allegorical meaning only when unable to discover the literal meaning. His treatise, "De Interpretatione nominum hebraicorum", is but a collection of mystical and symbolic meanings. Exceeding the "Commentarius in ep. ad Galatas", which is one of his best, his explanations of the New Testament have no great value. Among his commentaries on the Old Testament must be mentioned those on Amos, Isaia, and Jeremias. There are some that are frankly bad, for instance those on Zacharias, Osee, and Joel.  

To sum up, the Biblical knowledge of St. Jerome makes him rank first among ancient exegetes. In the first place, he was very careful as to the sources of his information. He required of the exegete a very extensive knowledge of sacred and profane history, and also an understanding of the countries and places of Palestine. He never either categorically acknowledged or rejected the deuterocanonical books as part of the Canon of Scripture, and he repeatedly made use of them. On the inspiration, the existence of a spiritual meaning, and the freedom of the Bible
from error, he holds the traditional doctrine. Possibly he has insisted more than others on the share which belongs to the sacred writer in his collaboration in the inspired work. His criticism is not without originality. The controversy with the Jews and with the Pelagians had long since called the attention of the Christians to certain difficulties in the Bible. St. Jerome answers in various ways. Not to mention his answers to this or that difficulty, he appeals above all to the principle, that the original text of the Scriptures is the only one inspired and free from error. Therefore one must determine if the text, in which the difficulties arise, has not been altered by the copyist. Moreover, when writers of the New Testament quoted the Old Testament, they did so not according to the letter but according to the spirit. There are many subtleties and even contradictions in the explanations Jerome offers, but we must bear in mind his evident sincerity. He does not try to cloak over his ignorance; he admits that there are many difficulties in the Bible; at times he seems quite embarrassed. Finally, he proclaims a principle, which, if recognized as legitimate, might serve to adjust the insufficiencies of his criticism. He asserts that in the Bible there is no material error due to the ignorance or the heedlessness of the sacred writer, but he adds: "It is usual for the sacred historian to conform himself to the generally accepted opinion of the masses in his time." (P.L., XXVI, 96; XXIV, 856)

Among the historical works of St. Jerome must be noted the translation and the continuation of the "Chronicon Eusebii Cesariani", as the continuation written by him, which extends from 325 to 378, served as a model for the annals of the chroniclers of the Middle Ages; hence the defects in such works: dryness, superabundance of data of every description, lack of proportion and of historical sense. The "Vita S. Pauli Eremitae" is not a very reliable document. The "Vita Malchi, monachi" is a eulogy of chastity woven through a number of legendary episodes, i.e., the "Vita S. Hilarionis", it has suffered from contact with the preceding ones. It has been asserted that the journeys of St. Hilarion are a plagiarism of some old tales of travel. But these objections are altogether misplaced, as it is really a reliable work. The treatise "De Viris illustribus" is a very excellent literary history. It was written as an apologetic work to prove that the Church had produced learned men. Contemporary criticism has shown that for the first three centuries Jerome depends to a great extent on Eusebius, whose statements he borrows, often distorting them, owing to the rapidity with which he worked. His accounts of the authors of the fourth century however are of great value. Thanks to Dom G. Morin, the oratorical works of St. Jerome have recently become known. They consist of about one hundred homilies or short treatises, and in these the Solitary of Bethlehem appears in a new light. He is a monk addressing monks, not without making very obvious allusions to contemporary events. The orator is lengthy and apologizes for it. He displays a wonderful knowledge of the word of God and of the Bible. His oratory is excessive at times, and his teaching on grace is Semipelagian. A censorious spirit against authority, sympathy for the poor which reaches the point of hostility against the rich, lack of good taste, inferiority of style, and misquotation, are the most glaring defects of these texts. Evidently they are notes taken down by his hearers, and it is a question whether they were reviewed by the preacher. The correspondence of St. Jerome is one of the best known parts of his literary output. It comprises about one hundred and twenty letters from several and several from his correspondents. Many of these letters were written with a view to publication, and some of them the author even edited himself; hence they show evidence of great care and skill in their composition, and in them St. Jerome reveals himself a master of style. These letters, which had already met with great success with his contemporaries, have been, with the "Confessions" of St. Augustine, one of the works most appreciated by the humanists of the Renaissance. Aside from their literary interest they have great historical value. Relating to a period covering half a century they touch upon most varied subjects; hence their division into letters dealing with theology, polemics, criticism, conduct, and biography. In spite of their turgid diction they are full of the man's personality. It is in this correspondence that the temperament of St. Jerome is most clearly seen: his waywardness, his love of extremes, his exceeding sensitiveness; how he was in turn exquisitely dainty and bitterly satirical, unsparingly outspoken concerning others and equally frank about himself.

The theological writings of St. Jerome are mainly controversial works, one might say, composed for the occasion. He missed being a theologian, by not applying himself in a consecutive and personal manner to doctrinal questions. In his controversies he was simply the interpreter of the accepted ecclesiastical doctrine. Compared with St. Augustine his inferiority in breadth and originality of view is most evident. His "Dialogue" against the Luciferians deals with a schismatic sect whose founder was Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia. The Luciferians refused to approve of the measure of clemency by which the Church, since the Council of Alexandria, in 362, had allowed bishop, although a Donatist, to continue to discharge their duties on condition of professing the Nicene Creed. This rigid sect had adherents almost everywhere, and even in Rome it was very troublesome. Against it Jerome
IN HIS STUDY—CARPACCIO, S. GIORGIO DEGLI SCHIAVONI, VENICE
TAMING THE LION—CARPACCIO, S. GIORGIO DEGLI SCHIAVONI, VENICE
ST. JEROME
IN THE DESERT—PINTURICCHIO, S. MARIA DEL POPOLO, ROME
HIS DEATH—CARPACCIO, S. GIORGIO DEGLI SCHIAVONI, VENICE
JERUSALEM—1. VALLEY OF THE CEDRON AND MOUNT OLIVET. 2. VIEW OF JERUSALEM FROM MOUNT OLIVET. 3. VIEW OF JERUSALEM FROM THE MOUNT OF EVIL COUNSEL
Jerome wrote his "Dialogue," scathing in sarcasm, but not always accurate in doctrine, particularly as to the Sacrament of Confirmation. The book "Adversus Helvidius," was written in the year 392, when it was claimed that Helvidius held the two following tenets: (1) Mary bore children to Joseph after the virginal birth of Jesus Christ; (2) from a religious view-point, the married state is inferior to continency. Earnest entreaty decided Jerome to answer. In doing so he discusses the relations of Helvidius to Pelagianism. The work, written in Greek, was taken up again in the book "Adversus Jovinianum," written about ten years later. Jerome recognizes the legitimacy of marriage, but he uses concerning it certain disparaging expressions which were criticized by contemporaries and for which he has given no satisfactory explanation. Jovinian was more dangerous than Helvidius. Although he did not exactly teach salvation by faith alone, and the uselessness of good works, he made far too easy the road to salvation and slighted a life of asceticism.

Every one of these points St. Jerome took up. The Apocryphal "Adversus Helvidius," 394, is in fault with the Origenistic controversies. St. Jerome was involved in one of the most violent episodes of that struggle, which agitated the Church from Origen's lifetime until the Fifth Oecumenical Council (553). The question at issue was to determine if certain doctrines professed by Origen and others taught by certain pagans followers of Origen could be accepted. In the present case the doctrinal difficulties were embittered by personalities between St. Jerome and his former friend, Rufinus. To understand St. Jerome's position we must remember that the works of Origen were by far the most important exegetical collection then in existence, and the one most accessible to students. Hence a very natural tendency to make use of them, and it is evident that St. Jerome did so, as well as many others. But we must carefully distinguish writers who made use of Origen and those who advocated his doctrines. This distinction is particularly necessary with St. Jerome, whose method of work was very rapid, and consisted in transcribing the interpretations of former exegetes without passing criticisms on them. Nevertheless, it is certain that St. Jerome greatly praised and made use of Origen, that he even transcribed some erroneous passages without discovering it. In his letters to Rufinus, it is always adhering thinkingly and systematically to the Origenistic doctrines. Under these circumstances it came about that when Rufinus, who was a genuine Origenist, called on him to justify his use of Origen, the explanations he gave were not free from embarrassment. At this distance of time it would require a very subtle and detailed study of the question to decide the real basis of the quarrel. However that may be, Jerome may be accused of imprecision of language and blamed for a too hasty method of work. With a temperament such as his, and confident of his doubtless orthodoxy in the matter of Origenism, he must naturally have been tempted to justify anything. This brought about a most bitter controversy with his wily adversary, Rufinus. But on the whole Jerome's position is by far the stronger of the two, even in the eyes of his contemporaries. It is generally conceded that in this controversy Jerome was not altogether free from asceticism which had developed so largely in the fourth century. Perhaps the influence of that same reaction is to be seen in the doctrine of the monk Pelagius, who gave his name to the principal heresy on grace: Pelagianism. On this subject Jerome wrote his "Dialogus contra Pelagianos," Origen's rebuke of the "Onomasticon" of Eusebius, to which the translator has joined additions and corrections. The translations of the "Homilies" of Origen vary in character according to the time in which they were written. As time went on, Jerome became more expert in the art of translating, and he outgrew the tendency to palliate, as he came across them, certain errors of Origen. We must make special mention of the translation of the homilies "In Canticum Canticorum," the Greek original of which has been lost.

The most accessible edition of St. Jerome's complete works is in 10 volumes, and a Latin translation 16 volumes, and several years. The two Latin translations have been published as a result of special critical study. Of special merit are the "Sermons of St. Jerome," published by Morin in "Anecdota Maredsolanana," III (Oxford, 1897, 1903), 2 and 3. For the best edition of the historical documents concerning the life of St. Jerome see the article Hieronymus, in Bibliotheca hagiographica latina (Brussels, 1898-1899). 576. For literature on the subject consult Cunetio, Bibliotheca Latina, 1737, 576. The best and most up-to-date work on St. Jerome is Grützmacher, Hieronymus, eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchen- geschichte (3 vols., Berlin, 1910, 1911, 1913). Among the most accessible works are Bocchieri, S. Jerome et ses ennemies (Paris, 1903); Bänziger, Etudes sur St. Jerome (Paris and Brussels, 1913); Martin, The Life of St. Jerome (London, 1899). On St. Jerome's Latin writings, see Tixeront, Histoire des dogmes, II (Paris, 1900). Concerning the discussion that arose through the translation of the Bible from the Hebrew, see La Roque, L'esprit traditionel et l'esprit critique in Bulletin de l'archéologie ecclésiastique (1890), 37 sqq. Critics are not agreed as to the dates they attribute to some of St. Jerome's works.

Louis Sallet.

Jerome Emiliani, Saint, founder of the Order of Somasch; b. at Venice, 1481; d. at Somasch, 8 Feb., 1537; feast, 20 July; son of Angelo Emiliani (popularly called Miani) and of Eleonore Mauroceni, joined the army, and in 1508 defended Castelnuovo against the League of Cambrai. Taken prisoner and miraculously liberated, he was made a pilgrim and a beggar of the Church. Our Lady at Trevixo, in fulfilment of a vow. He was then appointed podestà of Castelnuovo, but after a short time returned to Venice to supervise the education of his nephews. All his spare time was devoted to the study of theology and to works of charity. After his ordination to the priesthood in 1518, the hospitals and the hovels of the poor were his favourite resorts. In the year of plague and famine (1528), he seemed to be everywhere, and showed his zeal especially for the orphans, whose number had so greatly increased. He rented a house for them near the church of St. Rose and, with the assistance of some pious laymen, ministered to their wants. His charge was also committed the hospital for incurables, founded by St. Cajetan. In 1531 he went to Verona and induced the citizens to build a hospital; at Brescia he erected an orphanage, at Bergamo one for boys and another for girls. Here also he took care of some fallen women who wished to do penance. Two priests, Alessandro Besusio and Agostino Bariso, now joined him in his labours of charity, and in 1532 Jerome founded a religious society, placing the motherhouse at Somasch, a secluded hamlet between Milan and Bergamo. In the rule, Jerome puts down as the
principals work of the community the care of orphans, poor, and sick, and demands that dwellings, food, and clothing shall bear the mark of religious poverty. Jerome fell a martyr to his zeal; contracting a disease at Bergamo, he died at Somașiaca. He was beatiﬁed by Benedict XIV in 1747, and canonized by Clement XIII in 1767. The Oﬃce and Mass in his honour were aﬀorded as early as 1771. A work written by Scipio Alhani (1600); another by Andreas Stella (1605). The best was written by Aug. Tortora (Milan, 1820; in Acta SS., Feb., II, 217 sq.).

After the death of Jerome his community was about to disband, but was kept together by Gambarena, who had also been a monk. He received the approbation of Pope Pius V (1540) of Paul III. In 1547 the members vainly sought aﬃliation with the Society of Jesus; then in 1547–1555 they were united with the Theatines. Pius IV (1553) approved the institution, and St. Pius V raised it to the dignity of a religious order, according to the Rule of St. Augustine, with solemn vows, privileges of the mendicant, and exemption. In 1569 the six members made their profession, and Gambarena was made ﬁrst superior general. Great favour was shown to the order by St. Charles Borromeo, and he gave it the church of St. Mayeuł at Pavia, from which church the order took its special name "Clariæ ad sancti Maioli Papae et congregations somaschanae". Later the education of youth was put into the programme of the order, and the colleges at Rome and Pavia became renowned. It spread into Austria and Switzerland, and before the great Revolution it had ten houses in the four provinces of Rome, Lombardy, Venetia, and France. At present the order has ten houses in Italy, two of which are in Rome. The general resides in Rome at the Giolami della Carità.


FRANCIS MEIBMAN.

Jeronymites: See Hieronymites.

Jerusalem.—I. BEFORE A.D. 71.—This article treats of the "City of God", the political and religious centre of the People of Israel, with its destruction by the Romans after it had become the scene of the Redemption. This part of the subject will be divided as follows: A. Names; B. Topography; C. History; D. Development of the City and its Chief Monuments.

A. Names.—According to Jewish tradition (Jos. xvi. 11), Jer. iii. 17; 11 Kings vii. 5, Jerusalem was originally called Salem (Peace), and was the capital of King Melchisedech (Gen. xiv. 18). This tradition is conﬁrmed by the cuneiform tablets discovered in 1838 at Tell Amarna, in Egypt (see below, under C. History). Five of these letters, written at Jerusalem about the year 1400 a.C., inform us that the city was then called Uru-e-am-lim (Conder, "The Tell Amarna Tablets", London, 1894, pp. 143–51). It ﬁgures in Assyrian inscriptions under the name of Ur-sa-hi-im-me (E. Schrader, Die Keilschrift. u. d. A. T., 1883, p. 290). Around the cuneiform inscriptions, the Akkadians, thirty cities and inhabitants (Ur, or Uru) is the Assyrian word for "city" (Hebrew fr). In several of the Tell Amarna Tablets the word salim is used in the sense of "peace". Urallim, therefore, means "City of Peace". The Psalmist, too, connects Salem with Zion: "He hath his tabernacle in Salem, and his abode upon the mountain of Zion" (Ps. lxvi. 5 [lxvii. 5]). When the Israelites came into the Land of Promise, Jerusalem was in the power of the Jebusites, and bore the name of Jebus. The Hebrews, however, were not ignorant of its ancient name; they often called it Jerusalem (עִירי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם) (Jos. x. 1; Judges xix. 10; 11 Kings vii. 5, etc.). In other passages of the Bible it is called Jerusalem (ʃʃחֲלָא) (I Par. iii. 5; Jer. xxvi. 18; Esther ii. 6, etc.). The Septuagint writes its name "Ierusaλyin". Under the hellenising inﬂuences which invaded Palestine, Jerusalem became Σιόλυμα (Antiq. Jud., i. x. 2), and Jerusalem μακησαμα (The Holy Polis) (I Mach. i. 14, 20; II Mach. i. 10; Bell. Jud., vi. x, etc.). The New Testament employs sometimes the Septuagint name and sometimes that of Machabees, which the Vulgate renders Jerusalem and Jerusaleuma. The Synaxarion gives Λυραλαμ, a form more nearly corresponding to the Hebrew. W. M. F. Petrie (W. M. F. Petrie, A.D. 136, he gave it the name of Ἐλλάια Ἰωτάλα. From the Mohammedan conquest of Palestine, in the seventh century, until our own times, the Arabs have called it El Quuds, "The Holy", and the fr qaddes, or "Holy City", of II Esd. xi. 52 (cf. M. E. R. James, 6, etc.). When and for what reason the name Jerusalem continued to be used until now.

B. Topography.—(I) Geographical Position.—Jerusalem is situated in latitude 31° 46' 45" N. and longitude 35° 13' 25" E. of Greenwich, about 32 English miles in a straight line from the Mediterranean on the west, and 13 from the Dead Sea on the east. It stands on the crest of a chain of mountains which traverses Palestine from north to south, and the highest point of which, at the north-west corner of the city, is 2577 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, and 3865 above that of the Dead Sea. Owing to this difference of level, the stream of these mountains, which drain the Plain of Judah, towards the Mediterranean, is gentle, while that to the east is very steep. A girdle of high hills surrounds the city, forming a sort of natural rampart. On the north is Mt. Scopus (2705 feet), next to it, on the east, the Mount of Olives (2865 feet), beyond which again is the Mount of Olives (2410 feet) (III Kings, xi. 7; IV Kings, xxiii. 13). To the south is the Mount of Evil Counsel (2549 feet), which forms the eastern boundary of the Plain of Raphaim, and next, on the south-west, comes a hill (2557 feet) to which no name has been given. Towards the north-west the city is more expanded; at some distance to the west it is bounded by the Nebi Samwil, the ancient Maspha, which has an altitude of 2935 feet. Notwithstanding the diﬃculty of access in its natural situation, Jerusalem is the centre of a network of ancient roads which connect it, on the east, with Jericho and the Jordan; on the south, with Hebron and Gaza; on the west, with Jaffa and Cesarea; on the north, with Samaria and Galilee. It was, however, situated beyond the great military and commercial highways between Egypt and Assyria.

(II) Site; Hills and Valleys.—The ancient city occupied the same position as the present, except that its southern extremity has remained outside of the walls since the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 136). Thanks, however, to systematic operations undertaken by English, American, and German engineers, much of the old southern wall has been brought to light. While, in many places, masses of ruins have changed the appearance of the ground, excavations and vertical borings, made within the last ﬁfty years, have, nevertheless, enabled the explorers to construct suﬃciently exact maps of the primitive conﬁguration. The ground on which Jerusalem stands, within this ring of surrounding mountains, is bafﬁling in character: on three sides—the east, south, and west—it stands upon terraced heights bordered by deep valleys which give it the appearance of a promontory jutting out to the south. The city itself is ﬂurrowed with ravines which cut it up into a number of little tables. The longest of these valleys is about two miles and a half; they have all been formed by erosion, due to torrential rainfall, in the quaternary period. To the north of the city they take the shape of more depressions in the soil, then, as they descend, sinking rapidly in the calcareous rock of which the mountains are formed, they soon become deep gorges running together at the south-east angle of the city, at a depth of about 800 feet below their starting-point. The two
principal hills rise on the south-west and the east respectively. The former of these hills is called Mount Zion, as described in Josephus (Antiq. Jud., XVI, vii. 1). Eusebius, and all the authors, Jewish and Christian, have followed him, the city of Jebus, or Zion—the City of David—stood there. This view, however, is contested by certain modern Palestinian scholars, who would locate Zion upon the northern despised, the steps of these hills, Mount Moriah (II Par., iii. 1), where stood the Temple of Jehovah.

(a) Mount Zion is bounded on the west by a valley which begins near the old pool called Birket Mamilla (see below, under D), about 1000 feet to the north-west of the hill itself. This valley, following a south-easterly direction as far as the Jaffa Gate, the ancient gate of the gardens (Gennath) (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2), then turns to the south and forms a great reservoir of water called the Birket es Sultán, by means of a massive dam, which was rebuilt in the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries. This is the Fountain of the Dragon (Roman) which Nehemiah came to when he went out of the city by the western gate (D. V., "dragon fountain", II Esd., ii. 13).

Josephus calls it the Pool of the Serpent (Bell. Jud., V, iii. 2); the Hebrew word "drachon" signifies both "dragon" and "serpent". This valley is called by the natives Wâdi Rabî; in the Bible it goes by the name of Ge Hinnom, or Ge Ben Hinnom, "Valley of Ennom" (in A. V., Hinnom) or "of the son of Ennom"—an unknown personage (Jos. xv; 8; xviii, 16; II Esd., xi, 30; Jer., xix, 2). Below the Birket es Sultán, it turns to the east, passing before Helel dam (q. v.), and connects with the Valley of Cedron. At the junction of the two valleys are the rich plantations forming "the king's garden" (or, in D. V., "the king's guard") mentioned in IV Kings, xxxiv, 4 (see under D). II Esd., iii. 15. Also at the mouth of the Valley of Hinnom is situated Tophest, the high place where Aschaz and Manasseh set up the worship of Baal-Moloch (II Par., xxxviii, 3; xxxiii, 6). The good King Josias defiled this execrable place, scattering human bones over it (II Par., xxxiv, 3-5), in spite of which Joasik restored there the infamous worship of his mother. From the unhealthy fires which were kept burning there for nearly a century and a half—those fires through which the apostate Jews caused their children to pass, in order to consecrate, or immolate, them to Moloch—Ge Hinnom (in Aramæan, Gehennaem) received the name of Tved vél vajis, " Gehenna of the Fire", and became the emblem of hell (in Greek text, Matt., v. 22, 29, 30; Mark, ix, 43, 45). The Valley of Cedron, from Hinnom as far as the Dead Sea, is still called Wâdi en Nâr, "Valley of Fire".

On the north, Mount Sion is bounded by a valley, now largely filled in, which goes down in a straight line from the Jaffa Gate—eastward to the foot of Mount Moriah. On the slope of this valley is a large reservoir called in Arabic Birket Hamâm el Batârak, "Pool of the Baths of the Patriarch", and in the itineraries of the pilgrims "Pool of Ezechias". Josephus calls it Amygdalœ, a name which, according to Conder, may with good reason be derived from ham migdalon, Jerusalem, the highest, and the only one completely isolated. Its highest point reaches an altitude of 2558 feet, and rises 331 feet above its base at the south-eastern angle. Its surface is considerably varied, being, indeed, divided by a small depression which branches off from the middle of the Transverse Valley and descends obliquely to the Pool of Siloe. Mount Sion thus consists of two lofty connected plateaux, one (the lower) stretching westward, the other (the shorter) to the north-west. The former is fairly uniform and measures 2300 feet in length from north to south, and 920 feet in breadth. After sinking about 100 feet towards the north-west, the ground rises about 20 feet and forms a rounded eminence opposite to the Temple, terminating in a precipice 195 feet above the former bed of El Wâd.

(b) Mount Moriah, or the Eastern Hill, is a narrow promontory connected with Mount Bezetha, the highest point of which is the Hill of Jeremias, with an altitude of 2556 feet. This tongue of land terminates on the south in a point near the Pool of Siloe; El Wâd encloses it on its western side, and the Valley of Cedron on its eastern. Upon its highest crest (2845 feet) was the domain of Omer (Amuza), the Jebusite, where Solomon built the Temple and his palaces. This is the summit called Moria; south of the royal quarter, the hill (2300 to 2050 feet) bears the name of Ophel (II Par., xxvii, 3). Cedron, which, since the third century after Christ, has also been called the Valley of
Joseph, begins near the so-called Tombs of the Judges, and descends, under the name of Wadi ed Dijon (Valley of Walnut), south-east to the foot of Scopus, thence south, becoming a deep gorge separating Mount Moria from the Mount of Olives and the Mount of Olives. At a point 1300 feet beyond the north-east angle of the city, it is crossed by a bridge which has replaced an ancient one. This older bridge gave access, on the right, to a staircase cut in the rock and leading up to the north side of the Temple, and, on the left, to a similar staircase leading up to the Mount of Olives. To the left of the bridge is the Garden of Gethsemane (see GETHSEMANI), with the Tower of David. The Jerusalem road from this part of Cedron Wadi sitti Mariam, or "Valley of the Lady Mary". Next come, on the same side, two fine monuments of the Greco-Roman-Judaic style (second to first century a. d.) excavated in the rock. The first of these has been called, since the fourth century after Christ, the Tomb of Absalom; the second, the Tomb of the Prophet Zacharias. Between the two is a grandiose Jewish tomb of the same period, belonging to the family of the Beni Hezir. A little farther on, upon the side of the Mount of Olives, is to be seen a rock-hewn tomb of Egyptian architectural plan, the upper story of which is surmounted by a low dome. In the Lukan Silwan, the houses built against long rows of sepulcres, most of them cut in a vast bank of calcareous rock popularly known as Es Zehwele. Opposite, at the foot of Ophel, a flight of thirty-two steps descends to a grotto, in which is a spring of slightly brackish water. This spring presents the phenomenon of a natural (subterranean) syphon producing an intermittent flow; only at intervals—from three to six times a day—does the water rush down, with a strange humming noise, from a cleft in the rock. The water of this spring is conveyed to the Pool of Siloam via a winding tunnel. The Arabs call the fountain of the Virgin, Virgin, and also Ain Qumm Damaj, "Fountain of the Mother of the Stairs"; its Biblical name is, according to some, En Rogel; according to others, the Upper Gihon (see below, under D). Cedron now begins to widen, and is covered with rich gardens, the "King's gardens" mentioned in the Bible. It receives the Hinom, together with El Wad and the little valley which descends obliquely from Mount Zion. Its descent in a course of about two and a half miles is 550 feet, but in the latter half of this distance it is encompassed with fifteen to fifty feet of rubbish. The ascent of Mount Moriah begins outside the Gate of Herod (Bab Zahira), passes to the south-south-east, under the north-eastern angle of the platform of the Temple, and ends at the bridge of Cedron. The numerous pools in this depression, near St. Anne's church, the traditional birthplace of the Blessed Virgin, have given it the name of Virgin. Here should be located the Probatic Pool, or Pool of Bethsaida (A. V. Bethesda), with the five porches (John, v, 2). The locality of the Birket Isral, a reservoir 359 feet long by 126 feet wide, has also been determined, to the north, against the outer wall of the Temple. (c) Mount Moriah (in D. V. the hill Garab—Jer., xxxi, 39) stretches between the Transverse Valley, on the south, and the upper course of El Wad, on the east. It rises somewhat abruptly towards the north-west but offers no particularly prominent height except the rock of Calvary (2518 feet). In A. D. 70, Garab was still covered with woods, with gardens watered by a stream (Bell Jud. V, ii, 2).

There is still discussion as to whether Sion, the City of David, occupied the traditional Mount Sion or Ophel; but all admit that before the reign of Ezechias (727 B. C.) the city of Jerusalem extended over both hills, within the limits of the first walls.

C. History.—The history of Jerusalem is to a certain degree indistinguishable from that of Israel. It will suffice here to call attention to the most memorable occurrences in the city.

(1) From its Origin to its Conquest by David.—As seen above, Jerusalem is the ancient Salem, the capital of Melchisedech, king and priest of the Most High. Learning of the return of Abraham (then called Abram), who had been victorious over Chedorlaimor and his allies, in the name of the Lord (Gen., vii, 1) "is the vale of Save, which is the king's vale" (Gen., xiv, 17). The king's vale is the Valley of Cedron, which begins to the north of the city (II Kings, xviii, 18; Antiq. Jud., I, x, 2.—Cf. IV Kings, xxv, 4; Jer., xxxix, 4). Like all the land of Chanaan, it was in the hands of the Philistines in the 12th century B.C. In the 10th century, it was occupied by David. When the Hebrews came out of Egypt, the King of Jebus was Adonis (Lord of Justice)—a name which, both in form and sense, recalls Melchisedech (King of Justice). Although Adonis (Lord of Justice) perished in the coalition of the five kings of Chanaan against Israel (Jos., x, 20; xii, 10), Jerusalem, thanks to its strong position, long maintained its independence. In the distribution of the land among the children of Israel, it was assigned to the descendants of Benjamin. The boundary between this tribe and that of Judah ran from En Schems, on the Jericho road, to En Rogel, in the Valley of Cedron, then, following the valley or of the Blessed Virgin, until it reached "the east of the children of Ennom" (Jos., xviii, 15, 16), skirted the city to the south and west. In the period of the Judges, Judah and Benjamin had tried to gain possession of it, but in vain, although they put its practitioners to work and gave the city to the names (Judges, v, 11). The city here spoken of is as Josephus remarks (Antiq. Jud., V, ii, 2), only the lower city, or suburbs. Jerusalem remained (Judges, xix, 12) independent of Israel until the reign of David.

(2) From David to the Babylonian Captivity.—Having become king over the Twelve Tribes of Israel, David combated the more valiant power of the Philistines and religious centre of God's people. He assembled all the forces of the nation at Hebron, and advanced against Jebraus. After long and painful efforts, "David took the castle of Sion" and "dwelt in the castle, and called it, the city of David; and built about from Mello and inwardly (II Kings, v, 7). This was about the year 1058 B. C. The king then caused cedar wood to be brought from Lebanon, and woodmen from Tyre, to build him a palace. Soon after, the Ark of the Covenant was solemnly brought into the city of David and placed in a tabernacle. The king one day beheld the destroying angel soaring above Mount Moria, ready to strike the Holy City. The Lord stayed his arm, and David, in thanksgiving, bought the threshing-floor which was upon the summit of the hill, the property of Araunah (A. V. Araunah), or Ornan, the Jebusite, and there built an altar, upon which he offered holocausts (I Kings, v, 3). Thenceforward Mount Moriah was destined to receive the temple of the Most High. David prepared the material and led the execution of the project to his son.

In the fourth year of his reign, Solomon began the building of the temple, under the direction of architects sent by his son. King Solomon supplied cedar wood and cypress wood; 70,000 men were employed in transporting wood from Joppa (Jaffa) to
Jerusalem, and 80,000 more in quarrying stone in the neighbourhood and shaping it. The splendid monument was completed, as to its essential details, in seven years and a half, and with great pomp the Ark of the Covenant was brought from the City of David to the Temple (II Ki. viii. 6). The buildings were erected upon a great platform, constructed by means of immense containing walls. To the west rose the Holy of Holies, surrounded by a series of chambers in several tiers, in front of which, to the east, was a monumental façade, or pylon, formed by two lofty colonnades of piers and shafts with great columns of bronze, like obelisks. Towards the east was the great court of the priests, square, surrounded with porches, and enclosing the altar of holocausts, the "sea of brass," and other utensils for sacrifices. This court was surrounded by others which were also enriched with galleries and superb buildings (see TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM). Solomon next devoted thirteen years to erecting, south of the Temple, "the house of the Forest of Lebanon," his royal palace, with that of the queen, Pharaoh's daughter, as well as the buildings destined for his numerous family, for his gods and for his slaves. In the connection of the Temple and the surrounding quarter was the City of David by a wall of enclosure, fortified the Millo (in D.V., Mello—III Kings, ix. 15), and "filled up the gulf of the City of David" (III Kings, xi. 27). The people began to murmur under taxation and forced labor.

Insurrection broke out when the proud Roboam, son of Solomon, began his reign (961-65). Ten tribes revolted from him to form the Kingdom of the North, or of Israel, and Jerusalem ceased to be anything more than the capital of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah. At the invitation of Jeroboam, who was elected sovereign of the new kingdom, Rezin, king of Aram (A. V., Shishak), Pharaoh of Egypt, invaded the land of Juda (976), took Jerusalem, and plundered the immense treasures of the Temple and the royal palace (III Kings, xiv. 25, 26). Asa (961-21 and Josaphat (920-904) enriched the Temple after their numerous victories over the neighbouring peoples. Under Judah and the Philistines, in alliance with the Arabs of the South, in their turn pillaged the Temple and slew or carried off all the sons of the king except the youngest, Ochoim, or Joachaz, the child of Athalia (II Par., xxii, 16, 17). On his murder, Athalia had her son Joash, a child of seven, deposed. When Joash alone, a child of one year, was saved from the massacre by the High-Priest Joia and secretly reared in the Temple. At the age of six he was proclaimed king by the people, and Athalia was stoned to death. Joash (886-41) restored the Temple and abolished the worship of Baal; but later on, he allowed himself to be perverted, and caused the Prophet Zacharias, the son of Joia, his preserver, to be put to death. He himself perished by the hands of his servants (IV Kings, xii; II Par., xxii). Under Amsias the Israelites of the North vanquished those of the South, attacked and "took possession of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim to the gate of the corner, four hundred cubits." The treasures of the Temple and of the royal palace were carried away to Samaria (IV Kings, xiv, 13, 14). Ozaas, or Azarias (811-760), repaired the breach and fortified the wall with strong towers (II Par., xxvi, 9). His son Joatham (759-44), a wise and good king, strengthened the city by building "the high gate of the house of the Lord, and on the wall of Ophel he worked much"—south of the royal quarter (II Par., xxvi, 3; IV Kings, xv, 3). At this time, the kings of Syria and Israel were marching against Jerusalem. God sent the Prophet Isaiah to King Achaas (743-27), who was at "the conduit of the upper pool." There the Prophet foretold him the repulse of the enemy and at the same time announced to him that the Messias, Emmanuel, should be born of a virgin (Is., vii, 14). Achas used the wealth of the Temple to pay tribute to Theglathphalasar, King of Assyria, whose protection he had sought against the kings of Israel and Syria; he was impious enough to substitute the worship of Baal-Moloch for that of Jehovah.

Ezechias (727-690) hastened to abolish the worship of idols. Alarmed by the fall of the Kingdom of Israel (721), he erected a second wall to protect the suburbs which had come into existence to the north of Mount Sion and the Temple. He made peace with Egypt and with Merodach Baladan, King of Babylon, and refused to pay tribute to Assyria. Upon this, Sennacherib, King of Ninive, who was at war with Egypt, invaded Palestine from the south, and sent his chief officers from Lachis to Jerusalem, with a numerous army, to summon the king to surrender at discretion. But, upon the advice of Isaiah, the king refused to surrender. To cut off the enemy's water, he dammed the spring of the Upper Gihon and brought the stream to the west of the City of David (II Par., xxxii, 3, 4, and 30). An Assyrian tablet (Taylor's Collection, col. 3) reports that Sennacherib, after vanquishing the Egyptians at Altaka and taking four cities of Judah, shut up Ezechias in Jerusalem "like a bird in a cage" (Cuneiform Inscriptions of W. Asia, I, Pl. 39).

This agrees with the Bible narrative; just as he was about to assault Jerusalem, Sennacherib was informed by his Tharace, King of Ethiopia, that he was coming against him, and forthwith, leaving the Holy City, he set out for Egypt; but his army was miraculously destroyed by pestilence (IV Kings, xvii, 13; xix, 35-37; II Par., xxxii, 9-22; Is., xxxvi, and xxviii). Sennacherib organized another army at Ninive and vanquished Merodach Baladan of Babylon, Ezechias's suzerain. Thus it was that, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, Manasses, son of Ezechias (695-45), found himself a tributary of Assuradan and of Assurbanipal, Kings of Ninive (Prism of Assuradan, op. cit., III, p. 16; G. Smith, "History of Assurbanipal", p. 30). Manasses afterwards tried to shake off the Ninivite yoke. In 666 Assurbanipal's generals came to Jerusalem, put the king in chains, and carried him to Babylon, which was in vassalage to Ninive (II Par., xxxiii, 9-11). Manasses, however, soon obtained his liberty and returned to Jerusalem, where he repaired the evils he had caused. He also restored the city walls built by his father (II Par., xxxiii, 14-16).

Among, one of the worst kings of Juda, was assassinated after a reign of two years. Josias, his son (641-08), guided by the Prophet Jeremias, destroyed the idolatrous altars and restored the Temple (621). Upon this occasion the High Priest Helcias found in a hall of the sanctuary an old copy of the Law of Jehovah given by Moses (IV Kings, xxii, 8-14; II Par., xxxiv, 14-21). In 608 the Pharaoh, Nebcho II, marched against Assyria. Actuated by a scruple of conscience, the good king attempted to bar the way against his suzerain's adversary, and met his death on the battle field of Megiddo (IV Kings, xxvii). Joachas, or Sellum, his successor, after reigning three months, was deposed by Necho, and sent as a captive to Egypt, while Eliacim, to whom the conqueror gave the name of Jehoiakim (D.V. Joakim), was put in his place (607-600). In 601 Nabuchodonosor (Nebuchadnezzar) entered Judea to consolidate his father's power. He carried away as captives to Babylon certain notables of Jerusalem, together with the young Prophet Daniel. Joakim revolted against the Babylonian yoke, but his son Joachin (Jehoiachin), surrendered to Nabuchodonosor. The city was given over to pilage, and 70,000 inhabitants, including the wives of the priests, were carried off to Babylon (IV Kings, xxvii, 1-17; cf. also II Par., xxxvi, 1-10). Sedecias, third son of Josias, succeeded his nephew (590-587). Urged by the Egyptian party, he, too, rebelled against his suzerain. Nabuchodonosor
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returned to Syria and sent his general, Nabu-sardan, against Jerusalem with a formidable army. The city surrendered after a siege of more than eighteen months. The Temple, the royal palaces, and other principal buildings were given to the flames, and the city was dismantled. The sacred vessels, with everything else of value, were carried away. Those who remained, and the inhabitants transported to Babylon with their blind king. Only husbandmen and the poor were left in the country, with a Jewish governor named Godolias (Gedaliah), who took up his residence at Maspah (IV Kings, xxiv, 18-20; xxv; II Par., xxxvi, 11-21).

(5) From the Return out of Captivity to the Roman Domination.—In 536 B.C. Cyrus, King of Persia, authorized the Jews to return to Palestine and rebuild the Temple of the Lord (I Esd., i, 1-4). The first convoy, consisting of 42,000 Jews, was dispatched under the leadership of Zoroabel, a prince of Juda. The builders were not only the descendants of those who had been exiled, but others of the other cities of Judah, who were afterwards included in the number of the Jews living in the land. The foundation of the walls of the holy city was laid in the second year of the reign of Darius (514). The old men could not restrain their tears when they saw the magnificent character of the new building. In 458, under Artaxerxes I, Esdras came to Jerusalem with 1500 Jews as governor of Judea and completed the political and religious restoration of Israel. Thirteen years later Nehemiah, with the authorization of Artaxerxes, completely restored the Holy City. But the death of Josias and the capture of Tyre, Alexander the Great, King of Macedon, became master of Western Asia. In 332 he marched against Jerusalem, which had remained faithful to Darius III. The High-Priest Jaddus, believing that resistance would be useless, went out to meet the great conqueror, and induced him to spare the Jews (Antiq. Jud., XI, vii, 3-6). After Alexander, Jerusalem suffered much from the long struggle between the Seleucids of Syria and the Ptolemies of Egypt. Palestine fell to Seleucus Nicanor; but in 305 Ptolemy Soter gained entrance into Jerusalem on a Sabbath Day by stratagem, and captured the city, which was delivered to the Jews (Antiq. Jud., XII, i, 1). A century later (203) Antiochus the Great again tore the Holy City from the grasp of Egypt. When, in 199, it fell once more into the power of Scopas, a general of Ptolemy Epiphanes, the Jews helped the troops of Antiochus, who had just defeated Scopas's army, to definitively drive the Egyptian garrison out of the citadel of Jerusalem (Antiq. Jud., XII, iii, 3). The Seleucids conceived the unfortunate idea of introducing hellenism—that is, pagan—notions and manners among the Jewish people, especially the sacerdotal and civil aristocracy. The high-priesthood had become a royal office; Jason was supplanted by Menelaus, and Menelaus by Lysimachus. These unworthy priests at last took up arms against each other, and blood flowed freely on several occasions in the streets of Jerusalem (II Mach., iv). Under pretense of stifling these tumults, Antiochus Epiphanes in 166 entered the Holy City and, accepting the titles of the Temple, plundered it of its most sacred vessels, massacred 40,000 persons, and carried off as many more into bondage (I Mach., i, 17-25; II Mach., v, 11-23). Two years later he sent his general Apollonius to suppress the Jewish religion by force and replace it at Jerusalem with Greek paganism. The high-priest, and the citadel which commanded the Temple and served as a garrison for the Syrians and an asylum for renegade Jews, was reinforced. The statue of the Olympian Jupiter was set up in the Temple of the Most High, while a cruel and bloody persecution everywhere broke out against those Jews who were faithful to their traditions (I Mach., i, 30-64; II Mach., v, 25, 26; vi, 1-11).

The priest Mathathias of Hasmon and his five sons, known as the Maccabees, rose in revolt against the Seleucids. Judas, succeeding on the death of his father (166), gained four victories over the Syrian armies, occupied Jerusalem (164), purified the Temple, strengthened the fortifications, and erected a new altar of holocaustus. He also repaired the walls of the city, but could not gain possession of the Acra, which was held by a Syrian garrison. After various victories and victories he made an alliance with the Roman Empire (I Mach., viii). Jonathan succeeded and maintained the struggle with no less heroism and success. He built a wall between the upper city and the Acra, as a barrier against the Syrians. Simon took the place of his brother when Jonathan fell by treachery (142). Three years later, he drove out the Syrian garrison of Acra, raised the fortress, and even levelled the hill on which it had stood—a gigantic undertaking which occupied the entire population for seven years (Antiq. Jud., XVIII, vi, 6; Bell. Jud., V, iv, 1). Demetrius II, a year after Simon's death, finally recognized the independence of the Jewish people. Simon, with two of his sons, was assassinated by his son-in-law, and his third son, John Hyrcanus I (135-86), succeeded him on the throne. Antiochus Sidetes, with a formidable army, came to besiege Jerusalem, but consented to withdraw for a ransom of 500 talents, and Hyrcanus took that sum from the treasuries of the royal sepulchre (Antiq. Jud., XIII, viii, 24; Bell. Jud., I, ii, 5). Hyrcanus I was succeeded by his son Aristobulus I, who combined the title of pontiff with that of king, reigning for ten years. His brother, Hasmoneaus (105-78), considerably enlarged the boundaries of the kingdom by his many brilliant victories. Upon his death Alexander, his widow, took the reins of government into her hands for nine years, after which she entrusted the high-priesthood and the kingship to her son Hyrcanus II (69), but his brother Aristobulus took up arms to dispute the possession of the throne. By virtue of the alliance with Rome which Simon had entered into, Pompey, the Roman general, came from Damascus to Jerusalem, in 63 B.C., to put an end to the civil war. The partisans of Hyrcanus opened the city (Antiq. Jud., IV, vii, 2), but those of Aristobulus entrenched themselves within the fortifications of the Temple, and could not be dislodged until after a siege of three months. Their resistance was at last overcome on a Sabbath Day; as many as 12,000 Jews were massacred, and Aristobulus was driven into exile. Pompey restored Hyrcanus to the high-priesthood, with the title of ethnarch, and declared Jerusalem a tributary of Rome (Antiq. Jud., XIV, iv, 1-4; Bell. Jud., I, vii, 1).

(4) Under the Roman Domination; until A. D. 70.—Cæsar authorized Hyrcanus to rebuild the walls that had been destroyed; Jason was appointed Antipater, the Idumæan, governor of Palestine, and the latter, four years afterwards, obtained the appointment of his eldest son, Phasael, as prefect of Jerusalem, and of his youngest son, Herod, as governor of Galilee. When Antipater died (43), Antigonus, the son of the former, as high-priest, advanced Hyrcanus II into exile among his allies, the Parthians, and imprisoned Phasael, who killed himself in despair (Antiq. Jud., XIV, xiii, 5-10; Bell. Jud., I, xiii, 5-10). Herod fled to Rome, where the Senate proclaimed him King of the Jews (40). But it was three years before the Cæsars, invested with more power, turned upon Antigonus, and the citadel which commanded the Temple and served as a garrison for the Syrians and an asylum for renegade Jews, was
little by little, until it should be as splendid as that of Solomon. He also enlarged the sanctuary by extending the galleries to the fortress of Antonia, on the north, and connecting it, on the south, with the site of

Antony, and took up his residence there (Bell. Jud., V, v, 3; Antiq. Jud., XV, xi, 5). He also built a theatre and an amphitheatre for gladiatorial combats. In 19 B.C. the king, whose origin as well as his cruelty rendered him odious to the Jews, thought to win their goodwill by reconstructing the Temple of Zorobabel, Solomon's palace, so as to erect there a superb stoas, or basilica. The opening of the new Temple took place in the year 10 B.C. (Antiq. Jud., XV, xi, 3-6), but thousands of workmen laboured at it until A.D. 64 (Antiq. Jud., XX, ix, 7). He built a second strong castle at the north-west angle of Mount Sion, and
flanked it with three superb towers—Hippicus, Phasel, and Marianne. He also opened the tomb of the kings of Judah, in which he found, to which, to say no more, popular indignation aroused by his sacrilege, he erected a monument of white marble at the entrance of the tomb (Antiq. Jud., VII, xv, 3; XVI, vii, 1). Herod was nearing the end of his reign of nearly forty-one years, when Jesus, the Divine Saviour, was born at Bethlehem. A few months after the first miracle of the Wise Men of the East, and the Massacre of the Innocents, he died of a hideous malady, hated by all his people (4 B. C.).

Archelaus, his son, took the title of king, but in the course of the same year Rome left him with only the title of Ethnarch of Judae, Samaria, and Idumea. Then they were subjected to a supreme tribulation. Archelaus was deposed and succeeded by the status of a Roman province. Coponius, Marcus Ambivius, Annius Rufus, Valerius Gratius (A. D. 14), and Pontius Pilate (25) were successively appointed procurators of the country. Pilate occasioned several seditions, which he stifled with extreme brutality. Under the administration of Pontius Pilate, Jesus Christ was arrested and put to death. The Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Divine Saviour have rendered Jerusalem—which was already glorious—the most celebrated city in all the world. The enthusiasm with which, after the Ascension of the Lord on the Mount of Olives, the apostles dispersed themselves disciples of Jesus Christ provoked a violent persecution of Christians, in which the deacon Stephen was the first martyr (Acts, vi, 8–15). Pontius Pilate having one day seized the funds of the Corban to pay for the construction of an aqueduct, a violent uprising of the Jews was thus occasioned (35). Summoned to Rome to give an account of his conduct, he was banished by Caligula (Antiq. Jud., XVIII, iii, 2). Two years later, the emperor made Herod Agrippa I, grandson of Herod, tetrarch of the countries beyond Jordan; in 41 Claudius made him King of Judæa. Agrippa undertook the construction of Jericho, which was destroyed by the Jews in 66.的内容...

At this epoch there came to Jerusalem Saddan, who was called among the Greeks Helen, Queen of Adiabene, a country situated on the Adiabas, which is an eastern tributary of the Tigris. Converted to Judaism, together with her numerous family, she resided in the city in terrible famine (cf. Acts, xi, 28). It was she who caused to be excavated, for herself and her family, to the north of the city, the imposing sepulchre known as the Tomb of the Kings (Antiq. Jud., XX, ii, 6; iv, 3). At this time the Blessed Virgin died, and was buried at Bethanias by St. Peter, who returned from Antioch to preside at the First Ecumenical Council (Acts, xv, 1–3). (See JUDAIZERS, sub-title Council of Jerusalem.) The King of Judea was replaced by a procurator, and Agrippa II, son of the preceding Agrippa, was made Prince of Chalcis and Perea, and charged with the care of the Temple of Jerusalem (Antiq. Jud., XX, ix, 7). He finished the third wall, which had been commenced by his father, and brought the work upon the sanctuary to a termination in A. D. 64. Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, and Cumanus were successively procurators, from 44 to 52. Then came Felix, Festus, and Petronius, from 52 to 66. With the last two, disorders and massacres occurred incessantly. Gessius Florus (66) surpassed the wickedness of his predecessors, and drove the people to revolt against the Roman domination: Agrippa and his party advocated peace, and appealed to Rome against the procurator; but after several days of civil war, the insurgent party triumphed over the pacific, massacred the Roman garrison, and set fire to the palaces. Cestius Gallus, consul of 67, took Jerusalem, with the Twelfth Legion, but only met with regular opposition. He was compelled to retire (Antiq. Jud., XX, xxii; Bell. Jud., II, xvii, 6; xix, 1–9). The Christians, recalling Christ's prophecies (Luke, xix, 43, 44), withdrew beyond the Jordan into Agrippa's territory, led by their bishop, St. John (Epiphanus, De Studiis, xiv, xxv). Nero commanded his general Vespasian to suppress the insurrection, and Vespasian, accompanied by his son Titus, invaded Galilee, in A. D. 67, with an army of 60,000 men. Most of the strong places had been captured, when the death of the emperor occasioned a suspension of hostilities. After the ephemeral reign of his three empereors, Jupiter, Titus, and Domitian, Vespasian was raised to the throne in November, 69.

Titus received from his father the command of the Army of the East, and in the following year, at the season when the Holy City was crowded with those who had come to the Feast of the Passover, he began to lay siege to it. On the 14th day of Xanthic (Bell. Jud., V, xiii, 7), or of the Hebrew month Abib—the day of the Passover, corresponding to 31 March—Titus took up his position on Mount Scopus with the Fifth, Seventh, and Fifteenth Legions, while the Tenth Legion occupied the Mount of Olives. On the other side, John of Gischala, son of Tobias, and the new town at Bethesa, with 11,000 men, and Simon, the son of Giora, held the upper and lower city, on the south-western hill, with 10,000 men. Attacking the third wall, on 9 April, the legions captured that line of defences after fifteen days' fighting. Once master of the new town, Titus took up a position to the west, on the ground known as "the Camp of the Assyrians" (Bell. Jud., V, vii, 2). An attack upon the second wall immediately followed. Five days later, the Romans gained entrance by a breach, but were repulsed, and mastered it only after five days of fierce and incessant fighting. Titus then approached the Antonia, which offered the only way of access to the Temple, and the citadel of Herod, which covered the first wall to the north of Mount Sion. After three days given to repose, the causeways and movable towers were made ready against the Hippicus tower and the Antonia miserably at Cesarea (Acts, xxi, 23; Antiq. Jud., XIX, vii, 2).

After three weeks of fresh preparations, the battering-rams effected a breach in the wall connecting the Antonia with the Temple, near the Pool of Stretus, but in vain. Two days later, the wall crumbled to pieces above a mine prepared by John of Gischala, and a handful of Roman soldiers gained entrance to the Antonia by surprise, at three o'clock in the morning of 20 June (Bell. Jud., VI, i, 1–7). Titus at once had the fortress demolished, in order to use the materials in constructing mounds against the Temple. For three weeks the Jews desperately defended the outer porticoes and then the inner, which the Romans entered only at the cost of enormous sacrifices. At last on 23 July, a Roman soldier flung a blazing torch into the half burnt temple. In the midst of frightful carnage the fire spread to the neighbouring buildings, and soon the whole platform was one horrible mass of corpses and ruins (Bell. Jud., VI, ii, 1–9; iii, 1, 2; iv, 1–5). The Romans then set fire to the palace in the hollow of El Wad, and to the Ophel next day they drove the Jews out of the Acre and...
burned the lower city as far as the Pool of Siloe (Bell. Jud., VI, vi, 3-4). There still remained the third rampart, the formidable stronghold of the upper city, where the defenders of the Aera, laden with booty, had joined Simon's men. Eighteen days were devoted to the preparations of the Romans. A battering-ram was erected against the north-west and north-east of the fortress, but scarcely had the battering-rams breached the walls when John and Simon fled secretly with their troops. On the eighth day of Elul (1 August) the city was definitely in the power of the Romans, after a siege of 143 days. To the question, "How did you capture Jerusalem?" Titus replied: "It is not I who have conquered. God, in His wrath against the Jews, has made use of my arm." (Bell. Jud., VIII, vii, 2.)

The walls of the Temple and those of the city were demolished. But Titus wished to preserve the fortress of the upper city, with the three magnificent towers of Herod's palace. Besides, the upper city was needed as a fortified station for the Tenth Legion, which was left to garrison Jerusalem. During this siege—one of the most sanguinary recorded in history—600,000 Jews, according to Tacitus (Hist., V, xiii), or eighty thousand, according to Josephus, were exterminated by the sword, disease, or famine. The survivors died in gladiatorial combats or were sold into slavery.

D. Development of the City and its Chief Monuments.—(1) Sion, or the City of David, according to Tradition—"...it is that David took the castle of Sion and "dwell in the city of David" (Ps. cxix. 11, 14); and "round about from Mello and inwards" (II Kings, vii, 9). When Solomon had completed the Temple and the House of the Forest of Lebanon, 100 cubits long, 50 cubits wide, and 30 cubits high, with a porch 30 cubits by 50, he erected the palaces and other buildings. Lower down, towards the south, in the locality which figures in the post-Exilic texts as the Ophel, we find the Gabbasites (Jos., ix, 22) and other Nathinites—foreign races placed at the service of the Levites to furnish wood and water for the sacrifices (I Esd., ii, 35; vii, 24; viii, 20; II Esd., iii, 28; vi, 21).

Did Sion, the City of David, occupy the eastern hill or that situated to the south-west? Before the exile, the Jews could not have been ignorant of the location, for the boundary wall of Sion enclosed the sepulchres of the prophet-king and fourteen of his successors; the last two Books of Kings repeat this thirteen times (II Kings, ii, 10; v, 43; vi, 24, etc.; IV Kings, vii, 20; Acts, vii, 2). In the Law of Moses. On their return from exile, the old men (I Esd., iii, 12) must have remembered in what quarter of the city the burial-places of David and his descendants were situated; in point of fact, Nehemiah does not hesitate to use them as a landmark (II Esd., iii, 16). Hyrcanus I and Herod the Great even opened these tombs of the kings to find treasure in them (Antiq. Jud., XVII, vi, 3; XIII, vii, 4; Bell. Jud., i, ii, 5). The white marble monument erected by the latter seems to have remained standing until A. D. 133 (Dion Cassius, Hist. Romae, LXXIX, iv). At any rate the tomb of David and the tombs of the Jews and the disciples of Christ in the time of St. Peter (Acts, ii, 29). Now Josephus, an eyewitness, says that the Jebusite city, which became the City of David, occupied the high western plateau of the south-western hill, which is now known as Mount Zion. In his time it was called "the upper city" (Antiq. Jud., XVI, vii, 1, etc.), and again the upper aqora, or market (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 1. Cf. I Mach., xii, 38; xiv, 36). The word Millo (in D. V. Mello) is always translated Aera in the Septuagint and Josephus, and, according to the latter, the Millo, or Mello, occupied the high plateau on which the castle of David was situated. Then came time called Aera, "lower city" and "lower market" (Antiq. Jfl., XVI, vii, 1; Bell. Jud., V, iv, 1; I Mach., i, 38). It was this hill, commanding the Temple, that was levelled by the Hasmonaens (Antiq. Jud., XIII, vi, 6; Bell. Jud., i, ii, 2). The Talmudists agree with the Jewish historian as to the position of the two markets (Neubauer, "La Géographie du Talmud", p. 138). Eusebius of Cesarea (Onomasticon, a. v., "Golgotha"), St. Jerome (Ep. civ., Ad Eusebium), St. Ephrem (Hymn, 13), and many later writers, Jewish and Christian, locate Sion, the City of David, upon the south-western hill, which has never borne any other name than that of Mount Zion.

(2) Sion on Ophel.—During the last fifty years many writers have rejected tradition and sought information from the mediaeval geographical writers. But the following are the two different topographical theories. The theory which places Sion upon Ophel is the only one which (apart from certain discrepancies as to the sites of the Mello, the Aera, the palaces of Solomon, etc.) is worth a moment's consideration. The partisans of this theory base it upon the following passage: "This same Ezechias was he that stopped the source of waters of Gihon, and turned them away underneath toward the west of the city of David" (II Par., xxxii, 30). They maintain that Sion was at Ophel for the following reasons: (a) En Rogel, the "fountain Rogel"—the fountain of the Valley of Hinnom (Is., viii, 18)—is the Btr Eydb, or "Well of Job", situated 2300 feet to the south of the Ain Sitti Mariam, or Fountain of the Virgin. (b) In former times, as now, the Fountain of the Virgin was the only spring which flowed in the vicinity of Jerusalem. (c) The Fountain of the Virgin is, therefore, the Uqi, or fountain of the courtyard of Ezechias who made the tunnel of Siloe. (d) By this passage the king brought the waters of the Fountain of the Virgin to the west of Ophel, that is, of the City of David. (f) The Books of Mackabees explicitly state that Sion was on the mountain of the Temple, or Moriah.

The following objections are made:—

(a) The Btr Eydb, that is to say, the Well of Job, is neither a spring nor a fountain (en or ayn), but a well (btr), 125 feet deep, in its present condition, and is supplied only by rain-drainage and infiltration. In the sixth century, Cyril of Scythopolis (Vita S. Sabae, lviii), and then Eutychius of Alexandria (Annals), and Moudir ed Dn ("Hist. de Jérusalem"), ed. Sauvare, p. 188) tell us that, after a great drought which lasted five years (500-14), in the twenty-third year of Anastasius, John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, caused a well to be dug to a depth, according to Cyril, of about 256 feet; or, according to the Annals, of about 282 feet (about 82 feet), but without finding any water. The Btr Eydb, therefore, is no Chasenean fountain, and the En Rogel must necessarily be the Fountain of the Virgin, the natural peculiarities of which must have made it famous in the country and fitted it to serve as a boundary mark between the tribes of Benjamin and Juda. The grotto of this spring, too, would have afforded a good place of concealment to David's two spies, who hid at En Rogel (II Kings, xvii, 17).

(b) In the time of Ezechias there were many springs of running water in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and the Jews knew them well (II Par., xxxii, 2-5). Josephus relates that when Titus was besieging Jerusalem many springs flowed so abundantly that they sufficed, not only to give drinking water to the Romans, but to irrigate the gardens (Bell. Jud., iv, 2). West of the city the ground was covered with gardens (Bell. Jud., v, ii, 2; v, 2), and this is why the western gate bore the name of Gennath, "Gate of the Gardens". Here Titus pitched his camp and here the officers of Sennacherib halted (IV Kings, xvii, 17. Cf. Is., vii, 3). Among the living waters of Jerusalem the Babylonian Talmud commemorates the "Beth Mamlkah" (in English, the "Capital, or city", as we shall see). Cyril of Scythopolis (loc. cit.) relates that, in the great five-years' drought "the waters of Siloe and of the Lucullians ceased to flow". Lastly, Josephus says that a conduit under the Gate
of Gennath brought water to the Tower of Hippicus (Bell. Jud., V, vii, 3). Several fragments of ancient aqueducts have been discovered under the Jaffa Gate and about the Haram el Batrak, commonly called the Pool of Eschias.

(c) Adonias, the first-born son of David the king, secretly assembled his numerous partisans upon "the stone of Zoheleth, which was near the fountain Rogel", where he offered rams and bulls, and was preparing to slay the king at the end of the banquet. But David, apprised of the plot by the Prophet Nathan, sent Solomon, with the Prophet and the royal guard, to Gihon, there to receive the sacred unction without Adonias's knowledge, and to be proclaimed king to the sound of trumpets (II Kings, i, 8-9, 33-45). On the flank of the Mount of Olives, opposite to the Fountain of the Virgin, is an immense rocky ledge called Ez Zahwele. This has been identified by Clermont-Ganneau with the stone of Zoheleth ("Quart. Stat.", 1870, p. 251). Wilson and Warren are of the same opinion (The Discovery of Jerusalem, p. 205). Conder supports the identification upheld by the common opinion of the learned ("Quart. Stat.", 1884, p. 242, n. 1). If the City of David had been on Ophel, would Adonias have held his treasonable banquet under the windows of the royal palace? Would David have been ignorant of this large and noisy gathering until Nathan's arrival? Would he have been able to get into the house of Codman from the bottom of Zoheleth? Would not the partisans of Adonias have heard the sound of trumpets and the shouts of the people before the royal procession had returned to Zion (II Kings, i, 41)? The fact appears to be that, while Adonias had withdrawn to a spot in the Valley of Cedron near En Rogel, Solomon was sent from the opposite side, where was the source of Gihon.

(d) There is no document which in any way attributes the construction of the tunnel of Siloë to Eschias. On the other hand, Isaiah, in the reign of Ahas, the father of Eschias, speaks (viii, 6) of "the waters of Siloë" (a word which means "sent"—John, ix, 7) "that go with silence". The Hebrew inscription found in 1881 on the wall of the tunnel is, according to Sayce ("Fresh Light", London, 1883, p. 116), earlier than Eschias, and may even date from the time of Solomon. Conder, Maspero, Stade, Renan, and others regard it as the work of Eschias.

(e) There is now no question of the fact that the Pool of Siloë was always without the walls of the city (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2; ix, 4). Now Eschias brought the waters of Gihon to a cistern within the city (IV Kings, xx, 20; Eschus, xlviii, 19, fragment of the Hebrew Bible), and the next is the pool of the name of Eschias, between the two walls—i.e., between the old wall and that of Eschias, north-west of Mount Zion. The Hebrews never divided the cardinal points of the compass.

(f) In the historical books Sion is applied to the city of Jebus, which, with the Mello, became the City of David. But in the poetic books Sion becomes, by metaphor, a synonym for the Temple (Ps. lxxvi, 65), or for Jerusalem (Ps. xxxiii, 3; lxxvi, 5). Sion sometimes designates the people of Israel (Is., x, 32; Soph., iii, 14), or Judea (Lam., iv, 22), and even the Jewish community in the dispersion (Jer., xxxii, 12; Zach., ii, 7). In the days of the Machabees the City of David, to the west of the Temple, has become the resort of infidels (I Mach., i, 35 sqq.). Symbolically, the name of Sion was transferred to the Temple and its fortress, which had become the only stronghold of Israel's faith. But Ophel was always excluded from the topographical Sion (I Mach., xii, 33-37). The study of the Bible has been more successful in discovering the place here indicated on the spot, the site formerly occupied by the holy Sion, the City of David, as does tradition. Archeology, too, positively confirms tradition.

(3) Sion the Upper City.—The sides of the traditional Mount Sion contain a great many dwelling-places wholly or partly excavated in the rock. These were, according to the common opinion, the houses of the aboriginal inhabitants. While constructing the British School and the excavations of 1875, to the south of the western plateau of Sion, Maudslay discovered the line of an ancient fortress. Its base is a scarped cut vertically in the rock, about 600 feet in length, and 40 to 50 feet in height. To the west and east of this colossal scarped wall are salients hewn out of the mass of the rock, 30 to 50 feet in height. These are the rock bases of flanking towers. The first is 20 feet in height, and rests upon a plateau of rock rudely shaped into a talus. Along the scarps runs a ditch, which is also dug out of the living rock, having a depth of from 5 to 10 feet and an average width of 16 feet (Conder and Kitchener, The Ruins of Jerusalem, 1875, pp. 81 sqq.). In 1894 Bliss took up and continued the work of exploration. From the eastern tower the scarps turn towards the north-east, following the outlines of the high plateau, and the ditch follows uninterruptedly in the same direction. On account of some houses which are grouped about the Holy Cenacle, the exploration has only been carried on to a length of 185 feet. The scarps were once crowned by a wall (some of the stones of which, cut and bevelled, were found in situ), rises to a height of 240 feet above the bed of the Ennom (Hinnom) (see Bliss). This fortress, which was originally constructed with man-made art, and which was so solid as to defy every attack, occupied the high city indicated by Josephus, "upon much the highest hill, straight along its length, which, by reason of its strong position, had been named by David the citadel" (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 1). It was about 2500 feet in length and 800 in breadth. To the north where it was protected by a valley of no great depth, Herod caused a strong castle to be built, which made the position almost impregnable, even against the Roman legions. Thanks to the dimensions and other indications supplied by Josephus, it is thought that the Tower of Phasael may be recognized in the first courses of masonry of the actual Tower of David, and that of Hippicus in the tower to the north-west of the citadel; that of Mariamne ought to flank the western wall. On the same side the Gate of the Valley formerly opened (II Par., xxvi, 9; II Eed., xi, 15; iii, 15), and at the south-east angle of the fortress (II Eed., iii, 11; xii, 37), which defended the Gate of the Corner before the Herodian structure existed (IV Kings, xiv, 13; II Par., xxv, 23). The high city, which, according to Josephus, was the aristocratic quarter, contained the Cenacle, according to tradition, the house of Anna, and the south-east angle of Herod's palace, the prison where St. James the Greater was beheaded. From the Tower of Phasael the wall descended, from west to east, upon the southern slope of Mount Sion, and ended at the enclosure of the Temple. An important fragment of this rampart has been discovered to the east of the Tower of David, and farther on, another piece, 290 feet long, flanked by two towers, the stone facing of which, on the side towards the valley, remains intact to a height of 39 feet (Warren, "Quart. Stat.", 1884, p. III). This was built by the ancient Gate of Ephraim (IV Kings, xiv, 13; II Par., xxv, 23). According to tradition, St. Peter was cast into prison in the suburb of Eschias; after being delivered by the Angel, he made his way to the city proper, where he found the iron gate open (Acts, xii, 1-11). As early as the sixth century A.D. the Church marked the spot by the name of the brother of John Mark, fifty paces south of this wall (Acts, xii, 12-17). The southern wall of Mount Sion probably formed part of the wall by which David joined the City of Jebus and the Mello (the Acre of the Septuagint). This hill, according to Josephus, is the largest city, the Akron of the Syrians, which was levelled
by the Hasmonaeans (Antiq. Jud., XIII, vi, 6). It contained the palace of the Hasmonaeans and that of Helen of Adiabene (Bell. Jud., VI, vi, 3).

To return to the south of the primitive fortress, a wall of later construction descends from the outer angle, south-east of the eastern tower, towards the Pool of Siloë. It is a work of the kings of Judah, if not of Solomon, but, as Blisse has remarked, it has been restored again and again—on the last occasion, by the Empress Eudocia (a. d. 450–60). At a point 130 feet from the beginning of the wall, exploration has brought to light the remains of a gate with three superimposed floorings of successive periods. It opens upon a street under which passes a drain leading to Ennom. This

Blisse followed the eastern wall of Mount Zion for only 650 feet, that is, as far as 150 feet north of the Pool of Siloë. According to Nehemiah (II Esd., iii, 16–19), the wall passed in front of the street of stairs which went down to the sepulchre of David, then by the reservoir which Josephus calls the Pool of Solomon (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2), and, lastly, by the House of the Heroes—all places as yet unidentified. The wall then formed an angle and then a re-entrant angle (II Esd., iii, 24), but we are ignorant as to the point where it crossed the valley to ascend Ophel. On the eastern flank of Ophel it has been ascertained that a small fragment of a wall exists, running from south-west to north-east and, 100 feet farther on, a remarkable

is the Dung Gate (II Esd., ii, 13), which Jeremias (xix, 2) calls the Earthen Gate; Josephus calls it the Gate of Essennians, and indicates its position in the quarter of Bethph (from the Hebrew Bethsoa, “a dunghill”) (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2). Here Mount Zion is crossed by two ancient aqueducts of different heights, which bring water from south of Bethlehem (Blisse, op. cit., pp. 17–82). About 2000 feet from this gate, Guthrie, in 1881, and, later, Blasis, have proved the existence of another gate, also containing three floors and protected by a tower. This is the Gate of the Fountain (II Esd., ii, 14; iii, 15; “water gate”, xii, 36) and, probably, also “the gate that is between two walls, and leadeth to the king’s garden” by which Sedecias escaped (Jer., lli, 7; IV Kings, xxv, 4). Starting from the tower, the wall takes a north-western direction and then turns abruptly to the north, leaving the Pool of Siloë outside the city, in accordance with what we are told by Josephus (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2; ix, 4). To the south of the Pool of Siloë the valley is crossed by a great dam, 233 feet long, a vast rain-water reservoir. The dam is 20 feet thick and is finished off, at about half its height, by a wall 10 feet thick, flanked by seven buttresses of equal strength. In spite, however, of successive reinforcements, it was unequal to resisting the pressure of the water. The Empress Eudocia had a second dam built, fifty feet to the north of the former one. This is “the king’s aqueduct” (or pool) of II Esd., ii, 14.
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hydraulic structure anterior in date to the tunnel of Siloë. The latter is a gallery, hewn in the rock, leading to a wall which goes down to the surface level of the Fountain of the Virgin, whence water could be drawn by means of buckets and ropes (Wilson and Warren, op. cit., pp. 248 sq.). Beyond doubt, “the water gate” and “the tower that stood out” (II Esd., iii, 26; xii, 36) must be located hereabouts. The wall has been found again at a distance of 700 feet in the same direction; it then turns to the north for a length of 70 feet and runs into the south-east angle of the Temple enclosure. At the elbow formed by this wall, there rose a tower, the “great tower that standeth out” (II Esd., iii, 27), intended as a defence for the royal palace. In course of time the kings of Judah prolonged the wall of Ophel so as to protect the eastern enclosure of the Temple. This line was pierced by numerous gates: “the horse gate” (II Par., xxiii, 15; IV Kings, xi, 16; II Esd., iii, 28), discovered in 1902, by the English engineers, facing the south-east angle of the Haram, which is called “Solomon’s Stables”; the eastern gate (of the Temple), corresponding to “the Golden Gate”; the Mephad, or “judgment gate” (II Esd., iii, 30) opposite to the Golden Gate; the Prison Gate (D. V. “watch gate”) (II Esd., xii, 38); the Gate of Sur (IV Kings, xi, 6); “the gate of the shieldbears” (D. V.), or “of the guard” (A. V.) (IV Kings, xi, 19); the Gate of Benjamin (Jer., xxxvii, 12; xxxviii, 7) are names of different gates which existed
previously or protected the suburbs that stretched north of the Temple from the time of Eschias to Herod. Lastly, there is the Sheep Gate (D. V. "flock gate") (1867, p. 308). (It is an ancient structure that is generally believed to be the original entrance to the city.

Of the ancient Temple nothing is now to be seen but the holy rock and a number of cisterns. The Haram el Sheirf is four-sided, and has right angles on the south-west and north-east. The southern wall measures 922 feet and is pierced by three entrances: the double Gate, the Triple Gate, and the Single Gate—remarkable works of the type of the Golden Gate and, like it, restored in the sixth century of our era. The eastern and the northern walls are each 1042 feet in length; the western 1601. The stones are carefully shaped and bevelled, 74 feet in height, the longest of them 20 to 30 feet. The wall was built of stone cut in courses, 600 feet long, in which the stones are 7 feet high. At the south-west angle this colossal wall goes down to a depth of 85 feet below the present surface of the soil.

Forty feet to the north of this angle may be seen three rows of stones, forming a vault 51 feet in length, called "Robinson's Arch," after the explorer who first recognized in these remains the fragments of a viaduct. The English engineers have as a matter of fact discovered, 54 feet to the west of this fragment of vaulting, and 55 feet below the actual level of the soil, three courses of the corresponding upright supporting wall. At the foot of Mount Zion, 240 feet from the Robinson's Arch, more remains have been found of the same viaduct, of which, indeed, Josephus clearly makes mention (Antiq. Jud. XIV, iv, 2; Bell. Jud., I, vii, 2; VI, vi, 2). The supporting wall rests upon a paved foundation, which in its turn is supported by a bed of earth 23 feet in thickness. In this mass of earth, in which no traces of masonry are found, there lie vaulting-stones of from 3 to 34 feet in height and width, and 7 feet in length—the remains of a much older bridge. Authorities have attributed the first viaduct to Herod and the second to the Kings of Judea, or even to Solomon. At the very bottom of the valley there is a channel cut into the rock and vaulted in the Phoenician manner;—this is an aqueduct which was later used as a drain (Wilson and Warren. op. cit., pp. 76-111; Perrot and Chipiez, "Hist. de l'art", IV, 1882. Cf. III. Kings, iii, 27).

The Plaza was excavated to the Temple, called "Barclay's Gate," opens 180 feet farther north; then, beyond the Wailing Place, comes a third gate called "Wilson's Arch." This is a viaduct arch 42 feet along the axis and 39 feet in span, built of blocks from 6 to 12 feet in length. In the bottom of the valley, round about the viaduct, Wilson has discovered several vaults with their constructions and pieces of handwork which seem to be of Phoenician origin. The viaduct, which is supposed to date from the time of Herod, was reconstructed in the Byzantine period. It both connected the Temple with Mount Zion and served as an aqueduct for the canal that runs from Bethlehem near Wilson's Arch there is an ancient vaulted pool, Birket el Bouraq, to which an aqueduct leads down from the citadel. Josephus places the Yxustus, the gymnasion constructed by the High Priest Jason, between the two viaducts. Beyond Wilson's Arch the first city wall joined the Temple enclosure (Wilson and Warren, op. cit., pp. 76 sq.).

The Second Wall.—"The second wall," says Josephus, "began at the gate that is called Gennath, which belongs to the first city wall. Enclosing only the southern district, it continued as far as the Antonia." (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 2). It is the work of Eschias and of Herod, according to Josephus, in the year 1801. It had for the foundations of a house, 20 feet to the north of the ditch of the citadel, a wall was brought to light, constructed of large stones, extending east and west to a distance of about 100 feet. At its western extremity it forms a somewhat obtuse angle with a stronger and still better constructed wall which runs north (Selah Merill, "Quart. Stat."). 1886. pp. 21 sq.; 1887, p. 217; 1888, p. 21). In 1900 a Greek high school was built 180 feet farther on, and it was found that the rock was probationary wall.

The accumulated fillings of the hollow remains of medieval structures were discovered; but the explorations on this spot were not followed up. Many Pales- tinologists, however, see here marked indications of a ditch. At the north-east angle of the Greek school C. Schick ("Quart. Stat."). 1897, p. 219; 1883, p. 19) had already ascertained that the wall turns once more at an angle eastwards. Up to this point the city wall skirts the Pool of Eschias at a distance of 180 feet to the west and 65 feet to the north. In building the most Greek long face of the Holy Sepulchre, the workmen came upon a scar which had once been crowned with a thick wall, some fine blocks of which were found still in situ; the wall sloped back from the face of the rock (Schick, "Quart. Stat."). 1889, p. 571; 1894, p. 146). Next, in 1883, while building the German Protestant church which took the place of the church of St. Mary the Latin, the engi- neers found that the latter edifice had stood upon filled ground. Digging down 30 feet below the actual level of the ground, they came to the rock, and then, under the great nave of the old church, they found a strong wall to the east of the church, which they believe to be the original. It keeps, however, some of its facing in the shape of carefully dressed slabs. Guteh (in "Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palastinavereines", XVII, p. 128) and Schick (in "Quart. Stat."). 1889, p. 146), with many others, regard this as a part of the second wall. In the time of Christ, Calvary was thus shut out from the perimeter of the second city enclosure. Indeed, the existence of the Jewish hypogeum—the Holy Sepulchre, another one 30 feet to the west, and a third to the north-east—leaves no room for doubt on this point; for only the kings enjoyed the privilege of sepulture within the city. Some three hundred years ago English engineers asserted that the wall of Eschias must necessarily enclose Golgotha, because this sig- zag city wall would, otherwise, have been built contrary to all the rules of military art. But since then the exploration of ancient Jewish and Chanaanitish necropolis has revealed irregularities, which are to be paralleled. While, upon the line indicated, the haphazard dig- gings made on various structures have all brought to light fragments of walls of a homogeneous wall, the religious communities in the Christian quarter to the north-west of Golgotha have in recent times executed important building operations without finding any traces of ditch or of rampart.

At the angle where the wall turned northwards should be found the new Gate of Ephraim (II Esd., xii, 38). But the course of the wall from this point is less easy to follow. It was, very probably, replaced in the time of Hadrian by the colonnaded street which led, almost in a straight line, from Mount Zion to the Gate of Damascus, and which was founded upon rock throughout. Following this street, we pass, on the left, the first of the façade of Constantine's Basilica, which was completely discovered in 1807 and, on the right, 230 feet from this structure, the Khan ez Zeit, which is built in a Jewish cistern partly hewn out of the rock. To the east of this cistern, on the slope of El Wad, the rock appears, cut obliquely. Farther on, the Old Gate (II Esd., iii 6; xii, 38) may be placed. Where the Street of the Columns was crossed by another, coming from the west, the former marked the intersection; one superb marble column of it still remains in situ, 23 feet high, leaning against a fine wall of Roman construction. Investigation has demonstrated the existence, at a point 200 feet west of this column, of a counterguard and a deep ditch, running from south to north (Schick. "Quart. Stat."). 1887, p. 154). It was by this gate that, ac-
according to tradition, Jesus went out from the city to the place of His crucifixion. North of the column and slightly to the east, at a distance of 100 feet, is to be seen a rocky scar which extends about 250 feet to the north. Near here the wall descended eastward into El Wad, where it came to the Fish Gate (II Par., xxxiii, 14; II Esd., iii, 9; xii, 38). This gate opened directly upon the Mount of Olives which came from Jaffa (cf. II Esd., xiii, 16). The wall then crossed Mount Bezatha, and the Tower of Hananeel (Jer., xxx, 38; II Esd., iii, 1; xii, 38) must be located on the ridge which descended from the Hill of Jerome to Mount Moria, and which was the vulnerable point towards Jerusalem. On this same ridge there was another tower, or stronghold, as early as the period of the kings of Judah; Nehemiah, who restored it, named it Birah, an Aramaic word derived from the Assyrian Biru, "palace," or "fortress of the temple" (in D. V., "tower of the house"); II Esd., ii, 8). This tower (see I Mach., xiii, 53; etc.) bore, in the time of Josephus, the hellenized name of Bâris. Under the Hasmonian dynasty, the whole rock on which this tower stood was removed on all sides, to a depth of 30 feet on the south, and of 15 feet on the north, the length of the excavation being 350 feet from east to west. On the north, where there is a deep cliff, the excavation is 150 feet more (cf. I Mach., xiii, 53). Herod caused the reservoir to be vaulted over, and built the fortress of Antonia on the rock of Bâris and on the southern esplanade (Bell. Jud., V, v, 8). It was in this building that Pontius Pilate had his praetorium, where Jesus was condemned to death. In saying that the second wall "went up to the Antonia," Josephus does not indicate where it ended, but only its direction. He himself does not place the Antonia at the end of the wall of Ezechias; on the contrary, he says that the Romans could approach it only after they had become masters of the city as far as the first wall (Bell. Jud., V, v, 8). From the Tower of Hananeel the wall was prolonged to the Sheep (or Flock) Gate (II Esd., iii, 1, 31; xii, 38), near the Probatic Pool, with the five porches, and the other great reservoirs, necessarily, within the walls.

Third Wall. From A.D. 41 to 44 Herod Agrippa I under the title of "King" and "Lord" the house of Agrippa at the Tower of Hippicus and crossed the Camp of the Assyrians to the north, as far as the octagonal Tower of Psephinus (Antiq. Jud., XIX, vii, 2; Bell. Jud., V, iv, 3). Traces of this tower were found at the north-west corner of the city, at the place where the Qasr Damascus is situated. The Agrippa wall was destroyed in the twelfth century. Thence Agrippa's wall took an easterly direction, towards the Towers of the Women, opposite the sepulchre of Helen of Adiabene, which is situated 2000 feet to the north. The Towers of the Women, some traces of which have been found, protected the gate which led up to the Fish Gate. It still stands, as to a considerable part of its height, though sunken into the ground, below the actual Gate of Damascus, or Bab el Amould. Thence the wall passed over the royal grotses (Bell. Jud., V, iv, 3) to cross the ridge of Besetha. The stone of this lofty hill is of excellent quality, and could be transported in immense blocks as far as the Temple by means of inclined planes. This is why, as early as the time of Solomon, the hill was used as a quarry, as is shown by the figure of a Phcenician cherub cut in the wall of one of the royal grotses. Already perforated with numerous ruins, the hill is crowned by a Greek cross, and the cut served as a ditch for the new city wall. Thus it was that the summit became a separate hill, called, since the sixteenth century, the Hill of Jerome. It again served as a quarry in the period of the Crusades and its present aspect has been taken on since then. On the north the grand wall continued eastwards as far as the height above Cedron, and then turned south to rejoin the second city wall. The line of the third wall has with slight modifications been kept in that of the actual city.

II. FROM A.D. 71 TO A.D. 1069. (1) To The Time of Constantine. (71-312). When Titus took Jerusalem (April—September, A.D. 70) he ordered his soldiers to destroy the city (Josephus, "De bello Jud." VI, ix). They spared only the three great towers at the north of Herod's palace (Hippicus, Phasael, Mariamne) and the western wall. Few Jews remained. The Roman Tenth Legion held the upper town and Herod's castle as a fortress; Josephus says that Titus handed the fields around his soldiers ("Vita", 76, ed. Dindorf, Paris, 1865, p. 832). The presence of these heathens would naturally repel all ideas of establishing a church, and there was no law against their presence in Jerusalem. The Jewish Rabbis gathered together at Jabne (or Jamnia, now Jebus) in the plain, north-west of the city, two hours from Ramleh. Meanwhile the Christian community had fled to Pella in Perea, east of the Jordan (south-east of Jenin), before the beginning of the siege. The Christians were still almost entirely Jews, converts from Judaism (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", IV, v). After the destruction they came back and congregated in the house of John Mark and his mother Mary, where they had met before (Acts, xii, 12 sq.). It was apparently in this house that was the upper church, the scene of the Last Supper and (as the assembly on Whit-Sunday. Epiphanius (d. 403) says that when the Emperor Hadrian came to Jerusalem in 130 he found the Temple and the whole city destroyed save for a few houses, among them the one where the Apostles had received the Holy Ghost. This house, which Epiphanius, is "in the part of Sion which was spared when the city was destroyed"—therefore in the upper part ("De mens. et pond.", cap. xiv. P. G. XLIII). From the time of Cyril of Jerusalem, who speaks of the upper church of the Apostles, where the Holy Ghost came down upon them (Catech., iii, 1, P. G., XXXIII, 6), the upper church was the principal church of the place. A great basilica was built over the spot in the fourth century: the crusaders built another church when the older one had been destroyed by Hakim in 1010. It is the famous Cenaculum or Cenaecle—now a Moslem shrine—near the Gate of David, and supposed to be the Ark of the Temple. During the first Christian centuries the church at this place was the centre of Christianity in Jerusalem, "Holy and glorious Sion, mother of all churches" (Intercession in "St. James' Liturgy", ed. Brightman, p. 54). Certainly no spot in Christendom can be more venerable than the place of the Last Supper, which became the first Christian church. The constant use of the name Sion for the Cenaculum has led to considerable discussion as to the topography of Jerusalem. Many writers conclude that it is on Mount Zion, which would therefore be the southern hill of the city. As the letters of Egeria ("Exercitationes de Terre Sainte", Paris, 1907, p. 121, plan). Others (Baederker, "Palatinae et Syrien", 6th ed., 1904, p. 27) oppose this tradition on the strength of the passages in the Old Testament that clearly distinguish Sion from Jerusalem and state that the Lord dwells in Sion (Ps. 132:11, Ps. 44:2, Ps. 145:11-14; Joel, iii, 21, etc.). So Sion would be the hill on the west, the Temple and David's palace.
It seems that the later name Sion began to be used for all Jerusalem. Josephus never uses it at all; already in the Old Testament the way was prepared for this extended use. Jerusalem is the "daughter of Sion" (Jer., vi, 2; etc.), all its inhabitants without distinction (Ps. xlii, 1; xliii, 2, etc.). In Christian times Sion seems to have lost its special meaning as one definite hill and to have become merely another name for Jerusalem. Naturally then they called their centre there by the name of the city, although it did not stand on the original Mount Sion. The pilgrim Ethelbert (Silvia) at the end of the 6th cent., always speaks of the Cenaculum as Sion, just as the Holy Sepulchre is always Anastasia (see ed. Hereus, Heidelberg, 1908).

From this Cenaculum the first Christian bishops ruled the Church of Jerusalem. They were all converts from Judaism, as were their flocks. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., IV, v) gives the list of these bishops. According to a universal tradition the first was the Apostle St. James the Less, the "brother of the Lord". His predominant place and residence in the city are implied by Gal., 1, 19. Eusebius says he was appointed bishop by Peter (Hist. Eccl., i), and John (II, 1). Not only did he share the privileges of the apostles, but he even shared the government with them (Acts, xv, 6, etc.; Eus., Hist. Eccl., II, xxiii). He was thrown from a rock, then stoned to death by the Jews about the year 63 (Eus., ib.; Josephus, "Ant. Jud." XX, ix, 1, ed. c.1, p. 780). After his death the surviving Apostles and other disciples who were at Jerusalem chose Simeon, son of Cleophas (also called Our Lord's brother, Matt., xii, 55), to succeed him. He was bishop at the time of the destruction (70) and probably went to Pella with the others. About the year 106 or 107 he was crucified under "Trajan" (Eus., Hist. Eccl., III, iii). The line of bishops of Jerusalem was then continued as follows: Judas (Justus), 107–113; Zachaeus or Zacharias; Tobias; Benjamin; John; Matthias (d. 120); Philip (d. c. 124); Seneca; Justus; Levi; Ephraim; Joseph; Judas Quiriacus (d. between 134–140). All these were Jews (Eus., Hist. Eccl., IV, v). It was during the episcopate of Judas Quiriacus that the second great calamity, the revolt of Bar-Kochba and final destruction of the city, took place. Goaded by the tyranny of the Romans, by the re-establishment of Jerusalem as a Roman colony and the establishment of an altar to Jupiter on the site of the Temple, the Jews rose in a hopeless rebellion under the famous false Messiah Bar-Kochba about the year 132. During his rebellion he persecuted the Jewish Christians, who naturally refused to acknowledge him (Eus., Chron., for the seventeenth year of Hadrian). The Emperor Hadrian put down this rebellion, after a siege that lasted a year, in 135. As a result of this last war the whole neighbourhood of the city became a desert. On the ruins of Jerusalem a new Roman city was built, called Ælia Capitolina (Ælia was Hadrian’s family nomen), and a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus was built on Mount Moriah. Any Jewish Christian was allowed under pain of death inside the town. This brought about a complete change in the circumstances of the Church of Jerusalem. The old Jewish Christian community came to an end. In its place a Church of Gentile Christians, with Gentile bishops, was formed, who depended much less on the sacred memories of the city. Hence the Church of Jerusalem did not for some centuries take the place in the hierarchy of sees that we should expect. Ælia was a town of no importance in the empire; the governor of the province resided at Caesarea. Now, the name Ælia among Christians of this time marks the insignificance, even the little Gentile church, as the restoration of the old name Jerusalem later marks the revival of its dignity.

Even as late as 325 (Nicæa I, can. vii) the city is still called only Ælia. The name lasted on among the Arabs in the form Ilyaa till late in the Middle Ages. As the rank of the various sees among themselves was gradually arranged according to the divisions of the empire (see Table of the Eastern Bishops, p. 279 sq.), Caesarea became the metropolitan see of the Bishop of Ælia was merely one of its suffragans.

The bishops from the siege under Hadrian (135) to Constantine (312) were: Mark (the first Gentile bishop, d. 156); Cassian; Publius; Maximus; Julian; Eutyches; Symmachus (ibid, 302); Julius (ibid, 314); Vincent (ibid, 324); Capito (d. 325); Maximus II; Antinianus III; Julianus; Valens; Dolichianus (d. 385); Narcissus (Eus., Hist. Eccl., V, xii). Narcissus was a man famous for his virtues and miracles, but hated by certain vicious people in the city who feared his severity. They accused him of various crimes and he, for the sake of peace, retired to an unknown solitude (Eus., Hist. Eccl., VI, x). The neighbouring bishops, hearing nothing more of him, proceeded to elect and consecrate Dios as his successor. Dios was succeeded by Germanon and Gordios. Then suddenly Narcissus reappeared, an old man of 110 years. The other bishops persuaded him to resume the episcopate. To try to do anything but pray for his flock, he made a Cappadocian bishop, Alexander, who came on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, his coadjutor. Alexander thus became a practically diocesan bishop even before the death of Narcissus in 121. Alexander was a friend of Origens and founded a library that Eusebius used for his "History" (VI, x). He died in prison in the Decian persecution (250). Then followed Mabianes or Maebianes (d. 266); Hymenaeus (d. 298); Zabdas; Herman (d. 311); Macarius (d. 333).

(2) Constantine and the Holy Places (318–337).—During the episcopate of Macarius a great change came to the whole empire that incidentally affected the See of Jerusalem profoundly. The Christian Faith was acknowledged as a religio licita and the Church became a recognized society (Edict of Milan, Jan., 313). At Constantine’s death (337) Christianity had become the religion of the Court and Government. As a natural result the Faith spread very rapidly everywhere. The same generation that had seen Diocletian’s persecution now saw Christianity the dominant religion and the old paganism gradually reduced to country villages and out-of-the-way places. Then began the process of organization among Christians; churches were built everywhere. A further result of the freedom and the dominance of Christianity was a revival of enthusiasm for the holy places where the new religion had been born, where the events that every one now read about or heard of in sermons and taken place. Already in the fourth century there began those great waves of pilgrimage to the Holy Land that have gone on ever since. It was in the fourth century that the Bordeaux pilgrim and Euthera made their famous journey thither (Peregrinatio Silvae). St. Jerome (d. 420) says that (there is the name of a Jewish Christian) was allowed under pain of death in every part of the world, even from distant Brittan (Ep. xliv ad Paulam; lxxiv ad Oceannem). A great number of monks from Egypt and Libya also came and established themselves in the desert by the Jordan. This led to an increased respect for the bishop who ruled over the very places where Christ had lived and died. These pilgrims on their arrival found themselves under his jurisdiction; they took part in the services of his church and eagerly watched the rites that were carried out at the Mount of Olives, the Cenaculum, and the Holy Sepulchre. Euthera’s careful account of the services in the church of the Eastern church is here given: "Easter tide is typical of this interest. When the pilgrims returned home they remembered and told their friends about the services they had seen in the most sacred places of Christendom; and they began to
imitate them in their own churches. Thus a great number of our well-known ceremonies (the Palm Sunday procession, later the Stations of the Cross, etc.) were performed within the wall rites of a certain temple. All this could not fail to bring about an advancement of rank for the local bishop. From the freedom of the Church the development was inevitable that changed the Bishop of Jaffa, mere suffragan of Cesarea, into the great "Patriarch of the Holy City," the chief of the Jews within their Promised Land. Meanwhile another result of these pilgrimages was the discovery of the Holy Places. Naturally the pilgrims when they arrived wanted to see the actual spots where the events they had read of in the Gospels had happened. Naturally too each such place when it was known or, more properly, became a shrine with a church built over it. Of these shrines the most famous are those built by Constantine and his mother St. Helena. St. Helena in her eighthieth year (326-327) came on a pilgrimage and caused churches to be built at Bethlehem, and on the Mount of Olives. Constantine built the famous church of the Holy Sepulchre (Anastasis). Eusebius (Vita Constantin, III, xxvi) says that the place of Calvary in about 326 was covered with dirt and rubbish; over it was a temple of Venus. Emperor Hadrian had built a great terrace round the place enclosed in a wall, on the site had placed a grove of the Chaldean Venus (St. Jerome, Ep. Lxxv, 40). When St. Helena came and was shown the place she determined to restore it as a Christian shrine. By order of the emperor all the soldiers of the garrison were employed to clear away the temple, terrace, and grove. Underneath they found Golgotha and the tomb of our Lord. Constantine wrote to Bishop Macarius saying: "I have nothing more at heart than to adorn with due splendour that sacred place," etc. (Vita Const., III, xxx). Two great buildings were erected near each other on this spot. To the west the rock containing the tomb was carved away, leaving it as a little shrine or chapel standing above ground. Over it was built a round church covered by a dome. This is the Anastasis, which still has the form of a rotunda with a dome, containing the Holy Sepulchre in the middle. Quite near, to the east, was a great basilica with an apse towards the Anastasis, a long nave, and four aisles. The aisles were galleries, the whole was covered by a gable roof. Around the apse were twelve columns crowned with silver, at the east were a narthex, three doors, and a colonnade in front of the entrance. This basilica was the Martyrium; it covered the ground immediately over part of the ground over St. Helena's chapel. Etheria speaks of it as "the great church which is called the Martyrium" (Per. Silv., ed. cit., p. 38). Underneath it was the crypt of the Invention of the Cross. The Mount of Calvary was not enclosed in the basilica. It stood just at the southeast side of the apse. Etheria always distinguishes between the three shrines, Anastasis, Crux, Martyrium. The place of the Cross (Calvary) was in her time open to the sky and surrounded by a silver balustrade (op. cit., p. 43). People went up to it by steps (Eus., "Vita Const.", III, xxii-x); Mommsen, "Die h. Grabskirche zu Jerusalem in ihrem ursprünglichen Zustande" (Leipzig, 1888). Later in the fifth century St. Melania the younger (439), a Roman lady who came with her husband Pinianus to Jerusalem where they both entered religious houses (see Nilles, "Kal. Man." Dec. 31, pp. 372-373), built a small chapel over the place of the tomb. The new buildings were destroyed by the Persians in 614.

It is not possible to enter here upon the endless discussion that still takes place as to the authenticity of this shrine. The first question that occurs is as to the place of the wall of Jerusalem in Christ's time. It is certain that He was crucified outside the city wall. No executions took place within the city (Matt. xxvii, 33; John xix, 17; Hebr. xii, 12, etc.) If then it could be shown that the traditional site was within the wall this would be decisive proof. It would be proved to be false. It is, however, quite certain that all attempts to prove this have failed. On the contrary, Conder found other contemporary tombs near the traditional Holy Sepulchre, which show that it was without the city, since Jews never died within the walls. Supposing that the possibility, we have this chain of evidence: if Hadrian really built his temple of Venus purposely on the site, the authenticity is proved. Constantine's basilica stood where that temple was; that the present church stands on the place of Constantine's basilica is not doubted by any one. A number of writers (as Eusebius, op. cit.) of the fourth century describe the temple as built on the site of Calvary in order to put a stop to its veneration by Christians, just as the temple of Jupiter was built purposely where the Jewish Temple had been. We have seen that an unchanging Christian community lived at Jerusalem down to Hadrian's time (Bar-Kochba's revolt). It would be strange if they had not remembered the site of the Crucifixion and had not reverenced it. The analogy of Hadrian's profanation of the Temple leaves no difficulty as to a similar deliberate profanation in Christian times. Ferguson who thought that the cave under the Qubbet-es-Sachra, on the site of the Temple, was the Holy Sepulchre of Constantine's time, and Conder and Gordon's site outside the Damascus gate (Conder, "The City of Jerusalem", London, 1909, pp. 51-58) hardly deserve mention. With the finding of the Holy Sepulchre and the building of the Anastasis and Martyrium is connected the story of the Invention of the Holy Cross. It is told by Rufinus (Hist. Eccl. X, viii, P. L. XXI, 477—about the year 402), Paulinus of Nola (Ep. xvi, v; P. L. LXI, 329; a. d. 403) and others. When the soldiers were removing the old balustrade and digging out the Holy Sepulchre they found to the east of the tomb three crosses with the inscription separated from them. Bishop Macarius discovered which was our Lord's Cross by applying each in turn to a sick woman. The third Cross healed her miraculously (see the life of Macarius). St. Paulinus (op. cit.) adds that a dead man was raised to life by the Cross of Christ.

The fame of the great shrines, Anastasis and Martyrium, then began to eclipse that of the Cenaculum. From this time the Bishop of Jerusalem celebrated the Holy Thursday mass in the Anastasis in the presence of the Holy Sepulchre. Constantine had a new "Church of the Apostles" built over the Cenaculum. Other shrines that go back at least to his time are the place of the Ascension on the top of the Mount of Olives, where he built a church, and the still extant magnificent basilica at Bethlehem.

(3) The Patriarchate (385-451).—From the time of Constantine then begins the advancement of the See of Jerusalem. The first General Council (Nicaea I, 325) meant to recognize the unique dignity of the Holy City without disturbing its canonical dependence on the metropolis, Cesarea. So the seventh canon declares: "Since custom and ancient tradition have obtained that the bishop in Αἰλία be honoured, let him have the succession of honour (ἐκτὸς τῆς δακολούθου τῆς τιμής) saving however the domestic right of the metropolis (ἡ μητροπολίτικη τῆς μητροπολίτου τῆς τιμής). The other patriarchs, including St. Theodoret, Bishop of Hierapolis, follow this decision with the following comments: "They are the "Decretum" of Gratian, dist. 65, v. 7. The "succession of honour" means a special place of honour, an honorary precedence immediately after the Patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch; but this is not to interfere with the metropolitan rights of Cesarea in Palestine. The situation of a suffragan
bishop who had precedence over his metropolitan was an anomalous one that obviously could not last. The succession from Maximus II (349); St Cyril of Jerusalem (350-358); (Euthychius intruded 357-359; Irenæus intruded 360-361; Hilary intruded 367-378); John II (386-417); Praylios (417-421); Juvenal (421-458). Already in the time of St Cyril difficulties arose about his relation to his metropolitan. While he was defending the Faith against the Arians, Acacius of Cesarea, an extreme Arian, summoned a Synod (358) to try Cyril for various offences, of which the first was that he had disobeyed or behaved with insubordination towards Acacius, his superior. It is difficult to be sure exactly what the accusation was. Sosomen (IV, xxv) says it was doing and disobserving the laws; Theodoret says it was only about his quite lawful claim to precedence. The case shows how difficult the position was. Cyril refused to attend the synod and was deposed in his absence. His refusal again opens a question as to his position. Did he refuse merely because he knew that Acacius was a determined Arian and would certainly condemn him, or was it because he thought that his exceptional "succession of honour" exempted him from the jurisdiction of any but a patriarchal synod? The three usurpers, Eutychius, Irenæus, Hilary, were invited into his see by their party during his three exiles.

It was Juvenal of Jerusalem (420-458) who at last succeeded in changing the anomalous position of his see into a real patriarchate. From the beginning of his reign he assumed an attitude that was quite incompatible with his canonical position as suffragan of Cesarea. About the year 425 a certain tribe of Arabs was converted to Christianity. These people set up their camp in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Juvenal then proceeded to found a bishopric for them. He ordained one Peter as "Bishop of the Camp" (patriarch de la bande). This Peter (apparently the sheikh of the tribe) signed at Ephesus in 431 with that title. Juvenal's action may perhaps be explained as merely the ordination of an Arabic-speaking coadjutor for these people whose language he himself did not know; but Peter's title and presence at Ephesus certainly show that he could be a genuine bishop. Juvenal had no sort of right to set up a new diocese nor to ordain a suffragan to his own see. The "See of the Parembols" disappeared again in the sixth century (Vaille "Le Monastère de S. Théoctiste et l'évêché des Paremboles" in "Bulletin de l'Institut de Palestine" 1909). From the Acts of Ephesus it appears that Juvenal had ordained other bishops in Palestine and Arabia. A number of bishops of the Antiochen patriarchate wrote a letter to the Emperor Theodosius II in which they appear to have some doubts as to the regularity of their position since, as they say, they have "been ordained formerly by the most pious Juvenal" (Mansi, IV, 1402). Now the right of ordaining a bishop always meant in the East jurisdiction over him. We see an instance of this in the Acts of the Council. Saidas, Bishop of Phaino in Palestine, describes Juvenal as "our bishop" (à notre évêque = our metropolitan, apparently. See Vaille: "L'érection du patriarchat de Jérusalem" in "Rev. de l'Or. chrét.", IV, 44 sq.). Clearly then even before the council Juvenal had been making tentative efforts to assume at least metropolitan rights. At the council he made a stroke to get his see recognized not merely as independent of and equal to Cesarea, but superior to the great Patriarchate of Antioch. Antioch, he pretended, must submit to the see that canonically (in spite of its honorary position) was the suffragan of Antioch's suffragan. His attempt failed altogether. He might perhaps have shaken off the authority of Cesarea; but this was too startling. Nevertheless the opportunity was a splendid one for him. We see Juvenal's claim to precedence for Antioch, he was the second bishop present. Celestine of Rome was represented by his legates; Cyril of Alexandria was president, but was already having trouble with Candidian the Imperial Commissioner; John of Antioch arrived late and then set up a rival council in favour of the heretics. Nestorius of Constantinople was the accused. Juvenal's own metropolitan (of Cesarea) was not present. The schismatical attitude of John of Antioch especially gave Juvenal his chance. Surely Cyril's council would not support John. Juvenal then, under colour of supporting Cyril and the pope, tried to get the council to acknowledge no less than the dethroned and deposed bishop. In a speech he explained to the Fathers that John of Antioch ought to have appeared at the council to give the oecumenical synod an explanation of what had happened (his late arrival and the anti-council he was setting up) and to show obedience and reverence to the Apostolic See of Rome and the Holy Church of God at Jerusalem. "For it was especially the custom according to Apostolic order and tradition that the See of Antioch be corrected and judged by that of Jerusalem. Instead of that John with his usual insolence had despised the council" (Mansi, IV, 432) interred into his see by their party during his three exiles.

When the Monophysite heresy began Juvenal was at first on the side of the heretics. He was present at the Robber Synod of 449, on the side of Dioscorus, and joined in the deposition of Flavian of Constantinople, and in the condemnation of Simeon of Jerusalem. He then converted to the orthodox and was in charge of getting any advantage from Chalcedon (451). Yet he was clever enough to turn even this position to his advantage. Chalcedon at last gave him a great part of what he wanted. At first he appeared at the council with the other Monophysites as an accuser, but then, when a controversy arose about the Chalcedonian formula, he threw off his former friends, turned completely round and signed Pope Leo's dogmatic letter to Flavian. The orthodox Fathers were delighted. In general council the titular rank given to Jerusalem by Nicea would naturally make itself felt. The adherence of so venerable a see was received with delight, the illustrious convert deserved some reward. Juvenal then explained that he had at last come to a friendly understanding with Maximus of Antioch, by which the long dispute between their sees should be ended. Antioch was of course to keep her precedence over Jerusalem and the greater part of her patriarchate. But she would sacrifice a small territory, Palestine in the strict sense (the three Roman provinces so called), and apparently Arabia, to make up a little patriarchate for Jerusalem. The emperor (Theodosius II) had already interfered in the quarrel and had given his consent. But he also gave his consent to Rome from Antioch for the benefit of Jerusalem. So this arrangement appeared as a sort of compromise. The council in the seventh and eighth sessions (Hefele: "Conciliengeisch." II, 477 and 562) accepted Juvenal's proposal. (Maximus's correspondence with Leo the Great shows that he was still not quite satisfied) and made Jerusalem a patriarchate with this small
territory. From this time then Jerusalem becomes a patriarchal see, the last (fifth) in order and the smallest. So was the number, afterwards so sacred, of five patriarchates established. The Quinisext Council (692) admits this order. It enumerates the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and adds: “After these be the city of Jerusalem” (can. xxviii). Such too is the order proclaimed by the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869) in Canon xxi and incorporated in our canon law (C. I. C. dist. 22, c. 7). Since Chalcedon no one has disputed the place of Jerusalem in the hierarchy of patriarchates. But it will be noticed how late its rank is given in, how late the conduct of the bishop who obtained it. Like the other comparatively modern Patriarchate of Constantinople (made finally by the same council, can. xxviii) it represents a later concession that upset the much older, more venerable ideal of three patriarchates only—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch. Jerusalem owes its place not to St. James, the brother of the Lord, but to the austere and unscrupulous Juvenal. Nothing, then, could show a greater ignorance of the whole situation than the naive proposal of Anglicans at various times (e.g. the Non-Jurors in their letter to the patriarchs, 1730) to give Jerusalem the title of “mother of all Churches” as the first see of all.

The frontiers of this new patriarchate, as established by Chalcedon, are to the north the Lebanon, to the west the Mediterranean, to the south Sinai (Mount Sinai was certainly originally included in its boundaries), to the east Arabia and the desert. Under the patriarch were these metropolitans: (1) Cessarea in Palestine (who now had to obey her former subject), Metropolis of Palestina I, with twenty-nine suffragans; (2) Scythopolis (in the Vulgate Bethan, Jos. xvii, 11; Judges i, 27; now Beer, seven hours south of Beersheba); (3) Samaria, with fourteen suffragans; (4) Petra (Sela) in the Hebrew, II Kings, xiv, 7; Is. xvi, 1 in the Wadi Mousa, half-way between the Dead Sea and the Red Sea), Metropolis of Palestina III with thirteen suffragans.

(4) From Juvenal to the Saracen Conquest (639-686).

—The patriarchs of this time were: Theodosius (Monophysite usurper, 452); Anastasius (458-478); Martyrius (478-486); Salustius (486-494); Elias (494-513; see Elias of Jerusalem); John III (513-524); Peter (524-544); Macarius (544-574); Elias (574-593); Theophanes (593-601); Maximus (601-609); Zacharias (609-631); Maximus (631-643); Sophronius (634-638 or 644). An important event for the city was the residence there of the Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II. She arrived first in 638 and then settled at Jerusalem from 444 to her death about the year 460 (see Eudocia). She spent this last part of her life in ardent devotion at the Holy Places, in beautifying the city and building churches. She rebuilt the walls along the south as so to include the Cenaculum within the city. On the north she built the famous protection Chapel of her martyrdom (now the famous Constantinian convent and Ecce biblicum). Justinian I (527-565) also added to the beauty of the city many splendid buildings. Of these the most famous was a great basilica dedicated to the Blessed Virgin with a beautiful mosaic of her. His own basilica, the Patriarchal Church of the city, has but now completely disappeared. He also built another great church of the Blessed Virgin at the southern end of the old Temple area (now the Al-aqṣā Mosque). The famous mosaic maps of Jerusalem discovered lately at Madaba (Gutta-Persimone’s ‘Die Mosaiken von Madaba’, 1906) give an idea of the state of the city in Justinian’s time. During this period the See of Jerusalem, like those of Alexandria and Anti-och, was troubled continually by the Monophysite schism. Under Juvenal the great crowd of monks who had settled in Palestine broke out into a regular revolution against the government and against the patriarch, whose change of front at Chalcedon they bitterly resented. They set up one of their own number, Theodosius, as anti-patriarch. For a short time (in 452) Juvenal had to give way to this person. But also in the other sees of the patriarchate orthodox bishops were expelled and Monophysites (such as Peter the Iberian at Majuma-Gaza) were set up in their place. The Empress Eudocia was at first an ardent Monophysite and helped that party nearly all the time she was in the city. Finally she was exiled by Consti

stantinople and implored the help of the emperor (Marcian, 450-457). He returned with a body of soldiers who reinstituted him, killed a great number of the monks, and finally took Theodosius, who had fled, prisoner. Theodosius was then kept in prison at Con
stantinople almost till his death. The disturbance was not finally put down till 453. Eventually the orthodox Abbot Euthymius converted Eudocia, who died in the communion of the Church (c. 460).

The further Monophysite disturbances affected Jerusalem, of course, too. Martyrius accepted the title of emperor. He excommunicated the Patriarch in Jerusalem, Peter, and sent Marcellus from Antioch to depose him. He died in 461, his successor, Peter, a synod in September, 530, in which he proclaimed his adherence to Chalcedon and Orthodoxy by agreeing to the deposition of the Monophysite Anthemius of Constantinople (deposed in that year; the Acts of this synod are in Mansi, VII, 1163-1176). From this time the patriarchs seem to have been all orthodox; though there were Monophysites in the city. Peter II eventually set up Monophysite bishops in communion with the (Jacobite) patriarchs of Antioch of the line of Sergius of Tella (since 539) even at Jerusalem itself. The first of these Jacobite bishops (they did not take the title patriarch) of Jerusalem was Severus in 597. From him descends the present Jacobite line. In the year 614 a great calamity befell the city: it was taken by the Persians. In 622 the Roman Emperor Mauire had been barbarously murdered by order of Phocas (902-910), who usurped his place. Chosroes (Khuṣru) II, King of Persia, had taken a special interest in the Holy Land. He recalled Mauire, who had even sent an army to restore him (591). The Persian king, furious at the murder of his friend and benefactor, then declared war against Phocas and invaded Syria (604). The war with Persia continued under Phocas's successor, Heraclius Conqueror (610-642). In 611 the Persians took Jerusalem. There were Jews and Nestorians, and the Cessarea in Cappadocia and Damascus. In 614 they stormed Jerusalem. Chosroes's son-in-law Shahrbarz besieged the city; in his camp were 26,000 Jews eager to destroy Christian sovereignty in their holy city. It is said that no less than 90,000 Christians died in Jerusalem in the three years of the Persian occupation. Jerusalem was taken captive to Persia. The Anastasius, Martyrius and other Christian sanctuaries were burned or razed to the ground. St. Helena's great
relic of the Holy Cross was taken off to Persia in triumph. The Jews as a reward for their help were allowed to do as they liked in the city. But their triumph did not last long. In 622 Heraclius marched against the Persians. In 626 he invaded Persia; Chosroes fled, was deposed, and murdered in 628 by his son Siroes. In the same year the Persians had to submit to a peace which deprived them of all their conquests. The Persian soldiers evacuated the cities of Syria and Egypt which they had conquered; the relic of the Cross was given back. In 629 Heraclius himself came to Jerusalem to venerate the Cross. This is the origin of the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September; see the lessons of the second nocturn on that day). The emperor as a punishment for the treason of the Jews, issued a bold law of Hadrian forbidding them to enter the city.

After the Persian assault on the town, even before the Romans reconquered it, Modestus, Abbot of the monastery of St. Theodosius in the desert to the south, acting apparently as vicar for the captured patriarch, had already begun to restore the shrines. It was impossible under Persian rule to restore the splendour of Constantine's great Martyrion. Modestus therefore had to content with a more modest group of buildings at the Holy Sepulchre. He restored the round Anastasis, much as it had been before, with a coenosis and the conical cupola. The custom of orientating churches had now become universal; so a new apse was made at the east (where the entrance had been) for the altar. Doors were pierced in the round wall north and south of this apse. The Anastasis, formerly a shrine subsidiary to the great basilica, now became the chief building. Modestus restored the little chapel of the Crucifixion, originally built by Melania, but did not attempt to rebuild any part of the basilica (Martyrion) except the crypt of the Invention of the Holy Cross. The whole esplanade around these buildings was enclosed by a wall and so made into a great atrium. During the next centuries a great number of chapels were built here to contain various relics of the Passion. Heraclius when he reconquered the city rebuilt the walls and restored many more of the ruined shrines. From his time to the Arab conquest Christian Jerusalem enjoyed a short period of peace under the Byzantine emperor St. Sophronius (634–638 or 644), who saw that conquest, was one of the more famous patriarchs of Jerusalem. In his time Monothelitism had arisen as one more of the many hopeless attempts to conciliate the Monophysites. Sophronius distinguished himself as an opponent of this new heresy. He was born in Damascus and had been a monk of the monastery of St. Theodosius. In defence of the Faith against the Monothelitians he had travelled through Syria and Egypt and had visited Constantinople. As patriarch in 634 he wrote a synodal letter in defence of the two wills of Christ that is one of the most important documents of the controversy (Mansi XI, 461 sq.). In 636 he had to give up his city to the Moslems.

(5) From the Arab Conquest to the First Crusade (686–1099).—The Moslems in the first seal of their new faith proceeded to invade Syria. Caliph Abu-bakr (632–634) gave the command of the army to Abu-'Ubaidah, one of the original Ashab (companions of Mohammed) in his flight (622). They first took Bosra. In July, 633, they defeated Heraclius's army at Ajnada near Emesa; in 634 they stormed Damascus and again defeated the Romans at Yarmuk. Emesa followed as the third city to be taken. The Moslem Caliph Omar (634–644) as to whether they should march on Jerusalem or Caesarea. By 'Ali's advice they received orders to take the Holy City. First they sent Mo'aawiya Ibn-Abd-Sufyän with 5000 Arabs to surprise the city; soon afterwards it was

inveted by the whole army of Abu-'Ubaidah. It was defended by a large force composed of refugees from all parts of Syria, soldiers who had escaped from Yarmuk and a strong garrison. For four months the siege continued; the Caliph may have kept their churches and sanctuaries, no one was to be forced to accept Islam. Sophronius further insisted that these terms should be ratified by the caliph in person. Omar, then at Medina, agreed to these terms and came with a single camel to the walls of Jerusalem. He signed the capitulation, then entered the city with Sophronius "and courteously discoursed with the patriarch concerning its religious antiquities" (Gibbon, ci, ed. Bury, London, 1898, V, 436). It is said that when the hour for his prayer came he was in the Anastasis, but refused to say it there, lest in future times the Moslems should make that an excuse for breaking the treaty and confiscating the church. The Mosque of Omar (Jami'Sa'dina' Omar), opposite the doors of the Anastasis, with the tall minaret, is shown as the place to which he retired for his prayer. Under the Moslems the Christian population of Jerusalem in the first period enjoyed toleration and was even allowed to attend ceremonies at the Church of the Sepulchre. It appears that the Christians had left the place where the Temple had once stood untouched. Omar visited it and found it filled up with refuse. In his time a large square building with no architectural pretension was put up to shelter the True Believers who wished to pray. In 691 'Abd-al-malik replaced this by the exquisite "Dome of the Rock" (Qubbat-es-Sachra), built by Byzantine architects, that still stands in the middle of the Temple area. This is the building long known as the Mosque of Omar, falsely attributed to him. It is an eight-sided building crowned with a dome, covered outside with marble and inside with many-coloured tiles, certainly one of the most splendid monuments of architecture in the world. It stands over a great flat rock, probably the place of the old altar of holocausts. 'Abdallah al-Imán al-Mal'mun (Caliph, 813–33) restored it. The dome fell in an earthquake and was rebuilt in 1022. The Crusaders (who turned it into a church) thought this was the original Jewish Temple; hence the many round temple-churches built in imitation of it. Raphaeil in his "Espousal of the Blessed Virgin" has painted it, as well as he could from descriptions, in the 12th century and the Temple area became to Moslems the "illustrious Sanctuary" (Haram-asb-sherif) and was gradually covered with colonnades, minbars (pulpitas), and smaller domes. At the south end Justinian's basilica became the "most remote Mosque" (Al-Masjid-al-aqsa, Sura
The Emperor Constantine IX (1042–1054) persuaded the Caliph Al-Mustansir bi-Habah (1036–1094) to allow the rebuilding on condition of releasing 3,000 Moslem prisoners and of allowing prayer for Al-Mustansir in the empty halls of the ancient churches of Egypt in the Middle Ages," London, 1901, p. 136). Byzantine architects were sent to Jerusalem. The rebuilding was finished in 1048. The work of Modestus was restored with a few additions, hurriedly and not well (Conder, op. cit., p. 282). The Holy Sepulchre remained in the care of the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem until the change in the temporal status of the church in 1661, when the Turks became masters of Palestine. From this time the condition of the Christians became unbearable. The Turks forbade Christian services, devastated churches, murdered pilgrims. It was the news of these outrages that provoked the Council of Clermont in 1145 and brought the Christian princes in the patriarchal succession after Sophronius was: (The see vacant from Sophronius's death to 705. Meanwhile Stephen of Dora acted as papal vicar for Palestine); John V (703–735); John VI (735–780, possibly the same person as John V); Theodore (780–c. 770); and Isidore (770–800, also known as Isidore II) (meanwhile for a time Theodore occupied the see); George of Sergius (800–807); Thomas (807–821); Basil (821–842); Sergius (842–c. 859); Solomon (c. 859–c. 864); Theodosius (c. 864–c. 879); Elias III (c. 879–907); Sergius II (907–911); Leo or Leontius (911–928); Anastasius or Athanassius; Nicholas; Christopher of Christodorus (d. 937); Agatho; John VII (murdered 969); Christopher II; Thomas II; Joseph II; Alexander; Agapius (986–97); Jeremias or Orestes (banished and murdered c. 1012); Theophilius; Arsenius (c. 1024); Jordanus; Nicephorus; Sophronius II; Mark II; Euthymius II (d. 1099).

SMITH, Jerusalem, 2 vols. (London, 1907)—the most exhaustive work on the history and topography of the city; CONDER, The City of Jerusalem (London, 1906); BERNARD AND BALMER, Jerusalem (London, 1906); WILSON, Jerusalem, the Holy City (London, 1888); WARRICK AND CONDER, Survey of Western Palestine, Jerusalem (London, 1883); WECHT AND BERKOWITZ, Palestine Exploration Fund (1869–1892), index; SEIFER, Jerusalem und das heilige Land (1873); NINCH, Auf biblischen Pfaden (1885); SMITH, Tales of the Ancient City, by SCHICK, ZAHN, Die dorivorit S. Virginis und das Haus des Markus im Neuen kirchliche Zeitschrift (1899), pp. 85–112; WILKIE, The architectural history of the Holy Sepulchre; DE VOGUE, Les églises de la Terre Sainte (Paris, 1860); SCHROEDER, Die Basilika Kostiantin’s in der Kreuzabnahme der Pfingsten (Freiburg, 1867); FUREST, The Buildings of the Holy Sepulchre (London, 1888); MOYNETE, Die h. Grabeskirche zu Jerusalem in den urprünglichen Zuständen, 1. Teil (Berlin, 1888); The Holy Sepulchre and the Temple at Jerusalem (London, 1868); CLERMONT-GANNAUX, L’authenticité du Saint-Sépulcre (Paris, 1877); GERARD, Desenay, Jerusalem Saccada Sacra Fe-VII (Vienna, 1898), in Corp. Scriptor. ecc. Lat. = LE SANGRE, Palestine under the Moslems (London, 1900); LE SANGRE, L’histoire du patriarcat de Jerusalem in the Revue de L’Orient chrétien (1899), pp. 44 sq.; LEQUIN, Oriens Christianus, III (Paris, 1740), 116, where the list of patriarchs will be found.

ADRIEN FORTEESCUE.

III. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was founded, as a result of the First Crusade, in 1099. Destroyed a first time by Saladin in 1187, it was re-established around Saint-Jean d’Acre and maintained until the capture of that city in 1291. During these two centuries it was for Western Europe a genuine centre of colonization. As the common property of Christendom, it retained its international character to the end, through the French, English, and German crusades, as well as through the feudal lords and the government officials, and the Italians acquired the economic preponderance in the cities.

(1) Kings and Succession to the Throne.—Godfrey of Bouillon, elected Lord of Jerusalem, 22 July, 1099, did not assume the royal crown and died 18 July,
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JERUSALEM XVII, 1). The description of Arculf, a Frankish bishop who went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in the seventh century, written down from his account by Adamnan, monk of Iona, c. 744 (d. 764) tells us that the site was not an unpleasant picture of the conditions of Christians in Palestine in the first period of Moslem rule. The caliphs of Damascus (661–750) were enlightened and tolerant princes, on quite good terms with their Christian subjects. Many Christians (e. g. St John Damascius, III, i, 750) declare important ones at their court. The Abbasids caliphs at Bagdad (753–1242), as long as they ruled Syria, were also just and tolerant to the Christians. The famous Harūn al-As'afar (Haroun al-Raschid, 786–809) sent the keys of the Holy Sepulchre to Charles the Great, who built a hospice for Latin pilgrims near the shrine. Revolutions and rival dynasties that tore the union of Islam to pieces then made Syria the battle-ground of the Moslem world; the Christians under new masters began to suffer the oppression that eventually led to the Crusades.

The sect of the Karāmīta (Carmathians) under Abu-Sa'id al-Jamā'ī arose in the neighbourhood of Kūfa. They defeated the troops of the Caliph Al-Mutazid (Ahmed Abu'l Abbas), entered Syria (903–904) and devastated the province. They seized Mecca and prevented the pilgrims from going there from the Levant (772); Elia IV was murdered (928). During this time Moslems again began to go in pilgrimage to Jerusalem instead of to the Hijāz. The religious importance that the city thus gained for them was the beginning of intolerance towards the Christians there. It is the invariable result in Islam; the more sacred a place is to Moslems the less they are disposed to tolerate unbelievers in it. The Fatimid dynasty now arose in Africa (903). At the end of 987 they got possession of Egypt. Meanwhile a frontier war with the empire went on always. The Romans took advantage of the dismemberment of the Moslem world to invade their former provinces. Already in 901, in the reign of Leo VI (886–911), the Roman armies had advanced into Syria as far as Aleppo and had carried off a great number of prisoners. In 962 Nicephorus Phocas with 100,000 men again came as far as Aleppo and devastated the country. In 993 the Romans reconquered Antioch. It was inevitable that the Christians of Jerusalem should try to help their fellow-countrymen to reconquer the land that had been Roman and Christian; inevitable, too, that the Moslems should punish such attempts as high treason. In 999 the patriarch of Jerusalem was put to death and correspondence with the Romans; many other Christians suffered the same fate, and a number of churches were destroyed. Meanwhile the first wave of the great Turkish race (the Seljuks) was pouring over the empire's empire. In 1034 a Turk, Ishaq, revolted and his successors held Palestine for a few years. In 969 Mu'mezz-El-Din-Allah, the fourth Fatimid Caliph in Egypt, conquered Jerusalem. A Moslem pilgrim, Al-Muqaddasi, wrote a description of the city, especially of the Haram ash-sharif, at this time (quoted by Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, by SMITH, Jerusalem, 2 vols. (London, 1907)—the most exhaustive work on the history and topography of the city; CONDER, The City of Jerusalem (London, 1906); BERNARD AND BALMER, Jerusalem (London, 1906); WILSON, Jerusalem, the Holy City (London, 1888); WARRICK AND CONDER, Survey of Western Palestine, Jerusalem (London, 1883); WECHT AND BERKOWITZ, Palestine Exploration Fund (1869–1892), index; SEIFER, Jerusalem und das heilige Land (1873); NINCH, Auf biblischen Pfaden (1885); SMITH, Tales of the Ancient City, by SCHICK, ZAHN, Die dorivorit S. Virginis und das Haus des Markus im Neuen kirchliche Zeitschrift (1899), pp. 85–112; WILKIE, The architectural history of the Holy Sepulchre; DE VOGUE, Les églises de la Terre Sainte (Paris, 1860); SCHROEDER, Die Basilika Kostiantin’s in der Kreuzabnahme der Pfingsten (Freiburg, 1867); FUREST, The Buildings of the Holy Sepulchre (London, 1888); MOYNETE, Die h. Grabeskirche zu Jerusalem in den urprünglichen Zuständen, 1. Teil (Berlin, 1888); The Holy Sepulchre and the Temple at Jerusalem (London, 1868); CLERMONT-GANNAUX, L’authenticité du Saint-Sépulcre (Paris, 1877); GERARD, Desenay, Jerusalem Saccada Sacra Fe-VII (Vienna, 1898), in Corp. Scriptor. ecc. Lat. = LE SANGRE, Palestine under the Moslems (London, 1900); LE SANGRE, L’histoire du patriarcat de Jerusalem in the Revue de L’Orient chrétien (1899), pp. 44 sq.; LEQUIN, Oriens Christianus, III (Paris, 1740), 116, where the list of patriarchs will be found.

ADRIEN FORTEESCUE.

III. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was founded, as a result of the First Crusade, in 1099. Destroyed a first time by Saladin in 1187, it was re-established around Saint-Jean d’Acre and maintained until the capture of that city in 1291. During these two centuries it was for Western Europe a genuine centre of colonization. As the common property of Christendom, it retained its international character to the end, through the French, English, and German crusades, as well as through the feudal lords and the government officials, and the Italians acquired the economic preponderance in the cities.

(1) Kings and Succession to the Throne.—Godfrey of Bouillon, elected Lord of Jerusalem, 22 July, 1099, did not assume the royal crown and died 18 July,
1100, having strengthened the new conquest by his victory over the Egyptians at Ascalon (12 August, 1099). After his death the barons invited his brother Baldwin of Flanders to assume the lordship of Jerusalem. Baldwin accepted and had himself crowned King of Jerusalem by the Patriarch Daimbert in the basilica of Bethlehem (25 December, 1100). Baldwin I (1100–1118) was the real founder of the kingdom. With the aid of new crusaders, and more especially the help afforded by the Genoese, Frankish and Venetian fleets, he took possession of the principal cities on the coast of Syria. Besides, the Countship of Tripoli and the Principality of Edessa became fiefs of the new kingdom, but the Principality of Antioch preserved its independence. Baldwin I attacked Egypt, then a capital of Egypt, but died at El-Arish (1118) in the course of this expedition. His cousin, Baldwin du Bourg, Count of Edessa, was chosen by the barons to succeed him. Baldwin II (1118–1131), who had followed Godfrey of Bouillon to the crusade, was a valiant knight and, in 1124, took possession of Tyre. In 1129 he married his daughter Mésiende to Fulk, Count of Anjou, who was the father of Geoffrey Plantagenet and already sixty years of age. Fulk (1131–1144) succeeded his father-in-law. Under his son, Baldwin III (1144–1162), who married Theodora Comnena, the kingdom attained its greatest dimensions after the capture of Ascalon (1153), but the Principality of Edessa, wrested from it in 1154, was recovered by Amaury I (1154–1174), brother of Baldwin III, succeeded to the throne on the latter's death, being only twenty-seven years of age. He was one of Jerusalem's most brilliant sovereigns, and thought to profit by the anarchy that prevailed in Egypt in order to acquire possession of that country, reaching Cairo twice (1167 and 1168) and, for the moment, having Egypt under his protectorate. But the formation of Saladin's power soon placed the kingdom in peril. Amaury died prematurely in 1174, leaving as his successor his son Baldwin IV (1174–1185), a very gifted young man, who had been the pupil of William of Tyre, but who was attacked with leprosy and rendered incapable of taking charge of affairs. He at first reigned under the guardianship of Milon de Planci and, assisted by Renaud de Châtillon, inflicted a defeat upon Saladin at Ramleh (1177). By 1182 the dreadful disease had worsened till that the unfortunate Baldwin "the Leprous" ("le Mésel") had the son of his sister Sibylia by the Count of Montferrat crowned under the name of Baldwin V. He also had Sibylia take as her second husband Guy of Lusignan, who had put himself at Baldwin's service and had been appointed governor of the kingdom. However, Guy seemed incompetent, the barons took the regency away from him and confided it to Raymond, Count of Tripoli. Baldwin IV died in 1185, at the age of twenty-five, without having married, and left the kingdom a prey to discord and exposed to the attacks of Saladin. The young Baldwin V, his nephew, died in 1186, supposedly of poisoning.

It was largely due to the instrumentality of Renaud de Châtillon that the barons elected Guy of Lusignan (1186–1192) and Sibylia sovereigns of Jerusalem. Incapable of defending his kingdom against Saladin, Guy was made prisoner at the battle of Tibérias (4 July, 1187), which was followed by the capture of Jerusalem (2 October), and purchased his liberty by yielding Ascalon to Saladin. The Kingdom of Jerusalem was destroyed. Then took place the Crusade of Saint-Jean d'Acre, of which Guy commenced the same. His wife Isabella and Sibylia died in 1187. Guy and Conrad of Montferrat, who had married Isabella, Sibylia's sister, disputed the title of king with Guy of Lusignan, and this rivalry lasted throughout the siege of Saint-Jean d'Acre, which city capitulated 13 July, 1191. On 28 July, Richard Cœur de Lion, King of England, imposed his arbitration upon the two rivals and decided that Guy should be king during his lifetime and have Conrad for his successor, the latter to receive Beirut, Tyre, and Sidon as guarantees; but on 29 April, 1192, Conrad was assassinated by emissaries of the "Old Man of the Desert." On his side, the renounced the title of king (May, 1192) and purchased the Island of Cyprus from the Templars. He died in 1194 and his widow married Henry I, Count of Champagne (1194–1197), who was elected king, but in 1197 Henry died from an accident and Isabella married a fourth time, to Hugh I of Lusignan (1197–1205), brother of Guy and already King of Cyprus. The turning of the course of the crusade to Constantinople obliged him to conclude a truce with the Mussulmans. Amaury died in 1205, leaving an only daughter Mésiende who married Bohemond IV, Prince of Antioch. However, it was 1232, death of Isabella and Conrad of Montferrat, that the barons gave the preference, and they requested the King of France to provide her with a husband. Philip Augustus accordingly selected John of Brienne (1210–1225), who hesitated for a long time before accepting and did not arrive in Palestine until 1216, having first been detained from the Pope a ransom. He directed the Crusade of Egypt in 1218 and, after his defeat, came to the West to solicit help. Hermann von Sales, the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, advised him to give his only daughter Isabella (Yolande) in marriage to the Emperor Frederick of Hohenstaufen. In 1223, Henry of Flanders proposed to seek the young princess at Saint-Jean d'Acre, and on 9 November she married Frederick II at Brindisi. Immediately after the ceremony the emperor declared that his father-in-law must renounce the title of King of Jerusalem, and he himself adopted it in all his acts. After the death of Isabella, by whom he was married Conrad, Frederick II attempted to take possession of his kingdom and to fulfil his crusader's vow, the execution of which he had so long deferred, and landed at Saint-Jean d'Acre (September, 1228), excommunicated by the pope and in disfavour with his new subjects. By a treaty concluded with the Sultan of Egypt, Frederick regained Jerusalem, and on 18 March, 1229, without any religious ceremony whatever, assumed the royal crown in the church of the Holy Sepulchre. Having confided the regency to Baldwin d'Ibelin, Lord of Sidon, he returned to Europe. To strengthen his power in the East, he married his daughter Jean d'Acre Richard Filangi, Marshal of the Empire, whom he named baillie (guardian) of the kingdom. The new regent combated the influence of the Ibelins and tried to secure possession of the Island of Cyprus, but was conquered and had to content himself with placing an imperial garrison there. In 1243 Conrad, son of Frederick II, having attained his majority, the court of barons declared that the regency of the emperor must cease, and invited the legitimate king to come in person and exercise his rights. Aix of Champagne, Queen of Cyprus and daughter of King Henry of Flanders, died at Cyprus. After his Crusade of Egypt, St. Louis landed at Saint-Jean d'Acre (1250) and remained four years in Palestine, putting the fortresses of the kingdom in a state of defence and endeavouring to subdue the factious barons. However, it was at this time that the Christian states were harassed by the Mongols and the Manéluks of Egypt, interior strife was at its height. In 1257, Henry of Lusignan having died, some of the barons acknowledged Queen Blaisance
regent in the name of her son Hugh II, whereas others would give their allegiance to none other than Con-
radin, grandson of Frederick II. Moreover, civil war broke out at Acre between the Genoese and the Ven-
etians, between the Hospitallers and the Templars, and on 31 July, 1288, the Venetians destroyed the Genoese fleet before Acre. The Mameluke Sultan Bichars, "the Condottiere" (El-Bundukdare), commenced the conquest of Syria without meeting any resistance, and in 1288, the last Christian cities, Tripoli, Sidon, and Acre, were cut off from one another. King Hugh II of Lusignan had died in 1287, and his succession was disputed by his nephew, Hugh III, and by King Louis IX of France, whose maternal grandfather was Amaury of Lusignan. In 1299 the barons acknowledged Hugh III, but the new king, unable to cope with the lack of discipline among his subjects, retired to Cyprus after naming Balian d'Ibelin regent of the kingdom (1276). But in 1277, Mary of Antioch sold her rights to Charles of Anjou, King of Naples, who, thinking to subdue the East, sent a garrison under command of Roger of San Severino to occupy Acre. After the Sicilian Vespers (1282), which ruined the projects of Charles of Anjou, the inhabitants of Acre expelled his sen-
chal, Roger of San Severino, who was a very powerful (1172-1286) their king. But at this time the remnants of the Christian possessions were hard pressed by the Mamelukes. On 5 April, 1291, the Sultan Malek-
Aeschafr appeared before Saint-Jean d'Acre and, de-
spite the courage of its defenders, the city was taken by storm on 25 May. The Kingdom of Jerusalem no longer existed, and none of the expeditions of the four-
teenth century succeeded in re-establishing it. The title of King of Jerusalem continued to be borne in a spirit of rivalry: by the Kings of Cyprus belonging to the House of Lusignan; and by the two Houses of Acre, both of them in hopes to hold the territory of Antioch. In 1459 Charlotte, daughter of John III, King of Cyprus, married Louis of Savoy, Count of Geneva, and in 1465 ceded her rights to Jerusalem to her nephew Charles of Savoy; hence, from that time up to 1870, the title of King of Jerusalem was borne by the princes of the House of Savoy.

(2) Institutions and Civilization—Towards the middle of the twelfth century, when the Kingdom of Jerusalem had attained its greatest dimensions, it comprised the entire coast of Syria from Beirut on the north to Raphia on the south. On the north-east its territory, bounded by the Lebanon district, which seemed to be deserted in having as its limits, Damascus, was hardly more than a few leagues in breadth; on the south-east it extended beyond the Dead Sea and the Jordan as far as the Arabian Desert and even included the port of Aila on the Red Sea. In the north the Countship of Tripoli was under the sovereignty of the King of Jerusalem. But in the very interior of the kingdom the power of the king was checked by numerous obstacles, and the sovere
igny belonged less to the king than to the body of feudalists whose power was centred in the High Court, composed of vassals and rear-vassals. Its authority governed even the succession to the throne, in event of dispute between two members of the royal family; it alone was empowered to make laws or "assizes", and to its initiative was due the compilation of the "Assizes of Jerusalem", erroneously ascribed to Godfrey of Bouillon. The king took an oath to the Royal Military service, and to this his rights and to his homage were attached. He could confiscate a fief unless in accordance with the regular judgment of that assembly. Moreover, if the king were to violate his oaths, the assizes formally pro
claimed the right of the lieges to resist. The High Court, presided over by the constable or marshal, assembled when commanded by the king; in jur,
dicial matters it constituted the supreme tribunal and its judgments were without appeal: "Nulle chose fute par court n'en doit estre desfaite" (Assises, I, clxvii). A "Court of the Burgesses", organized in the twelfth century, had analogous jurisdiction over the burgesses and could sentence to exile or even condemn to death. In the great fiefs mixed courts of knights and burgesses had similar control independen
tly of the liege. Even within these limits the king was incapable of compelling, without a considerable feudal obligations. Domiciled in impregnable castles, the architecture of which had been perfected after Mussulman models, the nobles led an almost inde
pendent life. A fief like that of Montléran with its four castles of Creac, Creac de Montléran, Alhamb, and Alle, held by d'Arques de Moise, in after time the city of Acre, the Seans, formed a really independent state. Renaud de Châtillon, who became Lord of Montléran in 1174, him
self waged war against the Mussulmans, whom he terrified by his cruise in the Red Sea, and his indi
vidual policy was counter to that of King Baldwin IV, who was powerless to prevent him from waging war against Saladin.

The Church, at this period, was also a power inde
pendent of the kings, and, with the exception of the king, the Patriarch of Jerusalem was the most im
portant personage in the realm. After the First Cru
sade, the Church was united in Palestine; numerous monasteries were founded and received large donations of landed property in Palestine as well as in Europe. Some patriarchs, especially Daimbert, who was at enmity with Baldwin I, even endeavoured to found a power thoroughly inde
pendent of royalty; nevertheless, both of these powers generally lived in harmony. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was elected by the clergy and ac
claimed by the people, had his powers confirmed by the pope, who continued to exercise great authority in Palestine. Moreover, the orders of religious knights,
like the Hospitallers, the Hospitaliers from Jerusalem and the Templars founded by Hugh of Payens in 1128, and the Teutonic Knights created in 1143, formed regular powers, equally independent of Church and State. Most lavishly endowed, they soon owned an incecalculable number of fiefs and castles in Palestine and in Europe. In spiritual matters they were di
rectly subject to the popes, but the king could not interfere in their temporal affairs, and each of the three orders had its own army and exercised the right of concluding treaties with the Mussulmans.

Although royal authority was restricted to rather narrow limits by these various powers, it nevertheless never ceased to be the direct support of the Christian states. Its financial revenues were more considerable than those of the majority of the European princes of the twelfth cen
tury, amongst the most profitable sources of income being the customs duties enforced at all the ports and of which the register was kept by natives who wrote in Arabic. The king also levied toll upon caravans, had the monopoly of certain industries, and the exclusive right to coin money. At times he obtained from the court of barons authority to levy extraordinary taxes; and in 1182, in order to meet the invasion of Saladin, all revenues, even those of the Church, were subjected to a tax of 2 per cent. Although the kings of the twelfth century were surrounded by high officials, and kept a sufficiently grand court, at which Byzantine etiquette ruled, they devoted most of their income to the defence of their kingdom. Their vassals owed an oath of fealty, and were subject to the prevailing Western customs, but in exchange they re
ceived pay. Moreover, the king enlisted natives or foreigners, settling on them a life-annuity or fief de soude: a light cavalry of Tirepoles mounted and equipped in Saracenic style, Maronite archers from the Lebanon, and Armenian and Syrian footsoldiers, and the list of this cosmopolitan army of which the effective force was hardly over 20,000 men, some few
hundreds of them being knights. To these regular resources already mentioned we must add the bands of crusaders constantly arriving from Europe, but whose turbulence and lack of discipline often rendered them more of an encumbrance than a help; besides, many considered that, having once engaged in combat with the Mosulmans, they had accomplished their vow and therefore regarded further service in Europe as unnecessary. This explains why with the well-organized Musulman states arrayed against it, the Kingdom of Jerusalem could only dispute the ground foot by foot for two centuries.

Nevertheless, despite its imperfect organization, the economic and political life of the kingdom rose to extraordinary height of development in the twelfth century. In order to repopulate the country, Baldwin I held out inducements to the Christian communities dwelling beyond the Jordan: in 1182 the Maronites of the Lebanon abjured their Monothelite heresy. Most of the natives did likewise, and constituted the influential middle class or burghers of the various cities, having the right to own land and an autonomous administration under magistrates called reis. In the ports, the Italian cities of Genoa, Venice, and Pisa, and the French cities of Marseilles, Narbonne, etc., received a share of the gains of the crusades, and even after the fatih's death they were still administered by their own consuls. Each of these colonies had lands or caçaus on the outskirts of the city, where cotton and sugar-cane were cultivated; the colonial merchants had the monopoly of commerce between Europe and the East, and freighted their outgoing ships with costly merchandise, spices, China silk, precious stones, etc., which the caravans brought from the interior of Asia. Industries peculiar to Syria, the manufacture of silk and cotton materials, the dye-works and glass factories of Tyre, etc., all helped to feed this commerce, as did also the agricultural products of the land. In exchange, the Western ships brought to Palestine such European produce as was necessary to the colonists; two frigates sailed yearly from Western ports, at Easter and about the feast of St. John, thus ensuring communication between Palestine and Europe. Thanks to this commerce, during the twelfth century the Kingdom of Jerusalem became one of the most prosperous states in Christendom. In the castles, as in the cities, the Western knights loved to surround themselves with gorgeous equipment and choice furniture, the latter often of Arabian workmanship. In Palestine there was a marked development along artistic lines, and churches and the towns were built according to the rules of Roman architecture. Even now, the cathedral of St. John at Beirut, built about 1130-1140 and transformed into a mosque, shows us the style of edifice reared by Western architects, its structure recalling that of the monuments of Limousin and Languedoc. The use of ivory used as a binding for the Psalter of Mélisende, daughter of Baldwin II, and preserved in the British Museum, displays a curious decoration in which are combined designs of Byzantine and Arabian art. But it was military architecture that reached the greatest development and probably furnished models to the West; even today the ruins of the Crac of the Knights, built by the Hospitalers, astonish the beholder by their double gallery, their massive towers, and elegant halls. The Kingdom of Jerusalem, established as a result of the First Crusade, was thus one of the first attempts made by Europe at civilization.

IV. FROM THE END OF THE LATIN KINGDOM TO THE PRESENT TIME.—(I) POLITICAL HISTORY.—The Latin dominion over Jerusalem really came to an end on 2 October, 1187, when the city opened its gates to Saladin (Yusuf ibn Ayyub, Salāh-ʾed-dīn, Emir of Egypt, 1169-93), although fragments of the Latin kingdom in Palestine lasted for another century. Frederick II acquired a short possession of Jerusalem (1191-1217) by treaty; later, Seneca, the "Emir of Jerusalem," added an empty splendour to the styles of various European sovereigns almost to our own time. Nevertheless after 1187 the episode of Christian and Latin rule over the Holy City is closed. From that time it falls back again into its former state of a city under Moslem government, in which Christian pilgrims are at best on a footing of toleration.

As soon as Saladin's army entered the city they set about to destroy all traces of the Christian rule. They tore the great gift cross from the Dome of the Rock, broke up the bells, plundered churches and convents, restored all the buildings that had been mosques (notably the Dome of the Rock and the El-Aqsa mosque), turned other churches into stables or granaries, founded Moslem schools, hospitals, and all the pious institutions that go by the general name of waqf. While Europe was thunderstruck at the loss of the Holy City, and was preparing a new crusade to retrieve it, the last Crusade took place in the Moslem world announcing the glad tidings that El-Quds was now purified and restored to the true believers. But—true to the promise made by Omar (see above)—Saladin left the Holy Sepulchre, as well as a few other churches, to the Christians (the Orthodox). For the use of these they had to pay a heavy tribute. The church of the Knights of St. John was turned into a hospital (at the place still called Muristan, where the German Protestant church now stands). Saladin further strengthened the walls of the city when the Third Crusade (with King Richard of England) approached and threatened to capture it. In 1219 the Sultan Malik-el-Muʾasams (d. 1227, vice-roy of Damascus for El-Mansur) ordered these walls to be destroyed, lest they should become a protection for the Franks. In 1229 another short interlude began. Emperor Frederick II (1212-50) came on his (the Fifth) Crusade. He obtained by treaty with the Sultan of Egypt, El-Kāmil (1219-38), possession of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, and the pilgrim roads from Jaffa and 'Akka for ten years and a half. The city was not to be fortified, and the Haram ehsherf (the Temple area) was to remain in exclusive Christian possession. In 1244, however, with Kerak, En-nāsir Dādūd, conquered Jerusalem again and destroyed the Tower of David. But in 1243 he made over the city to the Latins without any stipulations. This led to the final loss of the city. For Esrail Ayyub, Caliph of Egypt (1238-49), then called on the savage Khwarizmian tribes from Mesopotamia to recapture it. They poured over Syria plundering and murdering, and in September, 1244, stormed Jerusalem. In the massacre that followed 7000 Christians perished; Jerusalem was restored once more, and finally, to the Empire of the Caliph. From this time the remaining Latin possessions in Palestine were lost one by one in quick succession. The last town, 'Akka (Saint-Jean d'Acre), fell in 1291.

The title "King of Jerusalem" went from Guy of Lusignan (King of Jerusalem and Cyprus, 1186-92) to Henry of Champagne (1192-7), to whom it was only a title of pretense, as he reigned in the city. Amaury (Amalric) of Lusignan (brother of Guy), King of Cyprus (1194-1205), was elected king by the crusading army at Tyre, and married Isabel, daughter of Amaury I of Jerusalem (1162-79). He then added the title of Jerusalem to that of Cyprus (Amaury II). From this time the name of Cyprus used the title of Jerusalem and quartered its arms (argent, a cross potent between four croisslets) with their paternal coat (barry of ten azure and...
gant, a lion rampant or, crowned gules. See the arms of "die conic von cipers" in Gele's Wapenboeck, 1334-72. The Lusignan, "Kingdom of Jerusalem and Cyprus," came to an end in 1474, when Cardinal Cesar, widow of the last king (James III), abdicated in favour of the Republic of Venice. Whatever rights they may be supposed to have had to the title of Jerusalem passed to the House of Savoy. Meanwhile, at the death of Amoury II (1205), John of Brienne who married Mary, daughter of the same Isabel and Conrad of Montferrat, began a rival line of titular Kings of Jerusalem. His daughter Isabel (Iolantie), married Emperor Frederick II, who then assumed the title, and (as we have seen) for a short time actually reigned in Jerusalem. He crowned himself in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on 17 March, 1229. After him the title was borne by his descendants to Conradin (d. 1268). Then Hugh III, Prince of Antioch (1267-80) and regent of the scattered Latin possessions in Palestine for the absent kings of this line, began another series of titular Kings of Jerusalem. He was crowned at Tyre in 1269. His claim was maintained by his son Henry at Akka. But Mary of Antioch, also descended from Isabel, set up a claim to this visionary crown, and then sold it to her grand-nephew Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily (1265-1309), who had already obtained another claim by marrying Margaret, grand-daughter of John of Brienne. While the Moslems were gaining ground and driving back the thin remnant of the Latin kingdom every year, the Sicilians and the party of Hugh of Antioch were fighting for the possession of it. Eventually the kings of Sicily added it to their style, and "Jerusalem and the two Sicilies" existed as a royal title down to the Italian revolution (1860). Lastly, the House of Habsburg also added this shadowy royalty to its long list of titles. Jolanthe, daughter of René the Good (d. 1400), titular King of Jerusalem and Naples—married Duke Frederick of Lorraine; from her the line came to the Dukes of Lorraine, and so, through Maria Theresa's marriage with Francis of Lorraine (1736), to the House of Austria. The arms of Jerusalem formed one of the fifty-eight quarterings of the Imperial Arms of Austria; and "König von Jerusalem" was one of the emperor's long string of titles, till Ferdinand I (1525-48) had the good sense to reduce both quarterings and titles to those that had a real meaning. The story of this title of Jerusalem forms a curious by-path in history, and is a typical example of the prevalence that medieval heralds loved. Meanwhile, the Moslem ruled again over the Holy City. The crusading idea lingered on in the West for centuries. Pope Pius II (1458-64) still hoped to renew the work of Urban II; but nothing ever came of these attempts. Jerusalem was lost to Christendom in 1187; it is lost still.

Till the sixteenth century Syria belonged to the caliphs of Egypt; but it was constantly overrun for short periods by their various enemies. In the thirteenth century the Mongols, who had destroyed the line of caliphs at Baghdad, poured over Syria plundering and destroying under their chief Hulagu (capture of Aleppo, 1260). Kutus (1259-60) sent his famous general, Beibars el-bundukdari, by whom the Mongols were driven out. Beibars then had Kutus murdered and reigned as al-Fath (1260-77). He succeeded in driving the Crusaders nearly back to their last stronghold, 'Akka, crushed the "Assassins" (Hashishiyen)—fanatical Isma'ilis who had been the terror of Syria for nearly two centuries—and conquered a great part of Asia Minor. The name of Beibars (Es-Sultan el-Malik es-Sahir, rukn-ed-dunya wa-liln, "The foundation of the highest king, prop of the world and the faith") may be seen on many monuments in Jerusalem. Kalilün (1279-90) deposed Beibars' son, made himself caliph, further harassed the Crusaders, and built splendid monuments all over Syria. In 1400 the Mongols under Timur again devastated the land.

Meanwhile the Osmanli Turks were becoming the dominant race in Islam. In 1516 under Sultan Selim I (1512-20), after they had crushed the Persians (1514), they turned southward towards Syria. On 14 August, 1516, Selim routed the Egyptian army and killed the Caliph Kâsîm el-Abî (d. 1521) on 22 January, 1517. Selim entered Cairo in triumph. Mutawakki, the last Egyptian caliph, died a captive of the Turks in 1518, bequeathing his title to the conquering House of Osman. It is on the strength of this (quite illegal) legacy that the Turkish sultan still calls himself Caliph of Islam. From this time the Turk has been master of Jerusalem. In 1799 Napoleon I invaded Syria and reached Nazareth. In 1831 the Egyptian army under Ibrahim Pasha took the Turks near Homs (Emessa), and kept possession of Syria and Jerusalem till England and Austria conquered them back for the Turks in 1840. During the nineteenth century Syria has had her share of various Turkish reforms. Jerusalem and the holy places especially, as being the most interesting parts of the empire to Christians and the scene of continual Christian pilgrimages, were the places where the Turkish government was most anxious to show that its reforms were really meant. The great number of Christian institutions of various sects and the large Christian population of Jerusalem have almost from it the appearance of an Eastern town. The latest development is the enormous increase of Jews, who, in spite of repeated attempts on the part of the government to keep them out, form large colonies in and around the city. They and the European Christians are now the predominant element. There are to cities of the Turkish Empire where Moslems are so little in evidence as in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth.

(2) The Holy Sepulchre.—The Crusaders found the group of buildings as they had been left by Constantine IX's restoration (1048; see above). In 1140 to 1149 they made a complete reconstruction of the whole under their architect Master Jordan. The effect of this was a great French-Romanesque cathedral. At the east of the round building over the Anastasis a transept, and beyond it a choir and an
apse were built; an aisle surrounded the choir and apse. At the junction with the round building they put a triumphal arch. All the various chapels opened into the central church. From the apse steps led down to the chapel of St. Helena. The entrance was at the wall of the cathedral and was a large building. From the choir one could see into the Anastasis and into all the chapels. This Crusaders’ Church is the one that still stands: the beautiful Romanesque doors, at the south especially, still give it a Western appearance. Slight restorations were made in 1340, 1350, 1400 and 1490. In 1808 the round building was burnt down. The Orthodox persuaded the Turkish government to allow them alone to restore it. Their architect closed up the triumphal arch, thus again destroying the unity of the whole, and replaced the old columns of the rotunda by clumsy pillars. He also enclosed the tomb in the present ugly marble covering. The choir of the Crusaders’ Church became the present Orthodox Katholikon. The arches between it and its aisles were walled up; the aisles became dark passages. The cupola they built over the rotunda threatened to fall in 1898. France and Russia together had it rescued, restored and iron dome thrown on it. Thus was decided the dispute between Catholics and Orthodox as to the keys of the Holy Sepulchre that immediately caused the Crimean War (1853). All the parts of the church now need repairs which are not executed, because no religion will allow the other to undertake them for fear of disturbing their various rights. The inside of the cupola over the Anastasis is rotting daily. But the reappearance of the roof is the most dangerous of all, since by Turkish law the right to repair implies possession and the possession of a roof means possession of all it covers. In the present building, walled up and divided into a complex mass of dark passages and chapels laden with tawdry ornament, it is still possible to trace the plan of the great Crusaders’ Church. For the rights of the various religions see below.

(3) The Orthodox Patriarchate.—Through all the political changes, under Saracens, Egyptians, and Turks, the old line of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem (who followed the Church of Constantinople into schism in the eleventh century) goes on. But there is little to tell of their history. The line was often broken, and there have been many disputed successors. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem under its two names (Byzantine, 329-1122; Bulgarian, 1122-1261) is the second in the list of the Patriarchates of the East. When the Crusaders took Jerusalem (1099), the Orthodox patriarch (Simon II) fled to Cyprus. As long as the former held the city, it was impossible for the schismatical rival of their Latin patriarchs to live in it. In 1142 the Orthodox continued their line by electing Arsenius II: he resided at Constantinople. After the Moelems had recaptured the city, the Orthodox patriarchs came back and lived in or near it. The only event of any importance in the later history of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem is the Synod of Constantinople (often called the Synod of Bethlehem) in 1672. This synod represents the climax of the Orthodox reaction against the heresies of Cyril Lucaris (d. 1638). Cyril was Patriarch of Constantinople (Cyril I) at five separate intervals (1629-3, 1623-30, 1630-4, 1634-5, 1637-8); he had imbued Protestant ideas from his friends in Germany and England. As patriarch he organized—or tried to organize—a reforming party, and he wrote in 1629, a famous “Confession” (Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith), which is full of pure Calvinism. Eventually Lucaris was accused of treason against the imperial house (this is the famous “infringement of Genevan laws”), and he left a certain number of Protestantizing disciples, but the enormous majority of the Orthodox adhered his new doctrines. In the years following his death four synods were held—at Constantinople (1639), Yassy in Moldavia (1643), Jerusalem (1672), and Constantinople again (1672)—in which the Orthodox faith was asserted against Protestantism in the most uncompromising terms. Of these synods that of Jerusalem was by far the most important. It is interesting to compare them with the official pronouncements of the Orthodox Church, and may be compared to our Council of Trent. Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669-1707), who summoned the synod, was certainly the most distinguished bishop of that line during this latter period. He was the 81st. In 1808 the round building was burnt down. The Orthodox persuaded the Turkish government to allow them alone to restore it. Their architect closed up the triumphal arch, thus again destroying the unity of the whole, and replaced the old columns of the rotunda by clumsy pillars. He also enclosed the tomb in the present ugly marble covering. The choir of the Crusaders’ Church became the present Orthodox Katholikon. The arches between it and its aisles were walled up; the aisles became dark passages. The cupola they built over the rotunda threatened to fall in 1898. France and Russia together had it rescued, restored and iron dome thrown on it. Thus was decided the dispute between Catholics and Orthodox as to the keys of the Holy Sepulchre that immediately caused the Crimean War (1853). All the parts of the church now need repairs which are not executed, because no religion will allow the other to undertake them for fear of disturbing their various rights. The inside of the cupola over the Anastasis is rotting daily. But the reappearance of the roof is the most dangerous of all, since by Turkish law the right to repair implies possession and the possession of a roof means possession of all it covers. In the present building, walled up and divided into a complex mass of dark passages and chapels laden with tawdry ornament, it is still possible to trace the plan of the great Crusaders’ Church. For the rights of the various religions see below.

(3) The Orthodox Patriarchate.—Through all the political changes, under Saracens, Egyptians, and Turks, the old line of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem (who followed the Church of Constantinople into schism in the eleventh century) goes on. But there is little to tell of their history. The line was often broken, and there have been many disputed successors. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem under its two names (Byzantine, 329-1122; Bulgarian, 1122-1261) is the second in the list of the Patriarchates of the East. When the Crusaders took Jerusalem (1099), the Orthodox patriarch (Simon II) fled to Cyprus. As long as the former held the city, it was impossible for the schismatical rival of their Latin patriarchs to live in it. In 1142 the Orthodox continued their line by electing Arsenius II: he resided at Constantinople. After the Moelems had recaptured the city, the Orthodox patriarchs came back and lived in or near it. The only event of any importance in the later history of the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem is the Synod of Constantinople (often called the Synod of Bethlehem) in 1672. This synod represents the climax of the Orthodox reaction against the heresies of Cyril Lucaris (d. 1638). Cyril was Patriarch of Constantinople (Cyril I) at five separate intervals (1629-3, 1623-30, 1630-4, 1634-5, 1637-8); he had imbued Protestant ideas from his friends in Germany and England. As patriarch he organized—or tried to organize—a reforming party, and he wrote in 1629, a famous “Confession” (Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith), which is full of pure Calvinism. Eventually Lucaris was accused of treason against the imperial house (this is the famous “infringement of Genevan laws”), and he left a certain number of Protestantizing disciples, but the enormous majority of the Orthodox adhered his new doctrines. In the years following his death four synods were held—at Constantinople (1639), Yassy in Moldavia (1643), Jerusalem (1672), and Constantinople again (1672)—in which the Orthodox faith was asserted against Protestantism in the most uncompromising terms. Of these synods that of Jerusalem was by far the most important. It is interesting to compare them with the official pronouncements of the Orthodox Church, and may be compared to our Council of Trent. Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669-1707), who summoned the synod, was certainly the most distinguished bishop of that line during this latter period. He was the 81st. In 1808 the round building was burnt down. The Orthodox persuaded the Turkish government to allow them alone to restore it. Their architect closed up the triumphal arch, thus again destroying the unity of the whole, and replaced the old columns of the rotunda by clumsy pillars. He also enclosed the tomb in the present ugly marble covering. The choir of the Crusaders’ Church became the present Orthodox Katholikon. The arches between it and its aisles were walled up; the aisles became dark passages. The cupola they built over the rotunda threatened to fall in 1898. France and Russia together had it rescued, restored and iron dome thrown on it. Thus was decided the dispute between Catholics and Orthodox as to the keys of the Holy Sepulchre that immediately caused the Crimean War (1853). All the parts of the church now need repairs which are not executed, because no religion will allow the other to undertake them for fear of disturbing their various rights. The inside of the cupola over the Anastasis is rotting daily. But the reappearance of the roof is the most dangerous of all, since by Turkish law the right to repair implies possession and the possession of a roof means possession of all it covers. In the present building, walled up and divided into a complex mass of dark passages and chapels laden with tawdry ornament, it is still possible to trace the plan of the great Crusaders’ Church. For the rights of the various religions see below.
private opinion of a heretic: here the Fathers are on safe ground. Chapter iv defends—no longer Cyril but—the Orthodox Church by quoting her formulæ, and contains a list of anathemas against the heretics of the “Confessions.” Chapter v again tries to defend Cyril by quoting various deeds and sayings of his, and transcribes the whole decree of the Synod of Constantinople in 1639, and then that of Yassy (Tăuerna) in 1643. Chapter vi gives the decrees of the synod in the form of a “Confession of Doctrines.” It has eighteen decrees (depositions), then four “questions” (prophores) with long answers. In these all the points denied by Lucaris’s “Confession” (Church and Bible, predestination, cult of saints, sacraments, the Real Presence, the liturgy a real sacrifice, etc.) are maintained at great length and in the most uncompromising way. A short epilogue closes the acts. Then follow the date, signatures, and seals.

Because of its determined anti-Protestantism (Protestants are described as being patent heretics and ἀπεράσσων λαχανίστατοι), Protestant writers have described this synod as a work of the Jews, of the French ambassador at that time, Olivier de Nointel, and of other Catholics who were undermining the Eastern Church. It is true that the Synod of Jerusalem represents a strongly Catholic reaction after Lucaris’s troubles (it accepts and defends the word transubstantiation—περιτομή λεύκης—for instance). It is all the more remarkable that its decrees have been accepted unreservedly by the whole Orthodox Church. They were at once approved by the other patriarchs, the Church of Russia, etc.: they are allowed for in the symbolic books of the Orthodox Church, and form an official creed or declaration in the strictest sense, which every Orthodox Christian is bound to accept. Since this synod the Orthodox Church has not spoken again officially.

An affair that concerned the Orthodox Patriarchate of Jerusalem was that of the independence of the great monastery of Mount Sinai. This monastery, one of the richest and most famous of Eastern Christendom, was undoubtedly at one time subject to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem. In 1782, after a great struggle, the Abbot of Mount Sinai succeeded in asserting his independence of any patriarch. As Archbishop of Sinai the abbot now reigns over the smallest autocephalous Church of their communion. But he is still ordained in Jerusalem, and the patriarchs have constantly tried to assert some kind of authority over their independent daughter-church. The last great quarrel was in 1830, when the archbishop (Cyril Byzantius) had a dispute with his monks. Instead of applying to Jerusalem he wrote to Constantinople for help. Sophronius III of Constantinople (1863–67) at once took up his cause against the monks. The Patriarch of Jerusalem trembled and synod (1867), in which he protested both against the interference of Constantinople. Less for the sake of Jerusalem’s shadowy rights over Sinai than because of the ever-welcome chance of opposing the arrogant interference of Constantinople, the other Orthodox Churches all supported Jerusalem, so that Byzantius was deposed and the Patriarch of Jerusalem was only theoretical. The patriarchs were all Greeks. Originally, under the rule, they had been Arabs, taken naturally from the native clergy of Palestine. But in 1534 Germanus, a Greek of the Peloponnesus, succeeded in being elected and from that time to this his successors have all been Greeks. Germanus further succeeded in heliurizing all the admirers of the patriarchate: the monks of the Holy Sepulchre, the bishops, archimandrites, and officials of the patriarchal court are all Greeks. It became a recognized principle that no native Arab should ever be appointed to any office in the patriarchate. The result of this is that for over three centuries the patriarchal curia of Jerusalem has been and remains a foreign colony in the land, utterly separate from the native Arab lower clergy and the people. But this state of things will soon come to an end. Following the triumphant example of Antioch there is at this moment a great agitation among the Orthodox Arabs to assert their place in their own patriarchate. And as they are supported by Russia they will succeed. The reigning patriarch, Damianus, though of course a Greek, is not unfriendly to the Arab agitators. On the other hand the monks, the “Fraternity of the Holy Sepulchre,” stand out as a bulwark of Orthodoxy in the state of things, and treat the Arabs as schismatistical revolutionaries. Everyone has heard of the scandalous riots that took place in 1908, and culminated in the pretended deposition of the patriarch. Till quite lately, moreover, most of these Greek patriarchs did not even take the trouble to reside in
their titular city. Mere servants of the ecclesiastical bishop, having no interest in their Arab flock, they were not interested in the security of the tinotile, useless ornaments of the Pharan. Since the accession of Cyril II (1845-72), this abuse has been removed and the patriarchs live near the Monastery of the Holy Sepulchre.

Meanwhile the sees of the patriarchate have almost entirely disappeared. In Juvenal's time (420-58) fifty-nine bishops in the three Palestine obeyed the new patriarch. The Moslem conquest, the Crusades, and the troubles of the Orthodox Church in Syria gradually reduced this number, till there are now only a handful of titular bishops who reside at Jerusalem, and few of these whose titles are registered but are always vacant. Only one bishop (the Metropolitan of 'Akka) now lives in his diocese (see the list below). The full list of patriarchs of Jerusalem during this period will be found in Le Quen, 'Oriens Christianus', III; for the later ones see Williams, 'Holy City', I, pp. 457-8. The patriarchs in the nineteenth century are: Anthimus, 1787-1808; Polycarp, 1808-27; Athanasius V, 1827-45; Cyril II, 1845-72. The last-mentioned refused to sign the excommunication of the Bulgars in 1872, and was deposed the same year. Procopius, who was said to be the man of Cyril still claimed to be patriarch, but the native Arabs acknowledged Cyril; the Pharan and nearly all the rest of the Orthodox world Procopius. Russia, however, then appointed Hierotheus, who, however, to every one's surprise took the side of the Pharan in the Bulgarian quarrel. So Russia fell foul of him, and took the opportunity of confiscating the property of the Holy Sepulchre in Bessarabia. Hierotheus died in 1882. There were then three candidates for the vacant see, Nicodemus, Gerasimus and Photius. Photius (always a determined enemy of the Papal claims) made the offer to Photius, and immediately subject to the patriarch. But the number of sees fluctuated with the fortunes of the Crusaders; there are various lists given by contemporary authors representing different circumstances. There were many abbeys besides the priory of the Holy Sepulchre (following the Augustinian rule); for these see Le Quen, III, 1279 sqq., and the 'Gesta Dei per Francos' (Hanover, 1611), 1077.

From the thirteenth century, when this hierarchy disappeared, the Russian support of the Catholic cause was upheld almost solely by the Franciscan Order. The priors were first sent to Palestine by St. Francis himself in 1219. The order has a special province, the 'Custodia Terrae Sanctae', which includes Lower Egypt, Cyprus, and Armenia. The head of this province, and till 1847 the supreme authority for Catholics in Palestine, is the Franciscan provincial who bears the title 'Custos Terrae Sanctae'. He had episcopal jurisdiction (but not orders), and the Turkish government granted him many privileges as civil head of the 'Latin nation' in Palestine.

The policy of Alexander II somewhat modified this, and the 'Custos', by turning to the 'Custodia Terrae Santa', which has passed into Arabic and Turkish) is recruited from all the other Franciscan provinces. Its official language is Italian. During the long centuries since the fall of the Latin kingdom the heroic friars have guarded the interests of the Catholic Church around the Holy Places. Always exposed to the jealousy of the Orthodox and other sects, continually persecuted by the Turks, they have kept their place till to-day, and with it our rights in the Holy Land, constantly at the price of their blood. It was in their hospices (the case nuove, which they have built all over the Palestinian desert) that the Catholic pilgrim found shelter. They have kept the Latin altars in repair, and have never ceased offering the Latin Mass on them for six centuries when no one else cared for them. The 'Reverendissimus Custos Terrae Sanctae' now fills a much less important place in the Catholic Church of Palestine; but no changes can ever make one forget that it was in the friars for defending our cause during those dark years.

In the sixteenth century it was felt that a state of things of which the result was practically Franciscan monopoly in Palestine had become an anomaly. The Turkish government had become tolerant, a number of other religious orders had built houses at Jeru-
salem and other cities, there were Arab Catholics who wished to become priests and to serve their own people, but there was no reason why the Catholic of Palestine should not be governed by an episcopal hierarchy in the normal way. Moved by these considerations Pius IX decided to change the titular Latin patriarchate at Rome into a real see again at Jerusalem. The titular patriarch, Augustus Foscolo (1830–47), was removed by the legation. In May 1847 Mgr. Augusto Vaglia was made patriarch in 1847, and ordered to take up his residence in the Holy City (Brief of 23 July, 1847). He was consecrated by the pope himself on 10 October, 1847, and arrived in his patriarchate in January, 1848. He found 4200 Latin Catholics there; at his death in 1872 he had doubled the number. The succession of these restored Latin patriarchs is: Joseph Valerga, 1847–72; Vincent Bracco, 1873–89; Louis Piavi, 1889–1905. Mgr. Piavi died on 24 January, 1905. After some delay, the present patriarch, Mgr. Philip Cassasei, formerly Latin Bishop of Syra, was promulgated in November, 1905, and entered Jerusalem just before Easter, 1907.

(5) Present Condition of the City.—Jerusalem (El Quds) is the capital of a sanjak and the seat of a mutasarrif directly dependent on the Sublime Porte. In the administration of the sanjak the mutasarrif is assisted by a council called majlis idāra; the city has a municipal government (majlis baladiyye) presided over by a mayor. The total population is estimated at 66,000. The Turkish census of 1905, which counts only Ottoman subjects, gives these figures: Jews, 45,000; Moslems, 8,000; Orthodox Christians, 6,000; Uniates, 2,500; Armenians, 950; Protestants, 800; Melkites, 250; Copts, 150; Abyssinians, 100; Jacobites, 100; Uniate Syrians, 50. During the nineteenth century large suburbs to the north and east have grown up, chiefly for the use of the Jewish colony. These suburbs contain nearly half the present population.

The Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem has jurisdiction over all Latins of Palestine, extending to Egypt on the south, the Latin Legation of Syria (seat at Beirut) on the north, and including Cyprus. He is appointed by the Roman Curia (libera collatio S. Petri) and is personally exempt from Turkish authority (eternal benefice of the Holy See). He is represented in the majlis. The patriarchate has no suffragan sees. The Custos Terra Sancte retains the use of episcopal insignia and certain rights of admission to the holy places; otherwise, he must now be counted only as the Provincial of the Franciscan Conventuals in the Order of the Holy Sepulchre (a military order of knighthood which began with the crusades and continues as a small dignity given to deserving Catholics), formerly made by the custos, are now in the hands of the patriarch. The patriarchal church in theory is the Holy Sepulchre. But since Catholics have only alternative rights there with the Orthodox and Armenians, Foscolo built a pro-cathedral near the Jaffa Gate (to the north): the patriarch's house and a seminary adjoin this church. But the patriarch celebrates the functions of Holy Week and others at the Holy Sepulchre according to the customs of the convent, which are carefully drawn up and enforced by the Government. The Franciscan custos lives at the Convent of St. Saviour to the north of the Muristan. This convent is the Franciscan head-quarters at Jerusalem. It was originally a Georgian monastery, and was acquired by the friars in 1581. Next to it is the large parish church of St. Saviour, finished in 1885 at the expense of the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph I; the Casa Nuova (hostelry for pilgrims) is close at hand. Then there are an orphanage, a school, a library, printing-press, etc., all in charge of the friars, clustered around the convent. The Franciscans have also the little convent of the Holy Sepulchre with the "Chapel of the Apparition," that forms the northern part of the group of buildings at the Anastasis. This has been Franciscan property since the thirteenth century (P. Barnabé Meiermann's "Nouveau Guide" contains an excellent plan of the Anastasis, coloured according to the possessions of the various religions). Six or seven priests and as many lay-brothers are sent from the convent of St. Saviour to reside here for periods of three months in turn. These are the "Fathers of the Holy Sepulchre" who are always on guard to celebrate the Latin Offices receive pilgrims, and maintain our traditional rights. They have a hard time while they are on duty. There is no way out of the convent except by the door to the whole complex on the south. This door is locked by the Turkish guardians at night, so the friars are locked in. Their food is brought to them from St. Saviour, and passed through a wicket in the great door every day. Formerly the residence in the narrow damp convent shut in among the other buildings, which they do not leave during their time of office, was very injurious to their health. But in 1869 Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria, when he made his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, obtained from the Turkish government some improvement in the ventilation of the convent and leave to build a terrace and a belfry behind it. In 1875 the friars rang their bells to summon Catholics to their services for the first time at this place since centuries (the Orthodox do not use bells but clappers—symantnarc: bells are an abomination to Moslems). The third Franciscan convent in Jerusalem is by the Chapel of the Scourging in the Tarīq Bāb Sūtī Mirām, opposite the Antonia castle. This property belonged to them from the time of the Crusades till 1818. It has then a session in the Pasha and turned into a stable. It was given back in 1838, and restored at the expense of King Maximilian of Bavaria.

Other Latin properties in Jerusalem are the College of St. Ann for Melkite clergy governed (since 1875) by Cardinal Lavagerie's Père blanc near the Bab Sūtī Mirām (Gate of the Lady Mary), the Dominican convent and Eccoli biblique at St. Stephen outside the Damascus Gate (1884), the great French Hospice "Notre Dame de France", directed by the Augustinians of the Assumption outside the walls to the northwest near the Bab Ābdū-l-hamid (1857), the Benedictine monastery with a seminary for Syrian Uniates on the Mount of Olives (1890), the new German Bene-
(isolate monastery at the "Dormitio B. M. V." on Mount Zion, given by the German Emperor in 1806, the German and Austrian hospices, the French Pères de Sion, and Christian Brothers. There are convents of the French Carmelites nuns (on the Mount of Olives, since 1873), Poor Clares, Franciscan nuns of the Third Order of St. Francis, Benedictines nuns, Sisters of the Rosary, of St. Joseph and of "Marie Réparatrice". Of all these Latin institutions the oldest colonies (e.g. the Franciscans) have on the whole an Italian character, by far the greatest number are French, but the Germans (especially by the two large parishes in the vicinity of St. Vincent de Paul, Père de Sion and St. Joseph) are now getting considerable influence. As throughout the Turkish Empire, French is the European language most spoken at Jerusalem.

Most of the Uniate Churches have establishments in the Holy City. The Melkite Patriarch of Antioch also bears the titles of Alexandria and Jerusalem. He has a church (St. Verónica) in the Khán-exzeit just behind St. Saviour where the Melkite patriarchal vicar (who generally resides at Jaffa) and the patriarch himself (when present) officiate; near it is a hospice for Melkites. There is also a Melkite monastery near the Nablus road. The Maronites have a parish church served by their patriarchal vicar; that of the Uniate Armenians (Notredame du Spasme) is in the Via Dolorosa opposite the Austrian hospice. The Armenian had an Archibishop of Jerusalem (Michael Alessandrius) from 1855 to 1897. No successor has been appointed to him. The Syrian Uniates have also a small church, where their patriarchal vicar officiates. The Syrian Uniate Patriarch of Antioch is considered as administrator of an Archdiocese of Jerusalem; but he does not use the title. A hardship felt by all these Uniates is that they cannot celebrate their Offices at the Holy Sepulchre. The Turk recognizes only the rights of Latins there.

The Orthodox Church naturally also fills a large place among the Christian communities of Jerusalem. The patriarch bears the title "the most blessed and holy Patriarch of the holy city Jerusalem and all Palestine, of Syria, Arabia beyond the Jordan, Cana of Galilee and Holy Zion". It should be noticed that of all the persons who bear the title "Patriarch of Jerusalem", this one alone represents historic continuity from the original line. His patriarchate extends to the Lebanon on the north and the Red Sea on the south to accept the sovereignty of the Sultan of (Sana). East and west it is bounded by the Syrian desert and the sea. The patriarch resides by the "Great Laura" in the Haréf desir-er-rûm not far from the Anastasia; he has also properties in the country at Katamôn near Jerusalem (where they say St. Simeon lived) and a convent in Jaffa. The sees of the Patriarchate are Cesarea, Scythopolis (Beisan), Petra, Ptolemis (Akka), Nazareth, Bethlehem, Lydda, Gaza, Nablus, Sebastia, Tabor, the Jordan, Tiberias, Philadelphia, Pella, Kerak, Diocesarea (Sepphoris), Madaba. The only resident bishop is the Metropolitan of 'Akka; those of Lydda, Gaza, Nablus, Sebastia, the Jordan, Philadelphia, Kerak and Madaba live at Jerusalem and form the Patriarch's Court. The other sees are left vacant. In the administration of his Church the patriarch is assisted by a synod consisting of ten bishops, the only archbishop being the Archbishop of Jerusalem. The large Orthodox monastery (St. Constantin) with a printing-press and hospice for pilgrims. In the Holy Sepulchre the Orthodox possess the central part (the "Katholikon") and various chapels. They have a monastery built against it (to the west). The patriarch has a church in Jerusalem dedicated to be given to any one religion; so it is common property, used in turn by all. There are sixteen other Orthodox monasteries in and around the city and various hospices, hospitals and schools. For the education of their clergy they have the "Monastery of the Holy Cross" (Deir el-musaalebe) about one and a half miles west of the city. This monastery (said to be at the place where the tree grew from which the cross was made) was originally Georgian. Inscriptions by the two Syriac versions in that script are of 1120. It was sold to the Greeks, opened as a theological college in 1855, since then several times closed and re-opened. Many students do not belong to the patriarchate, but come from Asis Minor, Cyprus, Greece, etc., to study here. There are hardly any Arabs. The only language used in the schools is Greek. The Greek element has hitherto had exclusive possession of the other Orthodox establishments in Jerusalem.

We have alluded to the troubles now raging through the attempt of the Arabs to break this monopoly. It is considerably broken, though not in favour of the Arabs, by the Russian establishments. The autocephalous Russian Church is represented in Palestine by a great number of large colonies and institutions altogether separate from those of the patriarchate. The first Russian archimandrite arrived in 1844; the consulates date from 1858. The Russian Palestine Society builds churches, in which the liturgy is celebrated in Slavonic. In the Russian establishments all over the country to the great annoyance of the Greek patriarchal element. It is because Russia has taken up the cause of the native Arabs that they can no longer be ignored as obscure revolutionaries of the lower classes. On the contrary, the Greek influence is already doomed; when Lord Darnius dies or is successfully deposed, we may expect to hear of an Arab patriarch as his successor. It remains to be seen whether the Phanar will then repeat the blunder it made at Antioch by excommunicating him. The chief Russian establishments at Jerusalem are the enormous group of buildings outside Jaffa road. These contain a large and very handsome church where the Russian archimandrite officiates, huge hospices for pilgrims, a hospital and other buildings, all close to the Russian consulate. Then they have a gorgeous church in Gethsemane, and another one with a high tower, a convent of nuns, and other buildings on the top of the Mount of Olives (the place of the Ascension in their tradition). There are also another Russian hospice in the Muristan, a lunatic asylum, and schools. But the Russians have no rights at the Holy Sepulchre. Each time they want to build a church they have to get a Convention from the patriarch. About 8000 Russian pilgrims visit the Holy Places every year.

The Gregorian Armenians have a Patriarchate of Jerusalem as one of their two minor patriarchates. In the seventeenth century the Catholikos of Echmiadzin gave the Armenian Church of Jerusalem the right to consecrate chrisms; whereupon the bishop assumed the title patriarch and began ordaining bishops. The title is now acknowledged by the Armenian Church. The jurisdiction of the Armenian Patriarchate of Jerusalem extends throughout the Pashalik of Damasus. Akka, Salkim (Tripoli), and Cyprus. Under him are seven archbishops and bishops who live with him and form his synod, and fourteen suffragans. The patriarchate is at the great Armenian monastery of St. James the south-west of the city, near the Bu Bn Bn Dâd. This was formerly a convent. Near the patriarchate is the"Bâb el-es-zelîm" near the patriarchate, and land outside the city opposite the great Russian colony. The
whole south-west of Jerusalem around their patriarchate is the "Armenian quarter". At the Holy Sepulchre they possess the Chapels of St. Helena, of St. John, of the "Division of Garments", of St. James (behind the Anastasis), and the "Stone of the Holy Woman." Meanwhile, in the Capharnum neighborhood some Armenians have further rights of walking in procession about the Anastasis, and take their turn to celebrate their offices at it.

The Jacobite Syrians have a little church (claimed as the house of John Mark) in the Harat-en-nebi Dádúd, with a more or less singular character. The character of their maronians (who now unites with this dignity of metropolitan of Jerusalem) resides, and the central chapel behind the Anastasis. The Copts have a large monastery (Deir-es-sultán) close to the Holy Sepulchre to the north, at the ninth Station of the Cross, with a hospice. Another Coptic church is at their Khán, between the Birket Hammáám-al-balut (Pool of Hese- kiah), and there several chapels in the Holy Sepulchre itself. The Copts have had a Bishop of Jeru-alem since the eleventh century. He now resides at Cairo with the title Bishop of the East (Sharkie). I or of St. Mark (Deir es-Souk Quwe), and ranks immediately after the Abuna of Abyssinia. The Abyssinians possess a large round church outside the city to the north-west (beyond the Russian buildings) and a monastery touching the Holy Sepulchre and the Coptic monastery. They have no special place in the great church itself; but share with the Copts (with whom, of course, they are in communion). The Nestorians had a metropolitan of Jerusalem from the ninth to the thirteenth century. Since 1282 the title seems to have disappeared (Le Quien, II, 1290).

Lastly, English, German and American Protestants of all sects have a great number of establishments, churches, hospitals, and hospices in Jerusalem. The most important of these are the German Evangelical Erlöserkirche in the Muristan (built in 1898 on land given by the German Emperor) with a school, the Johanniter hospit. Hospital of the Kaiserwerth Deaconesses, the Leper-house kept by the Moravians, and the Syrian Protestant orphanage. In 1841, by arrange- ment between the Prussian and English governments, an Anglo-Lutheran "Bishopric of St. James" at Jerusalem was founded. The bishops were to be appointed alternately by the two governments and to reside alternately in the two countries. But the bishopric was transferred to Syria, Chaldea, Egypt and Abyssinia. This is the famous "Jerusalem bishopric" that gave so great a scandal to the leaders of the Oxford Movement. The bishops were: Michael Samuel Alexander (appointed by England), 1842-5; Samuel Gobat von Cremnitz (by Prussia), 1845-7; Joseph Barclay (by England), 1879-81. Already during Gobat's time the two elements had drifted apart; when Barclay died, the arrangement fell through.

The Anglicans now have a bishopric "in" Jerusalem of quite a different type (since 1857). Bishop Blyth and his successor, the present Bishop, are Domestic Chap-episcopal Churches and on excellent terms with the Orthodox patriarchate. The Anglican College Church of St. George (with a college) is the seat of the bishop in Jerusalem. It is situated outside the city to the north, beyond the Dominican convent. St. Paul's Church belongs to the Church Missionary Society (outside, north-west); there is a large Anglican school (founded by Bishop Gobat) at the south-west corner of the walls. The London Jews' Society has a church, two hospitals and several schools.

The following persons use the title of Jerusalem in some way: the Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and all the East, residing at Alexandria or Damascus; the Melkite Patriarchal Vicar of Jerusalem residing at Jaffa; the Maronite


Jerusalem, Liturgy of.—The Rite of Jerusalem is that of Antioch. That is to say, the Liturgy that became famous as the use of the patriarchal Church of Antioch, that through the influence of that Church spread throughout Syria and Asia Minor, and was the starting-point of the development of the Byzantine rite, is itself originally the local liturgy, not of Antioch, but of Jerusalem. It is no other than the famous Liturgy of St. James. That it was actually composed by St. James the Less, as first Bishop of Jerusalem, is not now believed by any one; but two forms in it show that it was originally used as the local rite of the city of Jerusalem. There is a reference to the rite in the prayers for catechumens—"Lift up the horn of the Christians by the power of the venerable and life-giving cross" (Brightman, "Eastern Liturgies", Oxford, 1806, 37)—that is always supposed to be a reference to St. Helena's invention of the True Cross at Jeru-alem in the early fourth century. If so, this would also give an approximate date, at any rate for that prayer. A much clearer local allusion is in the Intercession, after the Epiklesis: "We offer to thee, O Lord, for thy holy places which thou hast glorified by the divine appearance of thy Christ and by the coming of thy holy Spirit" (the Eastern form of the Eastern liturgy of Palestine) "especially for holy and glorious Sion, mother of all Churches" (Sion, in Christian language, is always the local Church of Jerusalem. See Jeru-alem II) and for thy holy Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout the whole world" (sará sēstrē the eloçyménou, which means not only the whole Empire)—Brightman, op. cit., 54). This reference, then, the only one to any local Church in the whole liturgy—the fact that the Intercession, in which they pray for every kind of person and cause, begins with a prayer for the Church of Jerusalem, is a sure index of the place of origin of this prayer. We have further evidence in the catechetical discourses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. These were held about the year 347 or 348 in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; it is obvious that they describe the liturgy
known to his hearers there. Probst has examined the
outlines from this point of view ("Liturgie des IV
Jahrhunderts", Münster, 1883, 82-106) and describes
the liturgy that can be deduced from them. Allowing
for certain reticences, especially in the earlier instruc-
tions given to catechumens (the disciplina arcana),
and for certain slight differences, such as time always
brings about in a living rite, it is evident that Cyril's
liturgy is the one we know as that of St. James. An
obvious example one may quote Cyril's description of
the beginning of the Anaphora (corresponding to our
Preface). He mentions the celebrant's versicle,
"Let us give thanks to the Lord", and the answer of
the people, "Meet and just." He then continues:
"And when the Lord is present (in his presence) in the
sea, the sun and the moon, the stars and all creation
both rational and irrational, the angels, archangels,
powers, mights, dominations, principalities, thrones,
the many-eyed Cherubim who also say those words of
David: 'Praise the Lord with me.' We remember also
the Seraphim, whom Isaiah saw in spirit standing
around the throne of God, who with two wings cover
their faces, with two as their feet and with two fly:
who say: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth. We also
say these divine words of the Seraphim, so as to take
part in the hymns of the heavenly host" ("Catech.
We). This is an exact description of the be-

JERUSALEM

about the twelfth century. At present the old Rite

of Jerusalem is used, in Syria, by the Jacobites and
Uniat Syrians, and in a smaller circle by the Syriac
Maronites. The Greek version has been restored
among the Orthodox at Jerusalem for one day in the
year—31 December.

For bibliography see Antiqonene Liturgy.

ADRIAN FORTESCU.

Jerusalem, Synod of. See Jerusalem, subtitle IV.

Jesi (Eszna), Diocese of. In the Province of
Ancona, Italy, immediately subject to the Holy See.
The city is situated on a plateau near the Adriatic, and
is situated at the mouth of the river Esino, which flows
near the city and forms the boundary between Umbria and
Piceno. Little or nothing remains of the ancient buildings, temples,
baths, etc., still preserved in the fourteenth century.
After the Lombard invasion of 1242, in the fourteenth centu-
ry, the city was cast into the Esino in the Diocletian persecution,
and was also used (perhaps he is confused with Saint
Flannian, who was cast into the Esus or Anius). Other holy
bishops of antiquity were Saints Marius (c. 500), Cassianus (c. 647), Honestus. The relics of
these three were discovered in 1622. In 1242 the
century IV deposited the intruder Armanus and placed in
his stead the Francisca Gualtierio, an Englishman and
a friend of John of Parma, general of the order and
patron of the "Spirituals," spoken of by Salim-
borne as "bonus cantor, bonus predicador, bonus die-
ator." Bishop Severinus in 1257 laid the foundations
of the new cathedral, a magnificent structure; the old
one, now San Nicola, was outside the city, and in the
seventeenth century had fallen into ruin. Gabrielle de
Monte (1554) introduced the reforms of the Council
of Trent, which he had attended; he founded the semi-
"holy and glorious Sion" was left unaltered, it im-
plored with itself new authority as the use of the
patriarchal Church. The earliest notices of an An-
tichonene Rite that we possess show that it is this one
of St. James. There is no external evidence that the
Apostolic Constitution rite was ever used anywhere;
ily, it is not only from work itself that we deduce that it is
Syrian and Antichonene. Under its new name of
Liturgy of Antichon, St. James's Rite was used through-
out Syria, Palestine, and Asia Minor. When Jerusa-
lem became a patriarchate it kept the same use.
The Liturgy of St. James exists in Greek and Syrian.
It was probably at first used indifferently in either
language, in Greek in the Hellenized cities, in Syriac
in the country. Of the relation of these two versions
we can only say with certainty that the present Greek
version is a free one of the Syriac. The exactness
of the Greek translation from the Greek. There is good reason to
suppose that at Jerusalem, as everywhere else,
the primitive liturgical language was Greek. The schis-
U. BENIGNI.

Jesuattesses. See John Colommani, Saint.

Jesuita. See John Colommani, Saint.

Jesuits. See Society of Jesus.

Jesuit's Bark (China Bark; Cinchona; Cortex
China; Peruvian Bark), on account of its alkaloids,
is the most celebrated specific remedy for all forms
of malaria. It is obtained from several species of
Cinchona, especially C. succirubra, of the order Rubiaceae, that have
been discovered at different times and are indigenous
in the Western Andes of South America. Formerly
the bark itself, prepared in different forms, was used
as a drug, while to-day immense quantities form the
base of the production of cinchona alkaloids. The
industry is carried on principally in Germany, and the
Dutch and English cinchona plantations in Java, Cy-
JESUIT'S BARK

JESUIT'S BARK

lon, and Farther India are the chief sources whence the raw material is supplied. The history of cinchona bark, which dates back two hundred and eighty years, has greatly influenced that of pharmacy, botany, medicine, and frequent intercourse with Peruvian and tropical agriculture. Two hundred and fifty years ago the physician Bado declared that this bark had proved more precious to mankind than all the gold and silver which the Spaniards obtained from South America, and the world confirms his opinion to-day. Two hundred years ago the Italian professor of medicine Ramazzini said that the introduction of Peruvian bark would be of the same importance to medicine that the discovery of gunpowder was to the art of war, an opinion endorsed by contemporary writers on the history of medicine. Whoever has seen the ill with malaria at Lima. The countries was truth of the following observations of Weddel (d. 1877): "Few subjects in natural history have excited general interest in a higher degree than cinchona; none perhaps have hitherto merited the attention of a greater number of distinguished men."

This explains the fact that the above-named branches of science all possess an extensive literature on cinchona, which is accessible for purposes of comparison to those who care to study the subject in detail. Limited space here permits merely a sketch of the relation between the Jesuits and cinchona bark, which was rediscovered for a time in the texts of "Jesuit's Tree", "Jesuit's Powder", "Pulvis Patrum", etc., necessitating a glance into the earliest literature on cinchona, where, however, many difficulties arise. For a just appreciation of these difficulties, the following quotation from Alexander von Humboldt, which sufficiently accounts for them, should be borne in mind: "It is almost impossible to say that any Protestant physicians hatred of the Jesuits and religious intolerance lie at the bottom of the long conflict over the good or harm effected by Peruvian Bark." Many tales which were formerly widespread have proved fabulous; others are to be modified in detail; to which must be added modern discoveries of unquestioned genuineness. Scientific proof is found partly in the work of the present writer.

The Spanish Jesuit missionaries in Peru were taught the healing power of the bark by natives, between 1620 and 1630, when a Jesuit at Loja was imbued with its effects. The Jesuits then turned to the neighboring smaller, general councils of the order (three from each province) returned to their homes, taking it with them, and at the same time there is evidence of its use in the Jesuit colleges at Genoa, Lyons, Louvain, Ratisbon, etc. The remedy—connected with the name of Jesuita—very soon reached England, and "Memorius Politicus" in 1658 contains four numbers the announcement that: 'The excellent powder known by the name of Jesuita's powder' may be obtained from several London chemists." It remains to recall the fact that even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the bark kept in the Jesuit pharmacies or in their colleges was considered particularly efficacious because they were better able to provide a genuine unadulterated supply. Further, that in those two centuries Jesuit missionaries took the remedy to the malaria regions of foreign countries, even reaching the court of Peking, where they cured the emperor by its means; that in Peru during the eighteenth century they urged American collectors to lay out new plantations; and in the nineteenth century they were the first to plant cinchona outside of South America.

ROMPEL. Kritische Studien zur Alten Geschichte der Chinesen (Feldkirch, 1905); HEBERHANN in Historical Records and Studies, IV (New York, 1900), as a very important historical reference see BADER, Anzahl der Chinesen (Leipzig, 1663); BACKE in Medical Transactions, III (London, 1785); FRIEDEN, Verzeichn von Medicinal Pflanzen (Leipzig, 1826); WEDDEL, Erdkunde des Quechus (Paris, 1849); MARKHAM, A Memoir of the Lady Ana de Osorio (London, 1874);
Jesus, Daughters of, founded at Kermaria, in the Diocese of Vannes, France, in 1834, for the care of the sick poor and the education of girls. The congregation received temporary authorization 31 October, 1842. In 1893 a provincial house for Canada was founded at Three Rivers. The sisters in Canada number (1910) 267, choir and lay, in charge of 25 schools, chiefly model and elementary, in addition to 9 boarding schools, a hospital, and an orphanage; they also have 2 houses for the education of girls. In the United States they conduct an academy and hospital at Lewiston, Montana, and the school connected with the French parish at Waltham, Massachusetts. The congregation has over 200 convents throughout the world.

Häusler's Ordens und Kongregationen (Paderborn, 1908); Le Canada ecclésiastique (1910).

F. M. Rudge.

Jesus, Son of Sirach. See Ecclesiasticus.

Jesus and Mary, Sisters of the Holy Childhood of.—(1) A congregation founded in 1835 in the Diocese of Fréjus, for the education of girls and the care of the sick, with mother-house at Draguignan; government authorization was granted in 1853. (2) A congregation established at Sens, in 1838, for the work of teaching and the care of the sick in their own homes, the sisters being sent from the Troyes establishment; they received state authorization in 1853. Under the mother-house at St-Colombe-lès-Sens are over 30 filial establishments. (3) Sisters of the Holy Childhood of Jesus and Mary of Ste-Chrienne, known also as Sisters of Ste-Chrienne, founded in 1867 by Mme Anne-Victoire Ménage, née Tailleux, for the education of girls and the care of the sick poor. At the invitation of Bishop Jauffret of Mâcon, Mme Ménage and her community went from Argancy to Mâcon and took up their abode in the Abbey of St. Gelseinde, where, on 20 April, 1867, they bound themselves by vow to follow the statutes drawn up for them by the bishop. Their numbers soon increased until now (1910) there are about 1400 sisters in over 80 houses. The religious are divided into choir and lay sisters, the latter occupied with the domestic care of their various institutions, the former engaged in the works peculiar to the congregation, the direction of elementary and higher schools, industrial schools, and orphanages. The vows are made annually for ten years, after which final vows are taken. The congregation received the approval of the Holy See in 1883, and in 1899 its statutes were granted papal approbation. The sisters have houses in Lorraine, France, Austria, Belgium, England, and the United States. In the United States about 90 sisters have charge of 5 schools in the Archdiocese of Boston, with a total attendance of 2400. There is a novitiate of the congregation in Salem, Massachusetts.

Häusler's Ordens und Kongregationen (Paderborn, 1908); The Official Catholic Directory (1910).

F. M. Rudge.

Jesus Christ is the Word of God made flesh, Who redeemed man by His Death on the Cross, and Whose Divine mission is continued by the ministry of the Church. Without considering the numberless theological questions connected with Jesus Christ, we shall in the present article merely furnish a brief sketch of His life as it appears in the light of historical documents, premaising, however, an explanation of the two words which compose the Sacred Name.

The Greek Name Jesus is the Latin form of the Greek Ιησοῦς, which in turn is the transliteration of the Hebrew Joshua, or Josua, or again Jehosuha, meaning "Jehovah is salvation". Though the name in one form or another occurs frequently in the Old Testament, it was not borne by a person of prominence between the time of Josue, the son of Nun, and Josue, the high-priest in the days of Zorobabel. It was also the name of the author of Ecclesiasticus, of one of Christ's ancestors mentioned in the genealogy found in the Third Gospel (Luke, iii, 29), and of one of St. Paul's companions (Col., iv, 11). During the Helenizing period, Jason, a purely Greek analogon of Jesus, appears to have been adopted by many (1 Mach., vii, 17; xii, 18; xiv, 22; 2 Mach., i, 7; ii, 24; iv, 726; v, 8; 10); Acts, xvii, 5; 9; 2; Phil., i, 23; Col., iv, 1; Gal., i, 1; and John, vi, 51, 52; and the name is connected with the verb ἱεράω, to heal; it is therefore not surprising that some of the Greek Fathers applied the word Jesus with the same root (Euseb., "Dem. Ev.", IV; cf. Acts, ix, 34; x, 38). Though about the time of Christ the name Jesus appears to be fairly common (Jos., "Ant.", xix, 2, xvii, xiii, 1, xx, ix, 1; "Bel. Jud.", III, ix, 7; iv, 9; VI, v, 5; "Vit.", 22), it was imposed on our Lord by God's express order (Luke, i, 31; Matt., i, 21), to foreshow that the Child was destined to "save his people from their sins". Philo ("De Mut. Num.", 21; cf. Feifer, IV, 374) is, therefore, right when he explains Ἰησοῦς as meaning Θεοῦ σωτήρ, Jesus (Dem. Ev., IV, ad fin.; P. G., XXII, 333) gives the meaning Θεοῦ σωτήρως; while St. Cyril of Jerusalem interprets the word as equivalent to σωτήρ (Cat., x, 13; P. G., XXXIII, 677). This last writer, however, appears to agree with Clement of Alexandria in considering the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word as equivalent to σωτήρ, or, at least, approximately so; hence, for the former centuries the Jewis had referred to their expected Deliverer as the "Anointed"; perhaps this designation alludes to Isa., i, 1, and Dan., ix, 24-26, or even to Ps., ii, 2; xix, 7; xiv, 8. Thus the term Christ or Messias was a title rather than a proper name, "the anointed of God" (Ad pietatem et regni), says Laetaniens (Inst. Div., iv, vii). The Evangelists recognize the same truth; excepting Matt., i, 18; Mark, i, i; John, i, 17; xvii, 3; ix, 23; Mark, ix, 40; Luke, ii, 23; xxiii, 2, the word Christ is always preceded by the article. Only after the Resurrection did the title gradually pass into a proper name, and the expression Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus became only one designation. But at this stage the Greeks and Romans understood little or nothing about the real import of the word "anointed"; to them it did not convey any sacred conception. Hence they substituted Christus, or "exalted"; for Christos, or "anointed", and Christians instead of "Christians". There may be an allusion to this practice in Pet. ii, 3; ὁ χριστός δὲ εἱρμός, which is rendered "that the Lord is sweet". Justin Martyr (Apol., I, 4), Clement of Alexandria (Strom., II, iv, 18), Tertullian (Adv. Gentes, 11), and Lactantius (Inst. Div., IV, vii, 5), as well as St. Jerome (In Gal., V, 22), are acquainted with the pagan substitution of Christus for Christos, and are careful to explain the new term in a favourable sense. The pagans made little or no effort to learn anything accurate about Christ and the Christians; Suetonius, for instance, ascribes the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Octavian, to his constant instigation of sedition by Christus, whom he conceives as acting in Rome the part of a leader of insurgents. The use of the definite article before the word Christ and its gradual development into a proper name show
that the Christians identified the bearer with the promised Messiah of the Jews. He combined in his person the offices of prophet (John, vi, 14; Matt., xiii, 57; Luke, xiii, 33; xxv, 19), of king (Luke, xxiii, 2; Acts, vii, 40), and of Christ (Heb., ii, 17; etc.); he fulfilled all the Messianic predictions in a fuller and a higher sense than had been given them by the teachers of the Synagogue.

II. Sources.—The historical documents referring to Christ’s life and work may be divided into three classes: pre-Christian sources, Jewish sources, and Christian sources. We shall study the three groups in succession.

A. Pagan Sources.—The non-Christian sources for the historical truth of the Gospels are both few and polluted by hatred and prejudice. A number of rea-

sons, short of the fact that the pagan sources themselves are filled with contradictions, make their use difficult. The discussion of these sources will be left to a later section.

The pagan sources of the Field of the Gospel history was remote Galilee; the Jews were noted as a superstitious race, if we may believe Horace (Credat Judaeus Apella, I. Sat., v, 100): the God of the Jews was unknown and unintelligible to most pagans of that period; the Jews in whose midst Christianity had taken its origin were dispersed among, and hated by, all the pagan nations; the Christian religion itself was often confounded with one of the many sects that had sprung up in Judaism, and which could not excite the interest of the pagan spectator. It is at least certain that neither Jews nor Greeks, whether Jews or Christians, were in the least aware of the existence of the religion the rise of which they witnessed among them. These considerations will account for the rarity and the asperity with which Christian events are mentioned by pagan authors.

But though Gentile writers do not give us any information about Christ and the early stages of Christianity which we do not possess in the Gospels, and though their statements are made with unconcealed hatred and contempt, still they unwittingly prove the historical value of the facts related by the Evangelists.

We need not Delay over a writing entitled the “Acts of Pilate,” which must have existed in the second century (Justin, “Apol.,” I, 35), and must have been used in the pagan schools to warn boys against the belief of the Christians (Euseb., “Hist. Eccl.,” I, ix; I. V.); nor need we inquire into the question whether there ever existed any authentic census tables of Qumran (a. d. 54–119) for the statements that the Founder of the Christian religion, a deadly superstition in the eyes of the Roman, had been put to death by the procurator Pontius Pilate under the reign of Tiberius; that his religion, though suppressed for a time, broke forth again not only throughout Judea where it had originated, but even in Rome, the conflux of all the streams of wickedness and shamelessness; furthermore, that Nero had diverted from himself the suspicion of the burning of Rome by charging the Christians with the crime; that these latter were not guilty of incendiaryism, though they deserved their fate on account of their universal misanthropy. Furthermore, the author, over, describes some of the horrible torments to which Nero subjected the Christians (Ann., XV, xiv). The Roman writer confounds the Christians with the Jews, considering them as an especially abject Jewish sect; how little he investigated the historical truth of even the Jewish records may be inferred from the credulity with which he accepted the absurd legends and calumnies about the origin of the Hebrew people (Hist., V, iii, iv).

Another Roman writer who shows his acquaintance with Christ and the Christians is Suetonius (a. d. 75–160). He has been already noted for the interest he has shown in the Jewish sects (e.g., A.D., XX), and of priest
tended Christ (Chrestus) as a Roman insurgent who stirred up seditions under the reign of Claudius (a. d.


In his life of Nero he appears to regard that emperor as a public benefactor on account of his severe treatment of the Christians: “Multa sub eo et animadversa severe, et coercitam, nec minus instituta . . . afflicti Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae” (Nero, xvi). He consults his imperial majesty as to how to deal with the Christians living within his jurisdiction. On the one hand, their lives were confessedly innocent; no crime could be proved against them excepting their Christian belief, which appeared to the Roman as an extravagant and pernicious superstition. On the other hand, the people could not be shaken in their allegiance to Christ, whom they celebrated as their God in their early morning meetings (Ep., X, 97, 98). Christianity here appears no longer as a religion of criminals, as it does in the texts of Tacitus and Suetonius; Pliny acknowledges the high moral principles of the Christians, admires their constancy in the Faith (pernicia et inflexibilis obstinatio), which he appears to trace back to their worship of Christ (carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere).

The remaining pagan witnesses are of less importance: In the second century Lucian speaks of the Christ and the Christians, as he scoffed at the pagan gods. He alludes to Christ’s death on the Cross, to His miracles, to the mutual love prevailing among the Christians (“Philopseudes,” ns. 13, 16; “De Morte Pereg.”). There are also alleged allusions to Christ in Numenius (Origen, “Contra Cels.,” I, 31), to his parables in Galerius, to the earthquake at the Crucifixion in Phegon (Origen, “Contra Cels.,” II, 14). Before the end of the second century, the λέγεται ὁ Χριστός Celsus, as quoted by Origen (Contra Cels., passim), testifies that at that time the facts related in the Gospels were generally accepted as historically true. However scanty the pagan sources of the life of Christ may be, they bear at least testimony to His existence, to His miracles, His parables, His claim to Divine worship, His death on the Cross, and to the more striking characteristics of His religion.


B. Jewish Sources.—Philo, who died after a. d. 40, is mainly important for the light he throws on certain modes of thought and phraseology found again in some of the Apostles. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., II, iv) indeed preserves a legend that Philo had met St. Peter in Rome during his mission to the Emperor Caius; moreover, that in his work on the contemplative life he describes the life of the Christian Church in Alexandria founded by St. Mark rather than than the Jewish Essenes and Therapeutae. But it is hardly probable that Philo had heard enough of Christ and His followers to give an historical foundation to the foregoing legends.

The earliest non-Christian writer who refers to
Christ is the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus; born A. D. 37, he was a contemporary of the Apostles, and died in Rome A. D. 94. Two passages in his "Antiquities" which confirm two facts of the inspired Christian tradition. In the one he reports the murder of "John called Baptist" by Herod (Ant., XVIII, v, 2), describing also John's character and work; in the other (Ant., XX, ix, 1) he disapproves of the sentence pronounced by the high-priest Ananus against "James, brother of Jesus Who was called Christ." It is an altogether probable thing that Josephus, so well informed as Josephus must have been well acquainted with the doctrine and the history of Jesus Christ. Seeing, also, that he records events of minor importance in the history of the Jews, it would be surprising if he were to keep silence about Jesus Christ. Consideration for the priests and Pharisees did not prevent him from mentioning the judicial murders of John the Baptist and the Apostle James; his endeavour to find the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies in Vespasian did not induce him to pass in silence over several Jewish sects, though their tenets appear to be inconsistent with the truth. It is, therefore, to be expected, therefore, a notice about Jesus Christ in Josephus.

Ant., XVIII, iii, 3, seems to satisfy this expectation: "About this time", it reads, "appeared Jesus, a wise man (if indeed it is right to call Him man; for He was called Messiah and Christ, a title which was given to such men as receive the truth with joy), and He drew to Himself many Jews (and many also of the Greeks. This was the Christ). And when Pilate, at the denunciation of those that are foremost among us, had condemned Him to the cross, those who had first loved Him did not abandon Him. (For He appeared to them alive again on the third day, the holy prophets having foretold this and countless other marvels about Him.) The tribe of Christians named after Him did not cease to this day." A testimony so important as the foregoing could not escape the notice of the critics. Their conclusions may be reduced to three headings: First, there are those who consider the whole passage as spurious. To this class belong: Eichstadt, "Flaviani de Jesus Christo testimoniis addebis", quo jure nuper defensa sit quest. I-VI, 1813-41; "Questionibus sex super Flavianum de Josepho testimonio auctarium I-IV", 1841-45; Lewits, "Questionum Flavianarum specimen", 1835; Reuss in "Nouvelle Revue de Théologie", 1859, 312 sqq.; Gerlach, "Das angebliche Zeugnis von Christo in den Schriften des Fl. Josephus", 1863; Höhne, "Uber das angebliche Zeugniss des Josephus", 1871; Schilling, "Le témoignage des Juifs", 1872; Zig, 1901, 544-49; Farrar, art. "Jesus Christ" in "Encyclopædia Britannica", 9th ed. The principal reasons for this view appear to be the following: Josephus could not represent Jesus Christ as a simple moralist, and on the other hand he could not emphasize the Messianic prophecies and expectations without offending the Roman susceptibilities; again, the above cited passage from Josephus is said to be unknown to Origen and the earlier patristic writers; its very place in the Josephan text is uncertain, since Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., II, vi) must have found it before the notice concerning Pilate, while it now stands after them. But the spuriousness of the disputed Josephan passage does not imply the historian's ignorance of the facts connected with Jesus Christ. Josephus's report of his own juvenile precocity before the Jewish teachers (Vit., 2) reminds one of the story of Christ's stay in the Temple at the age of twelve; the disputed passage, therefore, is at least like Josephus's report of his own life in Rome (Vit., 3) recalls St. Paul's shipwreck as told in the Acts; finally his arbitrary introduction of a deceit practised by the priests of Isis on a Roman lady, after the chapter containing his supposed allusion to Jesus, shows a disposition to explain away the virgin birth of Jesus and to prepare the falsehoods embodied in the later Jewish writings.

A second class of critics do not regard the whole of Josephus's account of this Beginning Christ as spurious, but they maintain the interpolation in parenthesis. To this class belong such scholars as Gieseler, "Kirchengeschichte", I, ii, 81 sqq.; Haeck, "Leben Jesu", n. 9; Ewald, "Geschichte des Volkes Israel", V, 181-86; Paret in Herzog, "Realencyc.", s, 27-29; Wycliffe, "Juden und christliche hebräischen handschriften", III, 2nd ed., 623 sqq.; Müller, "Christi und Josephs Fl.", Innsbruck, 1895; Reinhart, "Josephe sur Jesus in "Revue des Etudes juives", 1897, 1-18; "Revue biblique", 1898, 150-52. The reasons assigned for this opinion may be reduced to the following two: Josephus must have mentioned Jesus, but he cannot have recognized Him as the Christ; hence the present Josephan text must be genuine, part must be interpolated. Again, the same conclusion follows from the fact that Origen knew a Josephan text about Jesus, but was not acquainted with our present reading; for, according to the great Alexandrian doctor, Josephus did not believe that Jesus was the Christ. Then again, the Christ considered by the Romans as the founder of the Christian religion.

The third class of scholars believe that the whole passage concerning Jesus, as it is found to-day in Josephus, is genuine. Among the authors belonging to this class we may mention: Bretschneider, "Capita theologie Judaeorum dogmatica e Flavii Josephi scripta collecta", 1812, 59-66; Böhmer, "Ueber das Flavius Josephus Zeugniss von Christo", 1823; Schönfeld, "Flavius Josephus de Jesu Christo testatus", 1840; Mayaud, "Le témoignage de Josephe", Strasbourg, 1855; Langen in "Tübingner theolog. Quartalschrift", 1865, i; Danko, "Historia revelationis divinae N. T.", I, 1867, 308-14; Daubus, "Pro testimonio Fl. Josephi de Jesu Christo", London, 1706; "Studien und Kritiken", 1856, 840; Kneller, "Fl. Josephus über Jesus Christus" in "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach", 1897, 1-19; "Historia revelationis divinae N. T.", 1874. The main arguments for the genuineness of the Josephan passage are the following: First, all codices or manuscripts of Josephus's work contain the text in question; to maintain the spuriousness of the text, we must suppose that all the copies of Josephus were in the hands of Christians, and were changed in the same way. It is, however, true that neither Tertullian nor St. Justin makes use of Josephus's passage concerning Jesus; but this silence is probably due to the contempt with which the contemporary Jews regarded Josephus, and to the relatively little authority he had among the Roman readers. Writers of the age of Tertullian and Justin could appeal to living witnesses of the Apostolic tradition. Third, Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl.", I, xi; cf. "Dem. Ev.", III, vi), Sozomen (Hist. Eccl., I, i), Niceph. (Hist. Eccl., I, 39), Isidore of Pelusium (Ep. IV, 225), St. Jerome (Catal. script. eccles., xiii), Ambrose, Cassiodorus, etc., appeal to the testimony of Josephus; there must have been no doubt as to its authenticity at the time of these illustrious writers. Fourth, the complete silence of Josephus as to Jesus would have been a more eloquent testimony than we possess in his present text; this latter contains no statement incompatible with its Josephan authorship: the Roman reader needed no information that Jesus was the founder of the Christian religion; the wonderful works of Jesus and His Resurrection from the dead were so incessantly urged by the Christians that without these attributes the Josephan Jesus would hardly have been acknowledged as the founder of Christianity. All this
miraculous power, His claims to be God, His betrayal, His institution of the Holy Eucharist, His passion, crucifixion, burial, resurrection. His repeated appearances (Rom., i, 5, 4; v; xi, 11; vii, 3, 3, 32; ix, 5; xv, 8; Gal., ii, 17; iii, 19; iv, 4; v, 21; I Cor., vi, 9; vi, 10; xi, 28; xv, 39; passim; II Cor., iii, 17; iv, 4, 11; XIII, 12; xii, 4; etc.).

However important the four great Epistles may be, the Gospels are still more so. Not that any one of them offers a complete biography of Jesus, but they account for the origin of Christianity by the life of its Founder. Questions like the authenticity of the Gospels, the relation between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth, the Synoptic problem, must be studied in the articles referring to these respective subjects.

III. CHRONOLOGY.—What has been said proves not merely the existence of Jesus Christ, but also the historicity of the main incidents of His life. In the following paragraphs we shall endeavour to establish their absolute and relative chronology, i.e. we shall show first how certain facts connected with the history of Jesus Christ fit in with the course of universal history, and secondly how the rest of the life of Jesus must be arranged according to the inter-relation of its single elements.

A. Absolute Chronology.—The incidents whose absolute chronology may be determined with more or less probability are the year of Christ's nativity, the beginning of His public life, and of His death. As we cannot fully examine the data entering into these several problems, the reader ought to compare what has been said on these points in the article CHRONOLOGY, BIBLICAL.

(1) The Nativity.—St. Matthew (ii, 1) tells us that Jesus was born "in the days of king Herod." Josephus (Ant., XVII, vii, 4) informs us that Herod died after ruling thirty-four years de facto, thirty-seven years de jure. Now Herod was made rightful King of Judæa a. u. c. 714, while he began his actual rule after taking Jerusalem a. u. c. 717. As the Jews reckoned their years from Nisan to Nisan, and counted fractional parts for entire years, the above data will place the death of Herod in a. u. c. 749, 750, or 751. Again, Josephus tells us that an eclipse of the moon occurred not long before Herod's death; such an eclipse occurred from 12 to 13 March, a. u. c. 750, so that Herod must have died before the Passover of that year which fell on 12 April (Josephus, Ant., XVII, vi, 4; vii, 4). As Herod killed the children of two years old in order to destroy the new-born King of the Jews, we are led to believe that Jesus may have been born a. u. c. 747, 748, or 749. The enrolment under Cyrenius mentioned by St. Luke in connexion with the nativity of Jesus Christ, and the remarkable astronomical conjunction of Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn in Pisces, in the spring of a. u. c. 748, will not lead us to any more definite result.

(2) Beginning of the Public Ministry.—The date of the beginning of Christ's ministry may be calculated from three different data found respectively in Luke, x, 19; xii, 23; Josephus, "Banaides" I, 18; and Mark, iv, 12; vi, 1; and Luke, iii, 1. The first of these passages reads: "And Jesus himself was beginning about the age of thirty years." The phrase "was beginning" does not qualify the following expression "about the age of thirty years," but rather indicates the commencement of the public life. As we have found that the birth of Jesus falls within the period 747-749 a. u. c., His public life must begin about 777-779 a. u. c. Second, when, shortly before the first Pasch of His public life, Jesus had cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, the Jews said: "Six and forty years was this temple in building, and didst thou build it in twenty years, according to the testimony of Josephus (loc. cit.), the building of the Temple began in the fifteenth year of Herod's actual reign or in the eighteenth of his reign de jure, i.e. 732 a. u. c.; hence, adding the forty-six
years of actual building, the Pasch of Christ's first year of public life must have fallen in 778 A. U. C. Third, the Gospel of St. Luke (iii, 1) assigns the beginning of St. John the Baptist's mission to the "fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar Augustus," while the successor of Tiberius, died 19 Aug., 767 A. U. C., so that the fifteenth year of Tiberius' independent reign is 782 A. U. C.; but then Tiberius began to be the associate of Augustus in A. U. C. 784, so that the fifteenth year reckoned from this date falls in A. U. C. 778. Jesus Christ's public life began a few months later, i.e. about A. U. C. 779. (3) The Year of the Death of Christ.—According to the Evangelists, Jesus suffered under the high-priest Caiaphas (A. U. C. 772-90, or A. D. 18-36), during the governorship of Pontius Pilate (A. U. C. 750-90). But this leaves the time rather uncertain. We have already seen that the fifteenth year of Tiberius is either 778 or 782, according to its computation from the beginning of Tiberius' associate or sole reign; the consulship of the Gemini (Fufus and Rubellius) fell in A. U. C. 782; the forty-second year before the destruction of Jerusalem is in A. D. 29, as being twelve years before the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles brings us to the same year, A. D. 29, or A. U. C. 782, since the conversion of Cornelius, which marks the opening of the Gentile missions, fell probably in A. D. 40 or 41. (4) Jesus died on Friday, the fifteenth day of Nisan. That Jesus died on Friday is clearly stated by Mark (xv, 42), Luke (xxiii, 54), and John (xix, 31). The few writers who assign another day for Christ's death are practically lost in the multitude of authorities who place it on Friday. What is more, they do not even agree among themselves: Epiphanius, c. g., places the Crucifixion on Tuesday; Lactantius, on Saturday; Westcott, on Thursday; Cassiodorus and Gregory of Tours, not on Friday. The first three Evangelists are equally clear about the date of the Crucifixion. They place the Last Supper on the fourteenth day of Nisan, as may be seen from Matt., xxvi, 12-17; Mark, 14-17; Luke, xxi, 8-16; John, xiii, 1-27. Nor can there be any doubt about St. John's agreement with the Synoptic Evangelists on the question of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The Supper was held "before the festival day of the pasch" (John, xiii, 1), i. e. on 14 Nisan, since the sacrificial day was computed according to the Roman method (Javino, 123 sqq., 139 sqq.). Again, some disciples thought that Judas left the supper table because Jesus had said to him: "Buy those things which we have need of for the festival day: or that he should give something to the poor" (John, xiii, 29). If the Supper had been held on 13 Nisan, the belief of the disciples could hardly be understood, since Judas might have made his purchases and distributed his alms on 14 Nisan; there would have been no need for his rushing into the city in the middle of the night. On the day of Christ's Crucifixion the Jews "went not into the hall, that they might not be defiled, but that they might eat the pasch" (John, xviii, 28). The pasch which the Jews wished to eat could not have been the paschal lamb, which was eaten on 14 Nisan, for the pollution contracted by entering the hall would have ceased at sundown, so that it would not have prevented them from sharing in the paschal supper. The pasch which Jesus must have been the sacrificial offerings (Chaqighah), which were called also pasch and were eaten on 15 Nisan. Hence this passage places the death of Jesus Christ on the fifteenth day of Nisan. Again, Jesus is said to have suffered and died on the "pasch of the pasch," or simply on the "pasch" (John, xix, 14, 31); as "pasch" meant Friday, the expression "pasch of the pasch" denotes the Friday on which the pasch happened to fall, not the day following it the pasch on which Jesus died is called "a great sabbath day" (John, xix, 31), either to denote its occurrence in the paschal week or to distinguish it from the preceding pasch, or day of minor rest. B. Relative Chronology.—No student of the life of Jesus will question the existence of its principal divisions: infancy, hidden life, public life, passion, glory. But the order of events in the single divisions is not always clear beyond dispute. (1) The Infancy of Jesus.—The history of the infancy, for instance, is recorded only in the First Gospel and it is still the "Tradition of the Evangelists." It is written with five pictures: St. Matthew describes the birth of Jesus, theadoration of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the Holy Innocents, and the return to Nazareth. St. Luke gives a sketch of the birth, of the adoration of the shepherds, of the circumcision, of the purification of the Virgin, and of the return to Nazareth. The two Evangelists agree in the first and the last of these two series of incidents (moreover, all scholars place the birth, the adoration of the shepherds, and the circumcision before the Magi), but how we are to arrange the intervening three events related by St. Matthew with the order given by St. Luke is a matter of a few of the many ways in which the chronological sequence of these facts has been arranged. (a) The birth, the adoration of the shepherds, the circumcision, the adoration of the Magi, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the Innocents, the purification, the return to Nazareth; this implies that either the purification was delayed beyond the fortieth day, which seems to contradict Luke, ii, 22 sqq., or that Jesus was born shortly before Herod's death, so that the Holy Family could return from Egypt within forty days after the birth of Jesus. Tradition does not seem to favour this speedy return. (b) The birth, the adoration of the shepherds, the circumcision, the adoration of the Magi, the purification, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the Innocents, the return to Nazareth. According to this order the Magi either arrived a few days before the purification or they came on 6 Jan., but in neither case can we understand how the Holy Family could have offered the sacrifice of the poor, before receiving the offerings of the Magi. Moreover, the first Evangelist intimates that the angel appeared to St. Joseph soon after the departure of the Magi, and it is not at all probable that Herod should have waited long before informing counsel what the Holy Family should be aking. The difficulties are not overcome by placing the adoration of the Magi on the day before the purification; it would be more unlikely in that case that the Holy Family should offer the sacrifice of the poor. (c) As Luke, ii, 39, appears to exclude the possibility of placing the birth before the presentation and the return to Nazareth, there are interpreters who have located the advent of the wise men, the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the Innocents, and the return from Egypt after the events as told in St. Luke. They agree in the opinion that the Holy Family returned to Nazareth after the purification, and then left Nazareth in order to make their home in Bethlehem. Eusebius, Epiphanius, and some other ancient writers are willing to place the adoration of the Magi about two years after Christ's birth: Paprock and his followers allow about a year and a half between his birth and the advent of the Magi; while Patriarch agrees with them who fix the advent of the Magi at about two weeks after the purification. The text of Matt., ii, 1, 2, hardly permits an interval of more than a year between the purification and the coming of the wise men; Patriarch's opinion
appears to satisfy all the data furnished by the Gospels, while it does not contradict the particulars added by tradition.

(2) The Hidden Life of Jesus.—It was in the seclusion of his youth that Jesus spent the greatest part of His earthly life. The inspired records are very reticent about this period: Luke, ii, 40–52; Mark, vi, 3; John, vii, 15; 12, 15, are about the only passages which refer to the hidden life. Some of them give us a general view of Christ’s life: “The child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was filled with wisdom: the grace of God was with him” (Luke ii, 40) is the brief summary of the years following the return of the Holy Family after the ceremonial purification in the Temple. “Jesus advanced in wisdom, and age, and grace with God and men” (Luke ii, 52), and He was subject to them (John i, 34). In the inspired outline of Christ’s life in Matthew after He had been “about thirty years of age” (Matt. i, 25) when the age of twelve. “When He was twelve years old” Jesus accompanied His parents to Jerusalem, “according to the custom of the feast” (Luke ii, 42). When they returned, the child Jesus remained in Jerusalem; and His parents knew not it. After three days, they found Him in the Temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions. “In the Temple” (John, ii, 19) that occasion Jesus spoke the only words that have come down from the period of His hidden life: “How is it that you sought me? Did you not know that I must be about my father’s business?” The teachers were astonished at His understanding. Theologians have been wont to ask: “How doth this man know letters, having never learned?” The same question is asked by the people of Nazareth, who add, “Is not this the carpenter?” St. Justin is authority for the statement that Jesus specially made “ploughs and yokes” (Contra Tryph., 58). Though it is not certain that at the time of Jesus elementary schools existed in the Jewish villages, it may be inferred from the Gospels that Jesus knew how to read (Luke, iv, 16) and write (John, vii, 5). At an early age He must have learned the so-called Septuagint (Deut., ii, 4), and the Halil, or Ps. cxix–cxlv (Hebr.). He must have been familiar with the other parts of the Scriptures too, especially the Psalms and the Prophetic Books, as He constantly refers to them in His public life.

It is also asserted that Palestine at the time of Jesus Christ was practically bilingual, so that Christ must have spoken Aramaic and Greek; the indications are that He was acquainted with Hebrew and Latin are rather slight. The public teaching of Jesus shows that He was a close observer of the sights and sounds of nature, and of the habits of all classes of men. For these are the usual sources of His illustrations.

To conclude, the hidden life of Jesus extending through thirty years is far different from what one should have expected in the case of a Person Who is adored by His followers as their God and revered as their Saviour; this is an indirect proof for the credibility of the Gospel story.

(3) The Public Life of Jesus.—The chronology of the Gospel is often a number of problems to the interpreter; we shall touch upon only two, the duration of the public life, and the successive journeys it contains.

(a) Duration of the Public Life.—There are two extreme views as to the length of the ministry of Jesus: St. Irenaeus (Contra Haer., II, xxii, 3–4) appears to suggest a period of fifteen years; the prophetic phrases, “the year of recompenses”, and “the year of my redemption” (Is., xxvi, 8; lxxii, 4), appear to have induced Clement of Alexandria, Julius Africanus, Philastrius, Hilariou, and two or three other patristic authorities, to assign that period, viz. one year, to the public life. This latter opinion has found advocates among some recent students: von Soden, for instance, defends it in Cheyne’s “Encyclopedia Biblica”. But the text of the Gospels demands a more extensive duration. St. John’s Gospel distinctly mentions three distinct paschs in the history of Christ’s ministry (ii, 13; vi, 4; xi, 55). The first of these occurs shortly after the baptism of Jesus, the last coincides with His Passion, so that at least two years must have intervened between the two events. It is impossible to assign room for the passover mentioned in vi, 4. Westcott and Hort omit the expression “the passover” in vi, 4, to compress the ministry of Jesus within the space of one year; but all the manuscripts, the versions, and nearly all the Fathers testify for the reading Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἐγκεκριμένος γιατί ἦταν ἐκ τοῦ πρῶτου πάσχαν. The feast day of the Jews, was near at hand.” Thus far therefore everything tends to favour the view of those patristic writers and more recent commentators who extend the period of Christ’s ministry a little over two years.

But a comparison of St. John’s Gospel with the Synoptic Evangelists seems to introduce another passover, indicated in the Fourth Gospel, into Christ’s public life. John, iv, 45, relates the return of Jesus into Galilee after the first passover of His public life spent in Jerusalem, and the same event is told by Mark, i, 14, and Luke, iv, 14. Again, the passover mentioned in John, vi, 4, has its parallel in the “green grass of” Mark, vi, 39, and in the explicit reference to the meal and to the passover in Luke, ix, 12 sqq. But the plucking of ears mentioned in Mark, ii, 23, and Luke, vi, 1, implies another paschal season intervening between those expressly mentioned in John, ii, 12, and vi, 4. This shows that the public life of Jesus must have extended over four paschs, so that it lasted little less than a year and a half a few months. Though the Fourth Gospel does not indicate this fourth passover as clearly as the other three, it is not wholly silent on the question. The “festival day of the Jews” mentioned in John, vi, 1, has been identified with the Feast of Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Expiation, the Feast of the New Moon, the Feast of Purim, the Feast of Dedication, by various commentators; others openly confess that they cannot determine to which of the Jewish feasts this festival day refers. Nearly all difficulties will disappear if the festival day be regarded as the pasch, as both the text (ἐπέρσυ) and John, iv, 36 seem to demand (cf. Dublin Review, XXXIII, 351 sqq.).

(b) Journeys of Jesus during His Public Life.—The journeys Jesus made during His public life may be grouped under nine heads: the first six were mainly performed in Galilee and had Capharnaum for their central point; the last three by Jesus on His return to Galilee, without any pronounced central point. We cannot enter into the disputed questions connected with the single incidents of the various groups.

(i) First Journey.—Dec., a. u. c. 778–Spring, 779. (Cf. John, i, ii; Matt., iii, iv; Mark, i; Luke, iii, iv.) Jesus abandons His hidden life in Nazareth, and goes to Bethania across the Jordan, where He is baptised by John and receives the Baptist’s first testimony to His Divine mission. He then withdraws into the desert of Judea, where He fasts for forty days and is tempted by the devil. After this He dwells in the neighbourhood of the Baptist, and receives the latter’s second and third testimony: here too He wins His first disciples, with whom He journeys to the wedding feast at Cana in Galilee, where He performs His first public miracle. Finally He transfers His residence, so far as there can be question of a residence in His public life, to Capharnaum, one of the principal thoroughfares of commerce and travel in Galilee.

(ii) Second Journey.—Passover, a. u. c. 779–about Pentecost, 780. (Cf. John, i–v; Mark, i–iii; Luke, iv–vii; Matt., iv–ix.) Jesus goes from Capharnaum to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover; here He expels the buyers and sellers from the Temple, and is questioned by the Jewish authorities. Many believed in Jesus, and Nicodemus came to converse with Him during the night. After the festival days He remained in Judea till about the following December, during which period He received the fourth testimony from John.
who was baptizing at Enon (A. V., Eno). When the Baptist had been imprisoned in Machaerus, Jesus immediately went to Galilee, staying by way of Jericho. The Samaritan woman at Jacob's well near Sichar; He delayed two days in this place, and many believed in Him. Soon after His return into Galilee we find Jesus again in Cana, where He heard the prayer of the ruler who pleaded for the recovery of his dying son in Capernaum. The rejection of Jesus by the people of Nazareth, whether at this time as St. Luke intimates, or at a later period, as St. Mark seems to demand, or again both now and about eight months later, is an exegetical problem we cannot solve here. At any rate, shortly afterwards Jesus is most actively engaged in Galilee, in teaching and in restoring among others Peter's mother-in-law and a demoniac. On this occasion He called Peter and Andrew, James and John. Then followed a missionary tour through Galilee during which Jesus cured a leper; soon He again taught in Capernaum, and was surrounded by such a multitude that a man sick of the palsy had to be let down through the roof in order to reach the Sacred Presence. After calling Matthew to the Apostleship, He went to Jerusalem for the second passover occurring during His public life, and it was on this occasion that He healed the man who had been sick for thirty-eight years from the unguent pool at Jerusalem. The charge of violating the Sabbath and Christ's answer were the natural effects of the miracle. The same charge is repeated shortly after the passover; Jesus had returned to Galilee, and the disciples plucked some ripe ears in the corn fields. The question became more acute in the immediate future; Jesus had returned to Capernaum, and there healed on the Sabbath day a man who had a withered hand. The Pharisees now make common cause with the Herodians in order to "destroy him". Jesus withdraws first to the Sea of Galilee, where He teaches and performs numerous miracles. He then retires to the region of the Gerasenes, where He prayer during the night, chooses His Twelve Apostles in the morning, and preaches the Sermon on the Mount. He is brought back to Capernaum by the prayers of the centurion who asks and obtains the cure of his servant.

(iii) Third Journey.—About Pentecost, A. U. C. 780—Autumn, 780. (Cf. Luke, vii, viii; Mark, iii, iv; Matt., iv, viii, ix, xii, xiii.) Jesus makes another missionary tour through Galilee; He resuscitates the son of the widow at Nain, and shortly afterwards receives the messengers sent by John from his prison in Machaerus. Then, with the news of the resuscitation of the dead, He rests at table in Magdala or perhaps in Capernaum; for the rest of His missionary tour Jesus is followed by a band of pious women who minister to the wants of the Apostles. After returning to Capernaum, Jesus expels the mute devil, is charged by the Pharisees with casting out devils by the power of devils, and encounters the remonstrances of His kinsmen. Withdrawing to the sea, He preaches what may be called the "Lake Sermon", consisting of seven parables.

(v) Fifth Journey.—Spring, A. U. C. 781. (Cf. John, vi; Luke, ix; Mark, vi; and Matt., xiv.) Jesus invites the Apostles, tired out from their missionary labours, to come with Him to the wilderness for rest. But, instead of finding the desired solitude, they are met by multitudes of people who had preceded them by land or by boat, and who were eager for instruction. Jesus taught them throughout the day, and towards evening did not wish to dismiss them hungry. On the other hand, there were only five loaves and two fishes at the disposal of Jesus; after His blessing, these scanty supplies satisfied the hunger of five thousand men, besides women and children, and the remnants filled twelve baskets of fragments. Jesus sent the Apostles back to their boats, and escaped across the lake in a boat. Jesus, after appointing Peter the first among the Apostles, went up the mountain where He prayed till far into the night. Meanwhile the Apostles were facing a contrary wind till the fourth watch in the morning, when they saw Jesus walking upon the waters. The Apostles first fear, and then recognize Jesus; Peter walks upon the water as long as his confidence lasts; the storm ceases when Jesus has entered the boat. The next day brings Jesus and His Apostles to Capernaum, where He speaks to the assembly about the Bread of Life and promises the Holy Eucharist, with the result that some of His followers leave Him, while the faith of the multitudes is increased. (Cf. John, vii, viii; Mark, vii, viii; Luke, ix, x; iv, xii, xiii.)

(vi) Sixth Journey.—About May, A. U. C. 781—Sept., 781. (Cf. Lk., ix; Mk., vii, ix; Matt., ix, viii; John, vii.) It may be owing to the enmity stirred up against Jesus by His Eucharistic discourse in Capernaum that He began now a more extensive missionary tour than He had made in the preceding years of His public life. Passing through the country of Genesareth, He expressed His disapproval of the Pharisaic practices of legal purity. Within the borders of Tyre and Sidon He exorcised the daughter of the Syrophoenician woman. From here Jesus travelled first towards the region of the Gerasenes, where He was received with enthusiasm, then he crossed through the northern part of Decapolis, probably along the foot of the Lebanon, till He came to the eastern part of Galilee. While in Decapolis Jesus healed a deaf-mute, employing a ceremonial more elaborate than He had used at any of His previous miracles; in the eastern part of Galilee, probably not far from Dalmanutha and Magedan, He fed four thousand men, besides children and women, with seven loaves and a few little fishes, the remaining fragments filling seven baskets. The multitudes had listened for three days to the teaching of Jesus previously to the miracle. In the course of the many miracles which He worked on this journey, on the blind, the dumb, the lame, the maimed, and on many others, the Pharisees and Sadducees asked Him for a sign from heaven, tempting Him. He promised them the sign of Jonas the Prophet. After Jesus and the Apostles had crossed the lake, He warned them to beware of the Pharisees; they then passed through Bethsaida Julia where Jesus gave sight to a blind man. Next we find Jesus in the confines of Cesarea Philippi, where Peter professes his faith in Christ, the Son of the living God, and in his turn receives from Jesus the promise of the power of the keys. Jesus here predicts His suffering and death, and about a week later is transfigured before Peter, James, and John, probably on the top of Mt. Thabor.
On descending from the mountain, Jesus exorcizes the unclean devil whom His disciples had not been able to expel. Bending his way towards Capharnaum, Jesus predicts His Passion for the second time, and in the company pays the tribute-money for Himself and Peter. This occasioned the discussion as to the greater in the kingdom of heaven, and the allied discourses. Finally, Jesus promises the disciples the grace of the Holy Spirit, to go publicly to the Feast of Tabernacles in Jerusalem.

(vii) Seventh Journey.—Sept., A. u. c. 781-Dec., 781. (Cf. Luke, ix.-xxii; Mark, x.; Matt., vi., vii., viii., x., xi., xii., xxiv.; John, vii.-x.) Jesus now "steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem", and, as the Samaritans refused hospitality, He journeyed to the Jordan. While still in Galilee, He refused the discipleship of several half-hearted candidates, and about the same time He sent out seventy-two disciples, two by two, before His face into every city and place whither He Himself was to come. Probably in the lower part of Peræa, the seventy-two returned with joy, rejoicing in the miraculous power that had been exercised by them. It must have been in the vicinity of Jericho that Jesus answered the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbour?" by the parable of the Good Samaritan. Next Jesus was received in the hospitable house of Simon the Leper at Bethany. Mark records Mary to have chosen the better part. From Bethania Jesus went to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles, where He became involved in discussions with the Jews. The Scribes and Pharisees endeavoured to catch Him in the sentence which they asked Him to pronounce in the case of the woman taken in adultery. When Jesus had avoided this snare, He continued His discussions with the hostile Jews. Their enmity was intensified because Jesus restored sight to a blind man on the Sabbath day. Jesus appears to have ended His stay in Jerusalem with the beautiful discourse concerning the harems of the East, in which He teaches His Apostles the Our Father, probably somewhere on Mt. Olivet. On a subsequent missionary tour through Judea and Peræa He heals the dumb and blind deaf-mutes, defends Himself against the charges of the Pharisees, and reproves their hypocrisy. On the same journey Jesus warned against hypocrisy, covetousness, worldly care; He exhorted to watchfulness, patience under contradictions, and to penance. About this time, too, He healed the woman who had the spirit of infirmity.

(viii) Eighth Journey.—Dec., A. u. c. 781-Feb., 782. (Cf. Mark, vii.-x.; John, x., xi.) The Feast of Dedication brought Jesus again to Jerusalem, and occasioned another discussion with the Jews. This is followed by another missionary tour through Peræa, during which Jesus explained a number of important points of doctrine: the number of the elect, the choice of one's place at table, the guests to be invited, the parable of the great supper of resoluteness in the service of God, the parables of the hundred sheep, the lost goat, and the prodigal son, of the unjust steward, of Dives and Lazarus, of the unmerciful servant, besides the duty of fraternal correction, and the efficacy of faith. During this period, too, the Pharisees attempted to frighten Jesus with the menace of Herod's persecution; on His part, Jesus healed a man who had the dropsey, on a Sabbath day, while at table in the house of a certain prince of the Pharisees. Finally, Mary and Martha send messengers to Jesus, asking Him to come and cure their brother Lazarus; Jesus went after two days, and Mary and Martha were sorry when several were laid in the grave. The Jews are exasperated over this miracle, and they decree that Jesus must die for the people. Hence He withdrew "into a country near the desert, unto a city that is called Ephraim".

(ix) Ninth Journey.—Feb., A. u. c. 782-Passover, 782. (Cf. Mark, x. xvi.; John, xi., xii.) This last journey took Jesus from Ephraim northward through Samaria, then eastward along the border of Galilee into Peræa, then southward through Peræa, westward across the Jordan, through Jericho, Bethania on Mt. Olivet, Bethphage, and finally to Jerusalem. While in the most northern part of the journey, He cured ten lepers; a little later, He answered the questions raised by the Pharisees concerning the kingdom of God. Then He gave seven prayers for the propitious of the unjust judge; here too belong the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, the discourse on marriage, on the attitude of the Church towards children, on the right use of riches as illustrated by the story of the rich young ruler, and the parable of the labourers in the vineyard. After the visit to Jerusalem, He predicted His Passion for the third time; James and John betray their ambition, but they are taught the true standard of greatness in the Church. At Jericho Jesus heals two blind men, and receives the repentance of Zacchæus the publican; here He proposed also the parable of the pounds entrusted to the servants by their master. Six days before the passch we find Jesus at Bethania on Mt. Olivet, as the guest of Simon the leper; Mary anoints His feet, and the disciples at the instigation of Judas are indignant at this seeming waste of ointment. A great multitude of people is at the feast, the Pharisees wish to know if Lazarus too. On the following day Jesus solemnly entered Jerusalem and was received by the Hosanna cries of all classes of people. In the afternoon He met a delegation of Gentiles in the court of the Temple. On Monday Jesus curses the barren fig tree, and during the morning He drives the buyers and sellers from the Temple. On Tuesday the wonder of the disciples at the sudden withering of the fig tree provokes their Master's instruction on the efficacy of faith; Jesus answers the enemies' question as to His authority; He teaches the Pharisees the parable of the wicked husbandmen, and of the marriage feast. Next follows a triple snare: the politicians ask whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar; the scoffers inquire whose wife a woman, who has had several lawful husbands, will be after the resurrection; the Jewish theologians propose the question: Which is the first commandment, the great commandment in the law? Then Jesus proposes His last question to the Jews: "What think you of Christ? whose son is he?" This is followed by the eightfold wo against the Scribes and Pharisees, and by the denunciation of Jerusalem. Jesus ends these last words of Christ with expressions of praise for the poor widow who had made an offering of two mites in spite of her poverty. Jesus ended this day by uttering the prophecies concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, His second coming, and the future judgment; these predictions are interrupted by the parable of the ten virgins, and of the talents. On Wednesday Jesus again predicted His Passion; probably it was on the same day that Judas made his final agreement with the Jews to betray Jesus.

(4) The Passion of Jesus. The history of Christ's Passion comprises three parts: the preparation for the Passion, the trial of Jesus, and His death.

(a) Preparation for the Passion.—Jesus prepares His disciples for the Passion, He prepares Himself for the ordeal, and His enemies prepare themselves for the destruction of Jesus.

(b) Preparation of the Apostles.—Jesus prepares His Apostles for the Passion by the eating of the paschal lamb, the institution of the Holy Eucharist, the concomitant ceremonies, and His lengthy discourses held during and after the Last Supper. Special mention should be made of the prediction of the Passion, and of the betrayal by one of the Apostles, the denial by Peter, James, and John; they are prepared in a more particular manner by witnessing the sorrow of Jesus on Mt. Olivet.
(ii) Preparation of Jesus.—Jesus must have found an indirect preparation for His Passion in all He did and said to strengthen His Apostles. But the preparation that was peculiarly His own consisted in His parable in the garden of Gethsemane, where the angel came to strengthen Him. The sleep of His favoured Apostles during the hours of His bitter struggle must have prepared Him too for the complete abandonment He was soon to experience.

(iii) Preparation of the Enemies.—Judas leaves the Master during the Last Supper. The chief priests and Pharisees hastily collect a detachment of the Roman cohort stationed in the castle of Antonia, of the Jewish temple-watch, and of the officials of the Temple. To these are added a number of the servants and dependants of the high-priest, and a miscellaneous multitude of followers with lances and torches, with swy frothing clubs, who were to follow the leadership of Judas. They took Christ, bound Him, and led Him to the high-priest's house.

(b) Trial of Jesus.—Jesus was tried first before an ecclesiastical court, and then before a civil tribunal.

(i) Before the Ecclesiastical Court.—The ecclesiastical trial includes Christ's appearance before Annas, before Caiphas, and again before Caiphas, who appears to have acted in each case as head of the Sanhedrin. The Jewish court found Jesus guilty of blasphemy, and condemned Him to death, though its proceedings are reported in only one source, Matthew's view. During the trial took place Peter's triple denial of Jesus; Jesus is insulted and mocked, especially between the second and third session; and after His final condemnation Judas despaired and met his tragic death.

(ii) Before the Civil Court.—The civil trial, too, comprised three sessions, the first before Pilate, the second before Herod, and the third again before Pilate. Jesus is not charged with blasphemy before the court of Pilate, but with stirring up the people, forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and claiming to be Christ the king. Pilate ignores the first two charges; the third he finds harmless when he sees that Jesus does not claim royalty in the Roman sense of the word. But in order not to incur the odium of the Jewish leaders, the Roman governor sends his prisoner to Herod. As Jesus did not humour the curiosity of Herod, He was mocked and set at naught by the Tetrarch of Galilee and then sent back to Pilate. The Roman procurator declares the prisoner innocent for the second time, but, instead of setting Him free, gives the people the alternative to choose either Jesus or Barabbas for their paschal freedom. Pilate pronounced Jesus innocent for the third time with the more solemn ceremony of washing his hands, as he had recourse to a third scheme of ridding himself of the burden of pronouncing an unjust sentence against his prisoner. He had the prisoner scourged, thus annihilating, as far as human means could do so, any hope that Jesus could ever attain to the royal dignity. But even this device miscarried, and Pilate allowed his political ambition to prevail over his sense of evident justice; he condemned Jesus to be crucified.

(c) Death of Jesus.—Jesus carried His Cross to the place of execution. Simon of Cyrene is forced to assist Him in bearing the heavy burden. On the way Jesus addresses His last words to the weeping women who sympathized with His suffering. He is nailed to the Cross, His garments are divided, and an inscription is placed over His head. While His enemies mock Him, He pronounces the well-known "Seven Words". Of the two robbers crucified with Jesus, one was converted at the other's cross. The sun was darkened, and Jesus surrendered His soul into the hands of His Father. The veil of the Temple was rent in two, the earth quaked, the rocks were riven, and many bodies of the saints that slept arose and appeared to many. The Roman centurion testified that Jesus was indeed the Son of God. The Heart of Jesus was pierced so as to make sure of His death. The Sacred Body was taken from the Cross by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, and was buried in the new sepulchre the Sabbath day prepared for Jesus. But Jesus rose early the first day of the week, and there was a great earthquake, and an angel descended from heaven, and rolled back the stone. The guards were struck with terror, and became as dead men. On arriving at the sepulchre the Holy Women were told by an angel that the Lord had risen from the dead. Peter and John hasten to the sepulchre, and find everything as Magdalen has reported. Magdalen too returns, and, while weeping at the sepulchre, is approached by the risen Saviour Who appears to her and speaks with her. On the same day Jesus appeared to the other Holy Women, to Peter, to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and to all the Apostles excepting Thomas. A week later He appeared to all the Apostles, Thomas included; later still He appeared to Lea and many others. Now Jesus ascended on a mountain in Galilee to a multitude of disciples, to James, and finally to His disciples on Mount Olivet whence He ascended into heaven. But these apparitions do not exhaust the record of the Gospels, according to which Jesus showed Himself alive after His Passion by many proofs, for forty days appearing to the disciples and speaking of the kingdom of God.

IV. THE CHARACTER OF JESUS.—The surpassing eminence of the character of Jesus has been acknowledged by men of the most varied type: Kant testifies to His ideal perfection; Hegel sees in Him the union of the human and the Divine; the most advanced sceptics do Him homage; Spinoza speaks of Him as the truest symbol of heavenly wisdom; the beauty and grandeur of His life overawed Voltaire; Napoleon I. at St. Helena, felt convinced that "Between him [Jesus] and whoever else in the world there is no possible comparison". The Roman saying "Récit de la Captivité de l'Empereur Napoléon"), Roussel testifies: "If the life and death of Socrates are those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a god." Strauss acknowledges: "He is the highest object we can possibly imagine with respect to religion, the best being we had recourse to if rectitude is impossible." To Renan "The Christ of the Gospels is the most beautiful incarnation of God in the most beautiful of forms. His beauty is eternal; his reign will never end." John Stuart Mill spoke of Jesus as a man charged with a special, express, and unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue. Not that the views of the foregoing witnesses are of any great importance for the theological student of the life of Jesus; but they show at least the impression made on the most different classes of men by the history of Christ. In the following paragraphs we shall consider the character of Jesus as manifested first in His relation to men, then in His relation to God.

A. Jesus in His Relation to Men.—In His relation to men Jesus manifested certain qualities which were perceived by all, being subject to the light of reason, of love, of truth, of justice, of mercy, of righteousness, of piety. He was the world's Saviour, the light of the world, the way, the truth, the life. He healed the sick, comforted the sorrowful, consoled the afflicted, strengthened the feeble, and comforted the broken-in-heart. He was the One in whom all the promises of God were fulfilled. He was the One who wrought miracles. He was indeed the Son of God. The Heart of Jesus was pierced so as to make sure of His death. The Sacred Body was taken from the Cross by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, and was buried in the new sepulchre the Sabbath day prepared for Jesus. But Jesus rose early the first day of the week, and there was a great earthquake, and an angel descended from heaven, and rolled back the stone. The guards were struck with terror, and became as dead men. On arriving at the sepulchre the Holy Women were told by an angel that the Lord had risen from the dead. Peter and John hasten to the sepulchre, and find everything as Magdalen has reported. Magdalen too returns, and, while weeping at the sepulchre, is approached by the risen Saviour Who appears to her and speaks with her. On the same day Jesus appeared to the other Holy Women, to Peter, to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, and to all the Apostles excepting Thomas. A week later He appeared to all the Apostles, Thomas included; later still He appeared to Lea and many others. Now Jesus ascended on a mountain in Galilee to a multitude of disciples, to James, and finally to His disciples on Mount Olivet whence He ascended into heaven. But these apparitions do not exhaust the record of the Gospels, according to which Jesus showed Himself alive after His Passion by many proofs, for forty days appearing to the disciples and speaking of the kingdom of God.
the conduct of Jesus is so many-sided that His character seems to elude all description. Command and sympathy, power and charm, authority and affection, cheerfulness and gravity, are somehow in the life of Jesus fronting each other in a manner that parallels the life of no other man. The make-up of the Gospels does not facilitate the work. At first they appear to us a bewildering forest of dogmatic statements and moral principles; there is no system, no method, everything is occasional, everything fragmentary. The Gospels are neither a manual of dogma nor a treatise on casuistry, they are the fountain of both. No wonder then that various investigators have arrived at entirely different conclusions in their study of Jesus. Some call Him a fanatic, others make Him a socialist, others again an anarchist, while many call Him a dreamer, a mystic, an Essene. But in this variety there are two things which the teachers of Jesus may be summarized: Some consider Jesus an ascetic, others an aesthete; some emphasize His suffering, others His joyfulness; some identify Him with ecclesiasticism, others with humanism; some recognize in Him the prophetic picture of the Old Testament and the monastic of the New, others see in Him only gladness and poetry. There may be solid ground for both views; but they do not exhaust the character of Jesus. Both are only by-products which really existed in Jesus, but were not primarily intended; they were only enjoyed and suffered in passive resignation to gain an end wholly different from either joy or sorrow.

(a) Strength.—Considering the life of Jesus in the light of reason, His strength, His poise, and His grace are His most characteristic qualities. His strength shows itself in His manner of life, His decision, His authority. In His rugged body, His precise, homeless life there is no room for weakness or sentimentality. Indecision is rejected by Jesus on several occasions: "No man can serve two masters"; "He that is not with me, is against me"; "Seek first the kingdom of God", these are some of the statements expressing Christ's attitude to indecision of will. Of Himself He said: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me"; "I seek not my own will, but the will of him that sent me." The authority of the Master does not allow its power to be questioned; He calls to men in their boats, in their tax-booths, in their homes, "Follow me", and they look on His face and obey. Matthew tells how: "The multitude . . . glorified God that gave such power to men"; St. Mark adds, "the kingdom of God comes in power"; St. Luke says, "His speech was with power"; St. John writes, "Thou hast given him power over all flesh"; the Book of the Acts reads, "God anointed him with power"; St. Paul too is credited with "the power of God and the Holy Ghost". In His teaching Jesus does not argue, or prove, or threaten, like the Pharisees, but He speaks like one having authority. Nowhere is Jesus merely a long-faced ascetic or a joyous comrade, we find Him everywhere to be a leader of men, whose principles are built on a rock.

(b) Poise.—It may be said that the strength of Christ's character gives rise to another quality which we may call poise. Reason is like the sails of the boat, the will is its rudder, and the feelings are the waves thrown upon either side of the ship as it passes through the waters. The will-power of Jesus is strong enough to keep a perfect equilibrium between His feelings and His reason; His body is the perfect instrument in the performance of His duty; His emotions are wholly subservient to the Will of His Father; it is the call of complying with His higher duties that prevents His anger from being expressed. There is therefore a perfect balance or equilibrium in Jesus between the life of His body, of His mind, and of His emotions. His character is so rounded off that, at first sight, there remains nothing which could make it characteristic. This poise in the character of Jesus produces a simplicity which pervades every one of His actions. As the old Roman roads led straight ahead in spite of mountains and valleys, ascents and declivities, so does Jesus in the life of Jesus fronting the tumult of man's life with the call of duty, in spite of pleasure or pain, honour or ignominy. Another trait in Jesus which may be considered as flowing from the poise of His character is His unalterable peace, a peace which may be ruffled and cannot be destroyed either by His inward feelings or outward encounters. And the personal qualities in Jesus are reflected in His teaching. He establishes an equilibrium between the righteousness of the Old Testament and the justice of the New, between the love and life of the former and those of the latter. He lops off indeed the Pharisaic conventionalism and externalism, but they were merely degenerations of the former outgrowths; He underlines that it embraces the whole Law and the Prophets; He promises life, but it consists not so much in our possession as in our capacity to use our possession. Nor can it be urged that the poise of Christ's teaching is destroyed by His three paradoxes of self-sacrifice, of service, and of self-love. The law of biological organisms, of physiological tissues, of intellectual achievements, and of economic processes shows that self-sacrifice is self-realization in the end. The second paradox is that of service: Whosoever shall be greater among you, let him be as the lesser, and he that shall be the greater among you, let him be as the servant. But in the industrial and artistic world, too, the greatest men are those who have done most service. Thirdly, the idealism of Jesus is expressed in such words as "The life is more than the flesh" and "Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." But even our realistic age must grant that the reality of the law is its ideals, and again, that the world of the idealist is impossible only for the weak, while the strong character creates the world after which he strives. The character of Jesus therefore is the embodiment of both strength and poise. It thus verifies the definition given by such an involved writer as Emerson: "Character is centrality, the impossibility of being displaced or upset. . . . The natural measure of this power is the resistance of circumstances."

(c) Grace.—But if there were not a third essential element entering into the character of Jesus, it might not be attractive after all. Even saints are at times bad neighbours; we may like them, but sometimes we like them only at a distance. The character of Christ carries with it the trait of grace, doing away with all harshness and want of sympathy. Grace is the unconstrained expression of the self-forgetting and kindly mind. It is a beautiful way of doing the right thing, in the right way, at the right time, and therefore opens all hearts to its possessor. Sympathy is the widest channel through which grace flows, and the abundance of the stream testifies to the reserve of grace. Now Jesus sympathizes with all classes, with the rich and the poor, the learned and the ignorant, the happy and the sad; He moves with the same sense of familiarity among all classes of society. For the self-righteous Pharisees He has only the words, "Woe to you, hypocrites!" He warns His disciples, "Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Plato and Aristotle are utterly unlike Jesus; they may speak of natural virtue, but we never find children in their arms. Jesus treats the publicans as His friends; He encourages the most tentative beginnings of moral growth. HeChoose these common fishermen for the corner-stones of His kingdom, and by His kindliness trains them to become the light of the world and the salt of the earth; He bends down to St. Peter whose character was a heap of sand rather than a solid foundation, but He graciously
forms Peter into the rock upon which to build His Church. After two of the Apostles had fallen, Jesus was gracious to both, though He saved only one, while the other destroyed himself. Women in need are not excluded from the general grace, and He welcomes them. He receives the homage of the sinful woman, He restores the son of the widow at Naim, He consoles the sorrowing sisters Martha and Mary, He cures the mother-in-law of St. Peter and restores the health of numerous other women. He accepts the ministry of the holy women of Galilee. He has words of sympathy for the women of Jerusalem who grudged His suffering. He was subject to His mother till He reached man's estate, and when dying on the Cross commended her to the care of His beloved disciple. The grace of the Master is also evident in the form of His teaching: He lays under contribution the simple phases of nature, the hen with her chickens, the gnat in the cup, the camel in the narrow street, the fig tree and its fruit, the fishermen sorting their catch. He meets with the lightest touch, approaching sometimes the play of humour and sometimes the thrust of irony, the simple doubts of His disciples, the selfish questions of His hearers, the subtle arguments of His opponents, and He feels no need of thrust in His doctrine: He lavishes His teaching and His benefits on the few as abundantly as on the vastest multitudes. He flings out His parables into the world that those who have ears may hear. There is a prodigality in this manifestation of Christ's charity that can only be equaled, by the waste of seed in the realm of nature. (2) In the Light of Faith. — In the light of faith the life of Jesus is an uninterrupted series of acts of love for man. It was love that impelled the Son of God to take on human nature, though He did so with the full consent of His Father: "For God so loved the world, as to give His only begotten Son" (John, iii, 16). For thirty years Jesus shows His love by a life of poverty, labour, and hardship in the fulfillment of the duties of a common tradesman. When His public ministry began, He spent Himself for the good of His neighbours, "doing good, and healing all that were oppressed by the devil" (Acts, x, 38). He shows a boundless compassion for all the infirmities of the body; He uses His miraculous power to heal the sick, to free the possessed, to resuscitate the dead. The moral weaknesses of man move His heart still more effectively; the publican, Mary Magdalen the public sinner, Zaccheus the tax administrator, are only a few instances of sinners who received encouragement from the lips of Jesus. He is ready with forgiveness for all; the parable of the Prodigal Son illustrates His love for the sinner. In His work of teaching He is at the service of the poorest outcast of Galilee as well as of the theological celebrities of Jerusalem. His bitterest enemies are not excluded from the manifestations of His love; even while He is being crucified He prays for their pardon. The Scribes and Pharisees are treated severely, only because they stand in the way of His love. "Come to Me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you" (Matt., xi, 28) is the message of His heart to poor suffering humanity. After laying down the rule, "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John, xxi, 13), He surpasses as it were His own standard by dying for His enemies. Filling up the unconscious prophecy of the godless high-priest, "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people" (John, xvi, 50), He freely meets His sufferings which He could have easily avoided (Matt., xxvi, 53), takes up the huge iniquity and ignominies, passes through the most severe bodily pains, and sheds His blood for the remission of sins" (Matt., xxvi, 28). But the love of Jesus embraced not only the spiritual welfare of men, it extended also to their temporal happiness: "Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God, and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt., vi, 33).

B. Jesus in His Relation to God.—Prescinding from the theological discussions which are usually treated in the chapters on Jesus' Divinity, we may consider the relations of Jesus to God under the headings of His sanctity and His Divinity.

(1) Sanctity of Jesus. — From a negative point of view, the sanctity of Jesus consists in His unsullied sinlessness. He can defy His enemies by asking, "Which of you shall convince me of sin?" (John, vii, 18). Even the evil spirit is forced to acknowledge Him as the Holy One of God (Mark, i, 24; Luke, iv, 34). His enemies charge Him with being a Samaritan, and having a devil (John, viii, 48), with being a sinner (John, ix, 24), a blasphemer (Matt., xxvi, 65), a violator of the Sabbath (John, ix, 16), a malefactor (John, xviii, 30), a disturber of the peace (Luke, xxii, 5), a seducer (Matt., xxvii, 63). But Pilate finds and declares Jesus innocent, and, when pressed by the enemies of Jesus to condemn Him, He washes his hands and excludes before the assembled people, "I am innocent of the blood of this just man" (Matt., xxvii, 24). The Jewish authorities practically admit that they cannot prove any wrong against Jesus; they only insist, "We have a law; and according to the law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God" (John, xix, 7). The final charge urged against Christ by His bitterest enemies was His claim to be the Son of God, symbolized by the cross.

The positive side of the sanctity of Jesus is well attested by His constant zeal in the service of God. At the age of twelve He asks His mother, "Did you not know, that I must be about my father's business?" He urges on His hearers the true adoration in spirit and in truth (John, iv, 23) remanded His Father's cause. Repeatedly He declares His entire dependence on His Father (John, v, 30, 36, etc.); He is faithful to the Will of His Father (John, viii, 29); He tells His disciples, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me" (John, iv, 34). Even the hardest sacrifices do not prevent Jesus from complying with His Father's Will. "My Father, if this chalice may not pass away, but I must drink it, they will be done" (Matt., xxvi, 42). Jesus honours His Father (John, viii, 49), is consumed with zeal for the house of His Father (John, ii, 17), and proclaims at the end of His life, "I have glorified thee on the earth, and lo, I come to My Father, and Greet Him in glory" (John, xiv, 33). He returns to His Father (Mark, i, 35; vi, 46, etc.), and teaches His Apostles the Our Father (Matt., vi, 9). He always thanks His Father for His bounties (Matt., xi, 25, etc.), and in brief behaves throughout as only a loving son can behave towards his beloved father. During His Passion one of His most intense sorrows was his feeling of abandonment by His Father (Mark, xv, 34), and at the point of death He joyfully surrenders His Soul into the hands of His Father (Luke, xxiii, 46).

(2) Divinity of Jesus. — The Divinity of Jesus is proved by some writers by an appeal to prophecy and miracles. But, though the earlier prophecies of the Old Testament to the letter, He Himself appears to appeal to them mainly in proof of His Divine mission; He shows the Jews that He fulfils in His Person and His work all that had been foretold of the Messiah. The prophecies uttered by Jesus Himself differ from the predictions of the Old Testament in that Jesus does not speak in the name of the Lord, like the seers of old, but in His own name. If it could be distinctly proved that they were made in virtue of His own knowledge of the future, and of His own power to dispose of the current of events, the prophecies would prove His Divinity; as it is they prove at least that Jesus is a messenger of the God inspired by God. This is not the place to discuss the historical and philosophical truth of the miracles of Jesus, but we know that Jesus appeals to His works as bearing witness to the general truth of His mission (John, x, 27).
of the Father and the Divinity of the Son will be reduced to a figure of speech. (See Theology, sub-title Christology.)

The reader will find a great many works referring to this subject among the commentaries on the Gospels mentioned in the articles Matthew, Gospel of Saint; Mark, Gospel of Saint; Luke, Gospel of Saint; and John, Gospel of Saint; and also in the articles so far belonging to the theological works on the Incarnation which will be found under Incarnation. We mention some of the principal works on the life of Jesus Christ: London or London: Vita Christi, or Sanctissimita S. Iesus Chrysti (1544); De Incarnatione Christi (Paris, 1530); Sive Deo, Deo sancto, sanctissimo (Ratisbon, 1840); VIEILLOT, Vie de N. S. Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1865); COBO, Deo sancto, sanctissimo (Paris, 1840); Histoire de N. S. Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1870); SCHROB, Sich verbesserter Lebens Jesu (Freiburg im Br. 1874); SIMMEL, Das Leben Jesu nach den vier Evangelien (Berlin, 1894); La vie de N. S. Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1880), tr. GRUPPE (New York and London, 1891); De Colloque, Le Christ (Paris, 1898), tr. Hickey (New York, 1906); DODON, Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1891), English translation, ed. O'REILLY (New York, 1895); MAAS, The Life of Christ According to Gospel History (4th ed., St. Louis, 1891); LIEBEN, N. S. Jesus-Christus son soul Beginners' (Paris, 1892); MAAS, Christ in Type and Prophecy (New York, 1900); PEETERS, Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1899); FORNARI, Della vita di Gesù Cristo (Rome, 1901). Among Protestant works may be noted: LANDE, Life of Jesus Christ (Edinburgh, 1854); GREER, The Life and Times of Jesus the Christ (London, 1888); GEDDES, The Life and Times of Jesus the Christ (New York, 1870); HUBER, Jesus der Mensch (Basel, 1878); ZELLER, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (London, 1883). Many more recent Protestant works have been published, and the stories of them are so infected by criticism or even by rationalism that they deny the historical existence of Jesus, or impeach the divinity of His Humanity, or minimize His Divinity, while nearly all seem to be in doubt about His Divinity.

A. J. MAAS.

Jesus Mary, Religious of.—The Congregation of the Religious of Jesus Mary was founded at Lyons, France, in October, 1818, by Claudine Thevenet, in religion, Mother St. Ignatius. The constitutions were approved by Pius IX, 31 December, 1847. The object of this congregation is to give to young ladies a Christian education conformable to their social position; for this purpose the religious have boarding-schools and academies, and, in large cities, residences for ladies of the literary profession. Their establishments of various kinds are numerous: in France, before the expulsion of 1901, they were at Lyons, the birthplace of the congregation, at Le Puy, Rodes, and Remiremont. Owing to the religious persecution, the mother-house was transferred to Rome in September, 1901. Besides the mother-house on the Via Flaminia, the religious have opened a college for sisters at Rome and a few houses for young ladies the means of culture which a residence in Rome and the study of the fine arts, modern languages, European literature, and history afford. The Stella Viva is situated on the Via Nomentana, near the Porta Pia. In 1842 Lyons sent a colony to India, where twelve houses now exist. The most important of these are at Bombay, Poona, Lahore, Simla, and Agra. In 1850 the first house in Spain was founded at Tarragona; then followed other foundations, Valencia, Barcelona, Orihuela, S. Gervas, Alicante, and Murcia. In 1902 Spain sent a convent to Mexico, and two houses in the city of Mexico and at Mérida, Yucatan.

The first house of the congregation in America was founded at St. Joseph, Levis, Canada, in 1858. In 1876 Sillery (Quebec) became the provincial house of America. Canada has four other houses, at St-Cergais, St-Michel, Trois-Ponts, and Beaupréville. In 1876 several sisters left Sillery to open houses in the United States. The first foundation was at Fall River, Mass., where the sisters now conduct a boarding-school and a parochial school attended by twelve hundred children. The house at Rochester, N. Y., had about one hundred fifty boarders, then, at Woonsocket, R. I., a boarding-school and two parochial schools, attended by fourteen hundred children. At Providence, R. I., the religious have a convent and two parochial schools. In 1902 several
nuns left the mother-house in Rome, to found an establishment in New York. The religious of Jesus Mary now possess a house on Fourteenth Street and an academy at Kingsbridge. They also have the supervision of a day-school for poor Italian children. The establishment on Fourteenth Street, called "Our Lady Peace", is a residence for ladies in the literary profession.

**Mother Ste Eugénie.**

**Jews and Judaism (יהודים, יועדים; Ioudaei, Iudaici).—** Of these two terms, the former denotes usually the inhabitants of Jews in Jerusalem in ancient times; the latter, the creed and worship of the Jews in contrast to Christianity, Mohammedanism, etc. The subject will be treated under the following heads: I. History of the Jews since the return from the Babylonian Exile, from which time the Israelites received the name of Jews (for their earlier history, see Israelites); II. Judaism as a religious communion with its special system of faith, rites, customs, etc.

I. **History of the Jews.**—This history may be divided into various periods in accordance with the leading event may be distinguished in the existence of the Jewish race since the Return in 538 B.C.

(1) **Persian Suzerainty (538-353 B.C.).—** In Oct., 538 B.C., Babylon opened its gates to the Persian army, and a few weeks later the great conqueror of Babylon, Cyrus, made his triumphal entry into the fallen city. One of the first official acts of the new ruler in Babylon was to give the exiled Jews full liberty to return to Judah (see I Esdras, i). The substance of Cyrus's decree in their favour is in striking harmony with other known decrees of that monarch, with his general policy of tolerance and?尾巴切味?wards the conquered races of his empire, and with his natural desire to have on the Egyptian border a community as large as possible, bound to Persia by the strongest ties of gratitude. A comparatively large number of Jewish exiles (50,000 according to I Esdras, ii, 64, 65), availed themselves of Cyrus's permission. Their official leader was Zoroabel, a descendant of the royal family of Juda, whom the Persian monarch had invested with the governorship of the sub-province of Judah, and entrusted with the precious vessels which had belonged to Yahweh's House. There appears to be by his side the priest "Jesuo, the son of Josedeo", probably as the religious and civil head of the returning community. The returned exiles, who mostly belonged to the tribes of Benjamin and Judah, settled chiefly in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. They at once organized a council of twelve elders, and this council, which was naturally presided over by Zoroabel, controlled and guided the internal affairs of the community, under the suzerainty of Persia. Without delay, too, they set up a new altar, and had it ready to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in 537 B.C. Henceforth, the ritual system was religiously carried out. The foundation of the second Temple was laid in the second month of the second year after the Return, but no further headway was made for fifteen or sixteen years, owing to the active interference and positive misrepresentations to the Persian kings by the Samaritans to whom the Jews had denied a share in the work of rebuilding the House of the Lord. Meantime, the Jews themselves lost much of their possession of Laconia (Mt. 320 B.C., it was seized by the Egyptian Ptolemy I (323-285 B.C.), who, on a Sabbath-day took Jerusalem, and carried away many Samaritans and Jews into Egypt. A few years later (315 B.C.), it fell into the power of Syria; but after the battle of Ipsus in Phrygia (301 B.C.), interest in the reconstruction of the Temple; and it is only in 520 B.C. that the Prophets Aggæus and Zacharias succeeded in rousing them from their supineness. Pecuniary help came too from the Jewish community in Babylon, and also, a little later, from the Persian king. This unexampled event might seem to have occurred as a moral sign and the Temple was solemnly dedicated. The Jewish leaders next started on the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, and here again met with the hostility of the Samaritans, whose complaints at the Court of Persia were most successful under Artaxerxes I "Longimanus" (464-424 B.C.), who issued orders strictly forbidding the Jews to proceed with the work.

The special mission of Esdras and Nehemiah in behalf of the struggling Palestinian community, strenuous efforts to lift up its moral and religious tone need not to be dwelt upon here (see Esdras; Nehemiah). Suffice it to say, that to whatever precise time their labours should be assigned (see Captivity), the scribe Esdras and the satrap Nehemiah left their permanent impress on the spiritual life of the Jews. After the death, which probably occurred not long before the end of the Persian rule over Judah in 333 B.C., little is distinctly known of the history of the Palestinian Jews. It seems, however, that under the satraps of Cœle-Syria, the action of the high-priest had a very considerable influence upon their religious and civil matters alike (cfr. Josephus, "Antiq. of the Jews", XI, vii.), and that their community enjoyed a steadily increasing prosperity, hardly marred by the deportations of a certain number of Jews to distant regions like Hyrcania, which probably occurred under Artaxerxes III (359-338 B.C.). During this period, the Jews who had preferred to stay in Babylonia remained constantly in touch with the returned exiles, sending them, at times, material help, and formed a flourishing community deeply attached to the faith and to the traditions of their race. Within the same period falls the formation of the Jewish colony at Elephantine (Upper Egypt), which was for a while supplied with a temple of its own, and the faithfulness of which to Persia is witnessed by Judeo-Aramean papyri recently discovered. Lastly, the institutions of Judaism which seem to have more particularly developed during the Persian domination among the Pharisees, with their educational and religious features, and the Scribes with their peculiar skill in the Law.

(2) **Greek Period (333-168 B.C.).**—A new period in the history of the Jews opens with the defeat of Darius III (335-330 B.C.) by Alexander the Great at Issus, in Cilicia. This victory of the young conqueror of Persia undoubtedly brought the Palestinian Jews into direct contact with Greek civilization, whatever may be thought of the exact historical value of what Josephus relates (Antiq. of the Jews, XI, viii., 3-5) concerning Alexander's personal visit to Jerusalem. Alexander allowed them the free enjoyment of their religious and civil rights and of those of them who went to war with him against Egypt and settled in Alexandria, a city of his foundation, by granting them equal civic rights with the Macedonians. Again, when the Samaritans rebelled against him, he added a part of Samaria to Judaea (331 B.C.). After Alexander's untimely death (323 B.C.), the different Greek cities had an ample share of the troubles which arose out of the partition of his vast empire among his captains. Placed between Syria and Egypt, it became the bone of contention between their respective rulers. At first, as a part of Cœle-Syria, it passed naturally into the possession of Laconia. But as early as 320 B.C., it was seized by the Egyptian Ptolemy I (323-285 B.C.) who, on a Sabbath-day took Jerusalem, and carried away many Samaritans and Jews into Egypt. A few years later (315 B.C.), it fell into the power of Syria; but after the battle of Ipsus in Phrygia (301 B.C.), interest in the reconstruction of the Temple; and it is only in 520 B.C. that the Prophets Aggæus and Zacharias succeeded in rousing them from their supineness. Pecuniary help came too from the Jewish community in Babylon, and also, a little later, from the Persian king. This unexampled event might seem to have occurred as a moral sign and the Temple was solemnly dedicated. The Jewish leaders next started on the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, and here again met with the hostility of the Samaritans, whose complaints at the Court of Persia were most successful under Artaxerxes I "Longimanus" (464-424 B.C.), who issued orders strictly forbidding the Jews to proceed with the work.

The special mission of Esdras and Nehemiah in behalf of the struggling Palestinian community, strenuous efforts to lift up its moral and religious tone need not to be dwelt upon here (see Esdras; Nehemiah). Suffice it to say, that to whatever precise time their labours should be assigned (see Captivity), the scribe Esdras and the satrap Nehemiah left their permanent impress on the spiritual life of the Jews. After the death, which probably occurred not long before the end of the Persian rule over Judah in 333 B.C., little is distinctly known of the history of the Palestinian Jews. It seems, however, that under the satraps of Cœle-Syria, the action of the high-priest had a very considerable influence upon their religious and civil matters alike (cfr. Josephus, "Antiq. of the Jews", XI, vii.), and that their community enjoyed a steadily increasing prosperity, hardly marred by the deportations of a certain number of Jews to distant regions like Hyrcania, which probably occurred under Artaxerxes III (359-338 B.C.). During this period, the Jews who had preferred to stay in Babylonia remained constantly in touch with the returned exiles, sending them, at times, material help, and formed a flourishing community deeply attached to the faith and to the traditions of their race. Within the same period falls the formation of the Jewish colony at Elephantine (Upper Egypt), which was for a while supplied with a temple of its own, and the faithfulness of which to Persia is witnessed by Judeo-Aramean papyri recently discovered. Lastly, the institutions of Judaism which seem to have more particularly developed during the Persian domination among the Pharisees, with their educational and religious features, and the Scribes with their peculiar skill in the Law.
whole country, and attained to eminence in science, art, and even literature, as is proved by the numerous Judeo-Greek fragments which have survived. Under Ptolemy II (Philadelphus), the Hebrew Pentateuch was first rendered into Greek; and this, in turn, led in the course of time to the complete translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint. His successor, brother of Antiochus I (277–222 B.C.), is particularly credited, after a successful campaign in Syria, with having offered rich presents at the Temple in Jerusalem. Again, the annual tribute demanded by the early Ptolemies was apparently light; and as long as it was paid regularly, the Palestinian Jews were left free to manage their own affairs under their high priest at whose side stood the Gerusa of Jerusalem, as a council of state, including the priestly aristocracy. In this wise, things went well under the high priesthood of Simon the Just (310–291 B.C.), and that of his two brothers, Eleazar II (291–276 B.C.) and Manasses (276–250 B.C.).

Matters proved less satisfactory under Onias II (250–226 B.C.), who withheld the tribute for several years from his Egyptian suzerain. Under Onias’s son and successor, Simon II (226–198 B.C.), whose godly rule is highly praised in 2 Macc. 1:17, the condition of Palestine became precarious owing to the renewed conflicts between Egypt and Syria for the possession of Coele-Syria and Judea. In the end, however, the Syrian king, Antiochus III, remained master of Palestine and did his utmost to secure the loyalty of the Jews not only of Judaea, but also of Mesopotamia and Babylon. Seleucus IV (187–175 B.C.) pursued at first the conciliatory policy of his father, and the Judean Jews prospered during the opening years of Onias III (198–175). Soon, however, intestine strife disturbed the pontiff’s wise rule, and Seleucus, misled by Simon, the governor of the Temple, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to seize the Temple funds. The failure of Heliodorus’s mission led eventually to Onias’s imprisonment and deposition from the high-priesthood. This deposition purchased from the new king, Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), by Jason, an unworthy brother of Onias, was the real triumph of Hellenism in Jerusalem. The man who, in turn, supplanted Jason was Menelaus, another hellenizing leader, whom craft and gold maintained in office, despite the complaints of the Jews to the Syrian monarch. At length, a popular revolt occurred against Menelaus, which Antiochus put down with great barbarity, and which resulted in his leaving Menelaus in charge of the high-priesthood, while two foreign officers became Governors of Jerusalem and Samaria respectively (170).

(3) The Maccabean Age (168–63 B.C.).—The whole period which has just been described, was marked by the steady growth and widespread influence of Hellenistic culture. Towards its end, the Jewish high priests themselves not only assumed and adopted Greek manners, but became the ardent champions of Hellenism. In fact, Antiochus IV thought that the time had now come to unify the various races of his dominions by thoroughly hellenizing them. His general edict for that purpose met with unexpected opposition on the part of most Palestinian Jews. Hence, by special letters he ordered the utter destruction of Yahweh’s worship in Jerusalem and in all towns of Judea: under the penalty of death everyone distinctly Jewish was prohibited, and Greek idolatry prescribed (168 B.C.). The Holy City had recently been dismantled, and a part of it (Acra) transformed into a Syrian citadel. Now its Temple was dedicated to Zeus, to whom Zeus were offered upon an idol-altar erected over Yahweh’s altar. In like manner, in all the townships of Judaea, Zeus were set up and heathen sacrifices offered. In the dire persecution which ensued, all resistance seemed impossible. In the little town of Modin, however, an aged priest, Mattathias, boldly raised the standard of revolt. At his death (167 B.C.), he appointed his son Judas, surnamed Maccabeus, to head the forces which had gradually gathered around him. Under Judas’s able leadership, the Maccabean troops won several victories, and in December, 165 B.C., Jerusalem was re-entered, the Temple cleansed, and Divine worship renewed.

The struggle was a hard one against the numerous armies of Antiochus V and Demetrius I, the next Syrian kings; yet it was heroically maintained, with varying success, by Judas until his death on the battlefield (161 B.C.). One of his brothers, Jonathan, became his successor in command for the next eighteen years (161–143 B.C.). The new leader was not only able to re-enter and fortify Jerusalem, but was also recognized as high-priest of the Jews by the Syrian Crown, and as an ally by Rome and Sparta. It was not given him, however, to restore his country to complete independence; he was treacherously captured and soon afterwards put to death by the Syrian general, Tryphon. Another brother of Judas, Simon (143–135 B.C.), then assumed the leadership, and un-
for himself the rights of Roman citizenship and the office of procurator over the whole of Palestine. He next proceeded to rebuild the walls of the Holy City, and to appoint two new leaders, Phasael and Joram, Governors of Jerusalem and Galilee respectively. From this time forth Herod's fortune grew rapidly, until in the Roman capital, whither he had fled from the wrath of the Nationalist party, he reached the goal of his ambition. The Idumean Herod ascended the throne of David, and his long reign (37-4 b.c.) marked his people and the Jews in several respects a glorious epoch in the history of the Jews (see HEROD THE GREAT). Upon the whole, however, it was disastrous for the Jews of Palestine. Its first part (37-25 b.c.) was chiefly spent in getting rid of the surviving Idumeans. By their death he, indeed, made the throne more secure for himself, but also alienated the mass of his subjects who were deeply attached to the Machabean family. To this grievance he gradually added others no less hateful to the national party. The people hated him as a bloody tyrant bent on destroying the worship of God, and hated still more the Romans who maintained him on the throne, and whose policy it was to entice him at the first opportunity. It was a short time before the death of Herod that Jesus, the true King of the Jews, was born, and the Holy Innocents were massacred.

Herod's death was the signal for an insurrection which spread gradually and was finally put down by Varus, the Governor of Syria. Next followed the practical ratification of the last will of Herod by Augustus. The principal heirs were Archelaus, who was appointed ethnarch of Idumea, Judea, and Samaria, with the promise of the royal title on condition that he should rule to the emperor's satisfaction. For his misrule, Augustus deposed him (A. d. 6), and put in his stead a Roman procurator. Henceforward, Judea continued as a part of the province of Syria, except for a brief interval (A. d. 41-44), during which Herod Agrippa I held sway over all the dominions of Herod the Great. The Roman procurators of Judea resided in Cesarea, and went to Jerusalem only on special occasions. They were subalterns of the Syrian governors, commanded the military, maintained peace and took care of the revenue. They generally abstained from meddling with the religious affairs, especially for fear of arousing their countrymen who regarded as unlawful the payment of tribute to Caesar. The local government was largely left in the hands of the Sadducean priestly aristocracy, and the Sanhedrin was the supreme court of justice, deprived, however (about A. d. 30), of the power of carrying a sentence of death. From the death of the last ethnarch (26-36), one of the procurators appointed by Tiberius, that Jesus was crucified.

Up to the reign of Caligula (37-41), the Jews enjoyed, without any serious interruption, the universal toleration which Roman policy permitted to the religion of the subject states. But when that emperor ordered that Divine honours should be paid to him, they generally refused to submit. Petronius, the Roman Governor of Syria, received peremptory orders to use violence, if necessary, to set up Caligula's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem. At Alexandria a fearful massacre took place, and it looked as if all the Jews of Palestine were doomed to perish. Petronius, however, delayed the execution of the decree, and in fact, escaped punishment only through the murder of Caligula in A. d. 41. The Jews were saved, and with the accession of Claudius who owed the imperial dignity to his marriage with Agrippa, it was no more than known, and perhaps forgiven for them. Through gratitude, Claudius conferred upon Agrippa the whole kingdom of Herod the Great, and upon the Jews at home and abroad valuable privileges. Agrippa's careful government made itself felt throughout the entire community, and the Sanhedrin, now under the presidency of Gamaliel, etc.
St. Paul's teacher, had more authority than ever before. Yet the national party remained in an almost constant state of mutiny, while the Christians were persecuted by Agrippa. Upon Agrippa's death (A.D. 44), the country was again subjected to Roman procurators, and this was the prelude to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Nearly all the seven procurators who ruled Judea from A.D. 44 to 66 acted as fascists, to drive its population to despair and revolt. Gradually, the confusion became so great and so general as manifestly to presage the dissolution of the commonwealth. At last, in A.D. 66, in spite of all the precautionary efforts of Agrippa II, the party of the Zealots burst into an open rebellion, which was terminated (A.D. 70) by the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, the destruction of the Temple, and the massacre and the banishment of hundreds of thousands of the unhappy people, who were scattered among their brethren in all parts of the world. According to Eusebius, the Christians of Jerusalem, forewarned by their Master, escaped the horrors of the last siege, by removing in due time to Pella, east of the Jordan. Prominent among the Jewish writers of the first century of our era are Philo, who pleaded the Jewish cause at Rome before Caligula, and Josephus, who acted as Jewish Governor of Galilee during the final revolt against Rome, and described its vicissitudes and horrors in a thrilling and probably also in an exaggerated manner.

(5) Last Days of Pagan Rome (A.D. 70–82).—Rome exulted over fallen Jerusalem, and struck coins commemorative of the hard won victory. The chief leaders of the defence, a long train of heavily chained captives, the vessels of the Temple, the seven-branched candlestick, the golden table, and a roll of the Law, grace Titus's triumph in the imperial city. And yet three strong fortresses in Palestine still held out against the Romans: Herodium, Macheras, and Masada. The first two fell in A.D. 71, and the third, the following year, which thus witnessed the complete conquest of Judaea. For a while longer, certain fugitive Jews from Galilee still attempted to foment a rebellion in Egypt and in Cyrenaica. But their efforts soon came to naught, and Vespasian availed himself of the Egyptian commotion to close for ever the temple of Onias in Heliopolis. At this juncture, it looked as though the distinct groups of Jewish families were hencethrough destined to drift separately, finally to be absorbed by the various nations in the midst of which they chanced to live. This danger was, however, averted by the rapid concentration of the surviving Jews in two great Christian communities independent of each other, and corresponding to the two great divisions of the world at the time. The first naturally comprised all the Jews who lived this side of the Euphrates. Not long after the fall of Jerusalem and its subsequent misfortunes, they gradually acknowledged the authority of a new ruler, in whatever way it arose, was actually constituted at Jamnia (Jabne), under the presidency of Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai. Together with the Sanhedrin (i.e., the supreme Court (Bêth Din) of the Western communities), there was at Jamnia a school in which Jochanan inculcated the oral Law (specifically the Halacha) handed down by the fathers, and delivered expository lectures (Hagada) on the other Hebrew Scriptures distinct from the written Law (Penta- teuch). Jochanan's successor as the head of the Sanhedrin (A.D. 80) was Rabbi Gamaliel II, who took the title of Nasi ("prince": among the Romans, "patriarch"). He also lived at Jamnia, and presided over its school, on the model of which other schools were gradually formed in the neighbourhood. He finally transmitted (A.D. 118) to his successors, the "Rabbinical Law", a religious authority to which obedience and reverence were henceforth paid, even after the seat of this authority was shifted first to Sepphoris, and finally to Tiberias.

The supremacy of "Rabbinism", thus firmly established among the Western Jews, prevailed likewise in the other great community which comprised all the Jewish families east of the Euphrates. The chief of this Babylonian community assumed the title of Besa or Calutha (prince of the Captivity), and was a powerful feudatory of the Parthian Empire. He was the supreme judge of the minor communities, both in civil and in criminal matters, and exercised in many other ways a wellnigh absolute authority over them. The principal districts under his jurisdiction were those of Naaras, Sora, Pumbeditha, Naharaia, Nahar-Paked and Machuza, whose rabbinical schools were destined to enjoy the greatest fame and influence. The patriarchs of the West possessed much less temporal authority than the princes of the Captivity; and this was only natural in view of the suspicious watchfulness which Vespasian and Titus exercised over the Jews of.
the Empire. A garrison of 800 men occupied the ruins of Jerusalem to prevent its reconstruction by the religious zeal of its former inhabitants, and in order to do away with all possible pretenders to the Jewish Throne or to the Messianic dignity a strict search was made for Jerusalem and peopled by a colony of foreigners. The city received the name of Aelia Capitolina, and no Jew was allowed to reside in it or even approach its environs. The Christians, now fully distinguished from the Jews, were permitted to establish themselves within the walls, and Aelia became the seat of a flourishing bishopric.

Under Antoninus Pius (138-161), Hadrian's laws were repealed, and the active persecution against the Jews came to an end. Aquila's disciples then returned to Palestine and reorganized the Sanhedrin at Usha, in Galilee (140), under the presidency of Simon II, the son of Gamaliel II. Simon's patriarchate was not free from the petty oppressions of the Roman officials, which the Palestinian Jews particularly felt and resented. On the occasion, therefore, of the warlike preparations of the Parthians against Rome, a fresh revolt broke out in Judea during the last year of Antoninus's reign. It was speedily suppressed under the next emperor, Marcus Aurelius (161-180), and followed by a re-enactment of Hadrian's extreme measures which, however, were soon annulled or never carried out. In 165, Rabbi Judah I succeeded Simon II as president of the Sanhedrin and patriarch of the West. The most important of his acts is the completion of the Mishna oral Law (about 189), which, concurrently with the Bible, became the principal source of rabbinical study, and a kind of constitution which even now holds together the scattered members of the Jewish race. As Rabbi Judah was in office for over thirty years, he was the last Jewish patriarch who had to complain of the vexations of the pagan rulers of Rome. Under Caracalla (211-217), the Jews received the right of citizenship; and under his successors the various disabilities by which they had been affected were gradually removed. Even such rabid persecutors of the Christians as Decius (249-251), Valerian (253-260), and Diocletian (284-305) left the Jews unmolested. During this period of peace, the patriarchs of the West frequently sent their legates to the various synagogues to ascertain their actual condition and collect the tax from which Juda III and his successors drew their income. In Babylonia, the Jewish communities and schools were flourishing under the princes of the Captivity, and except for a short space of time immediately after the conquest of the Parthians by the neo-Persians, and during the ephemeral rule of Odenathus at Palmyra, they enjoyed quiet and independence. The condition of the Jews in Arabia and China, at this time, is not known with any degree of certainty.

(8) Christian Emperors and Barbarian Kings (320-628).—The accession of Christianity to the throne of the Caesars by the conversion of Constantine, opens a new era in the history of the Jews. The equality of rights to which the pagan emperors had admitted them was gradually restricted by the head of the Christian State. Under Constantine (306-337), the restrictions were few in number, and due to his interest in the welfare of his Christian subjects and the promotion of the true religion, he made the passage from Christianity to Judaism a penal offence; prohibited the Jews from circumcising their child...
slaves; protected converts from Judaism against the fiery vengeance of their former coreligionists; but never deprived them of their citizenship, and never went beyond restraining them—with the exception of their rabbis—to take upon themselves certain public offices which had become particularly burdensome. Several exiles from Judaea were received with a very severe by his son Constans I (337–350), who attached the death penalty to marriages between Jews and Christians. The severity of these and other laws of Constans was but too fully justified by the dreadful excesses of the Jews in Alexandria, and by their temporary withdrawal in Judea. The Revolt of the Apostate, in 361, made a new diversion in their favour. This emperor decreed the rebuilding of the Temple on Mt. Moriah and the full restoration of Jewish worship, apparently with a view to secure the influence of the Mesopotamian Jews in his expedition against the Persians. The Jews were triumphant; but their triumph was short-lived; sudden flames burst forth from Mt. Moriah and rendered impossible the rebuilding of the Temple; Julian perished in his Persian War, and his successor, Jovian (363–364), reverted to Constans' policy. The next emperors, Valens and Valentinian, reinstated the Jews in their former rights, except, however, the exemption from public service. Under Gratian, Theodosius I, and Arcadius, they likewise enjoyed the protection of the Throne; but under Theodosius II (402–450), emboldened by their long immunity from persecution, they manifested a spirit of intolerance and crime which led to violent tumults between them and the Christians in various parts of the Eastern Roman Empire, and apparently also to the prohibition of building new synagogues and from discharging any state employment. It was under Theodosius II that the patriarchate of the West, then held by Jerome, came to an end (425). Some time before (c. 375), the Jews of Jerusalem undertook a work which, however important for Judaism, is less complete, in regard to both its Mishna and its Gemara, than the Babylonian Talmud, the compilation of which was terminated by the heads of the Babylonian schools about 499, despite the violent persecutions of the Persian kings. Theophilus III (440–447) and Firus (457–484). The immediate result of Firus' persecution was the emigration of Jewish colonists in the south as far as Arabia, and in the east as far as India where they founded a little Jewish state on the coast of the Red Sea which lasted till 1529. Under Qubad I, Firus's son, Mar Zutra II, succeeded to the rule of the Jewish state in Babylonia; but in 518, the Byzantine successors of Theodosius II enforced his anti-Jewish laws with great rigour, and, as a result, the intellectual life and former jurisdiction of the Judean Jews became virtually extinct.

In the West the Jews fared decidedly better during the fifth century than in the East. They of course suffered many evils during the invasions of the northern barbarians who flooded the Western Empire after its permanent separation in 376 from the Eastern Empire of Constantine. In the midst of the political convulsions naturally entailed by these invasions, the Jews gradually became the masters of the commerce, which the conquerors of the Western Empire, addicted to the arts of war, had neither time nor inclination to pursue. In the various states which soon arose out of that dismembered empire, the numerous Jewish populations do not seem for a long time to have been subjected to restrictive measures, except in connexion with their slave trade. The Vandals left them free to exercise their religion. They were justly treated in Italy, by the Kings of the Ostrogoths, and by the Roman emperors, Theodoric and Galla Placidia, but not everywhere in the West generally; and in Spain, by the Visigoths down to the conversion of King Recared to Catholicism (589), or rather down to the accession of Sisebut (612), who, deploring the fact that Recared's anti-Jewish laws had been little more than a dead letter, resolved at once to enforce them, and in fact added to them first the injunction that the Jews should release the slaves in their possession, and next, that they should choose between baptism and banishment. Anti-Jewish legislation was framed and effected important sections of the Jewish dominions. Hostility towards the Jews showed itself first in Burgundy, under King Sigismund (517), and thence it spread over the Frankish countries. In 554, Childebert I of Paris forbade them to appear on the street at Easter tide; in 551, Chilperic compelled them to receive baptism; in 613, Clovis II sanctioned new decrees against them; and in 629, Dagobert made them choose between baptism and expulsion. Thus the laws against the Jews both in Spain and in France reached gradually a degree of severity unknown even to such Eastern persecutors of Judaism as Justinian I (527–565) and Heraclius (610–641). Yet, the edicts of these Byzantine emperors were vexatious enough. In fact, Justinian's decrees so exasperated the Palestinian Jews that despite the persecutions of their Mesopotamian fellow-Jews by the Persian kings, Kusrar I (531–579), Hormizidas IV (570–591), and Kusrar II (590–622), they seized the first opportunity to avenge themselves by siding with Kusrar II in his war against Heraclius. During the Persian invasion and occupation of Palestine, they committed dreadful excesses against the Christians, which finally met with a merited punishment in the persecution which Heraclius, again master of Judea, started against them.

(7) The Mohammedan Ascendancy (622–1038).—The rise of Mohammedanism, with whose power the Arabian Jews came into contact when it was yet in its infancy, marks the beginning of a new period in Jewish history. Several centuries before Mohammed's birth (c. 570), the Jews had effected important settlements in Arabia, and in the course of time, they had acquired a considerable influence upon the heathen population. In fact, it is certain that at one time, there existed in Southern Arabia (Yemen), an Arab-Jewish kingdom which was brought to an end in 530 by a Christian king of Abyssinia. But although they had lost their royal estate, the Arabian Jews were still numerous and powerful, in the Hedjaz, north of Yemen. There was indeed but a small Jewish population in Mecca, Mohammed's birthplace; yet it is probable that contact with the Jews of that city was one of the means by which the founder of Islam became acquainted with Judaism, its beliefs, and its Patriarchs. This acquaintance became naturally closer after the Hegira (Flight) of Mohammed (622) to Medina, the chief centre of the Arabian Jews. To win the Israelites to his cause, the

Seleucus IV. Philopator. Antiochus IV. Epiphanes. "prophet" made various concessions to their religion and adopted some of their customs. As this was useless, and as the Jews were a constant menace to his cause, he resolved to get rid of their tribes one after another. He first put an end to the Jews in the vicinity of Medina, and next (628) subjected those of the Mezquita of Kharanuvar, and then (632) to the mediation of half the produce of the soil. After Mohammed's death (A. D. 632), Caliph Abu-Bekr tolerated the Jewish remnant in Khaibar and al-Kura; but this
toleration ceased under Omar, the prophet's second successor. During Omar's short caliphate (634–644), Syria, Phoenicia, Persia, Egypt, and Jerusalem fell under the sway of Islam. The Jews were fairly well treated by their new masters. Omar's so-called "Covenant" (640) imposed indeed restrictions upon Jews in the whole Mohammedan world, but these restrictions do not seem to have been carried out during his reign.

In return for the valuable assistance of the Babylonian Jews in Omar's campaigns against Persia, this caliph granted them several privileges, among which may be mentioned the recognition of their exilarch Bostanal (642). Under Islam's fourth caliph, Ali (656–661), the Jewish community of Iraq (Babylonia) became more fully organized and assumed the appearance of an independent state, in which the Talmudic schools of Sora and Pumbeditha flourished again. The exilarch and the head of the school of Sora, with his new name of Gaon (658), were of equal rank. The former's office was political, the latter's distinctly religious. The exilarch, both in bearing and in mode of life, was a prince. Thus it came to pass that the Jews scattered through the Mohammedan world persuaded themselves that in Abraham's own country there survived a prince of the Captivity who had regained the sceptre of David. For the caliphs of that day the Jewish exarchates were the representatives of the ideal times of the Talmud. The farther the dominion of the Ommiads (661–750) was extended, the more adherents were gained for the Jewish Babylonian chiefs. The great liberty which the Jews enjoyed under Islam's rule allowed them to cultivate Cabalism or neo-Hebraic poetry and to begin their Masonic labours (see MASSORA).

Meantime, their fellow-Jews were less fortunate in Spain, where most rulers of the seventh century enacted severe laws against Judaism. Towards the end of that century, Egica forbade them to own lands and houses, to repair to or trade with North Africa, and even to transact business with Christians. Having next discovered a plot of the Jews with the Moors to overthrow the Visigothic rule, he sentenced all the Jews of his states and ordered that their children of seven years and upwards be given to Christians to be baptised. This condition of things came to an end under Roderic, Egica's successor and last Visigothic King of Spain. With numerous Jews in their army, the Mohammedans crossed from Africa into Andalusia, defeated and slew Roderic (July, 711); Spain was gradually conquered; and in 720, the Saracens advanced into Spain, and set up an independent of the Gothic Kingdom. In Mohammedan Spain, the Jews, to whose help the conquerors largely owed their victories, obtained their liberty. In fact, it was now given to the Jews at large to enjoy a long period of nearly unbroken peace and security. Apart from the persecutions started in 737 by the Caliph of Damascus, Omar II, and in 723 by the Byzantine emperor, Leo III, they prospered everywhere till about the middle of the ninth century. It was during this period that the great Kingdom of the Chazars, which was situated west of the Caspian Sea, and had caused the Persians to tremble, embraced Judaism (c. 740); its rulers remained exclusively Jewish above two centuries and a half. After the caliphs of the Ommiad dynasty, one of whom had a Jew as his mint-master, those of the Abbasides, till after Harun al-Rashid (d. 809), do not seem to have seriously disturbed their Jewish subjects: during that time, the Babylonian Talmudic schools flourished, and Judaism, having been not only for their internal dissensions, religious (Kuraites) and political (contests for the dignity of exilarch), the Jews of Babylon would have been as happy as they were renowned for their learning. In Mohammedan Spain (with its separate Caliphate of Cordova since a.d. 750), the Jews were undeniably prosperous during the century now under review, although details concerning their condition during that time are actually wanting. In France, they were submitted to any serious restrictions under either Pepin (752–788) or Charlemagne (788–814), while under Louis I (814–840) it even enjoyed special favours and privileges, the king having for his confidential adviser his Jewish physician named Zedekiah, and actively protecting Jewish interests against powerful opponents.

Thus, with the exception of a passing persecution under the two sons of Harun al-Rashid, the Jews were left unmolested for about 100 years. But with the middle of the ninth century, and nearly everywhere, the cases to be the case. In the East, Jewish persecutions were resumed by the Byzantine emperors of the Macedonian dynasty (842–1056), and by the Abbasid Caliph al-Motawakel, who, in 853, re-enacted the Covenant of Omar, and under whose successors in the Caliphate of Bagdad, the Jewish community of Iraq lost more and more of its prestige and was supplanted in the exilarchate by that of Spain; the exilarchate gradually ceased to be an office of the State and finally perished (c. 940), owing chiefly to the dissensions between the Gaons of Sora and Pumbeditha; and the Gaonate itself, for a while made famous by Saadiah, ultimately disappeared through the decay of the Gaonic dynasty (c. 1038). Under the Fatimite dynasty of caliphs (909–1171), whose rule extended over North Africa, Egypt, and Syria, the Jews were worse off still. About the middle of the tenth century, the Jewish Kingdom of the Chazars was destroyed by the Russians. In the West, the lot of the Jews was also that of a despised and persecuted race. Charles the Bald (840–877) protected them effectively; it is true, but his weak Carlovingian successors and the early Capetians lacked sufficient authority for doing so. In Italy, as early as 855, Louis II ordered the banishment of all Italian Jews, and his order failed to have the intended effect only because of the distracted condition of the realm at the time. In Germany, where "Jew" was synonymous with "merchant," the emperors were long satisfied with exacting a special tax from their Jewish subjects; but finally Henry II (1002–1024) expelled from Mainz the Jews who refused to be baptized, and it is probable that his decree was applied to other communities.

Spain (Navarre, Castile, and Leon) also persecuted the Jews, although towards the end of the tenth century, its rulers placed them in many respects an equality with the rest of the population. In Mohammedan Spain, however, the Jews remained industrious and religiously free. Under such patrons of science and art as the Ommiad caliphs, Abd-er-Rhamman III (d. 961), Al-Hakem (d. 976), and the regent Al-Manzur (d. 1002), the Jews greatly increased in Moorish Spain, and became famous for learning as well as for commercial and industrial activity. The Talmudic schools of Cordova, Lucena, and Granada took the place of those of Sora and Pumbeditha, under the high patronage of the Jewish statesmen Hasdai, Jacob Ibn-Jau, and Samuel Halevi. During this period, an Arabic translation of the Mishna was made in Spain by Ibn-Habib, and the first commentaries on the Talmud were composed at Mainz by Gershom ben Juda (d. 1028).

(8) Era of the Crusades (1038–1300).—In many respects, Mohammedan Spain owed a great deal to its Jewish population; yet, in 1096, the Jews were expelled from the Kingdom of Spain. In the young kingdoms of Christian Spain were indebted to their Jewish inhabitants; nevertheless, Ferdinand the Great subjected them to vexatious measures and was only prevented from driving the sword against them by the intervention of the Spanish clergy. These, however, were but passing storms; for Alfonso VI (1071–1109) soon freely used Jews in his diplomatic
and military operations, while in the Mohammedan states distinct from Granada, Jewish culture reached the zenith of its splendour. The era of Jewish persecutions really began with the First Crusade (1096–1099). The crusaders landed in May–July, 1096, bloody scenes against the Jews of Trier, Worms, Mainz, Cologne, and other Rhenish towns, and repeated them as they went along in the cities on the Main and the Danube, even as far as Hungary, bishops and princes being mostly on the side of the victims, but proving, for various reasons, powerless to protect them effectively. On the capture of Jerusalem, 15 July, 1099, the crusaders wreaked a frightful vengeance on the Jews of the fallen city.

The interval between the First and the Second Crusade was a time of reprieve and recuperation for the Jewish race. In England, in Germany, and even in Palestine, they were left unmolested; while in Spain and in France, they attained to a high degree of prosperity and influence, and actively pursued literary and Talmudic studies under the guidance of Judah Halevi and the sons of Raashi. Yet, in 1146, on the eve of the Second Crusade, there began against them the violent persecution of the Almohades in Northern Africa and Southern Spain which brought about the speedy ruin of the Jewish synagogues and schools and would have resulted in the practical annihilation of the Jews of Mohammedan Spain had not most of them found a refuge in the Christian dominions of Alfonso VII (d. 1157). Then came the Second Crusade (1147–1149) with its atrocities against the Jews in Cologne, Mainz, Worms, Speyer, and Strasbourg, despite the protestations of Bernard of Clairvaux and of Eugenius III, and the efforts of the German prelates and the Emperor Conrad III in their behalf; and with its most deplorable result, namely the greater enslavement of the German Jews to the Crown. The next fifty years were, on the whole, for the Jewish race a period of peace and prosperity: in Spain, where Judah ibn-Berhn was steward of the palace to Alfonso VIII; in Mesopotamia, where Mohammed Almuktafi revived the dignity of exilarch; in the Two Sicilies, where the Jews had equal rights with the rest of the population; in Italy, where Pope Alexander III was favourable to them, and the Third Lateran Council (1179) passed decrees protecting their religious liberty; in England and its French provinces, where the Jews were very flourishing under Henry Plantagenet (d. 1189); in France itself, where under the kind rule of Louis VI and Louis VII (1108–1180) they greatly prospered in every direction. And yet, in some of these countries there was a deep-seated hatred of the Jewish race and its religion. It manifested itself in 1171 when the Jews of Blois were burned on the charge of having used Christian blood in their Passover, and it allowed Philip Augustus in the year of his accession (1180) to decree the confiscation of all the unmovable goods of Jewish subjects and their banishment from his domains.

This feeling showed itself particularly on the occasion of the Third Crusade (1189–1192). The Jews were massacred on the day of the coronation of Richard I (3 Sept., 1189) and soon afterwards in several English towns (1190). About the same time, crusaders murdered them at different places from the district of the Rhine to Vienna. When again in 1198 a new crusade (1202–1204) was preached, many barons of northern France got released from their debts to Jewish creditors, and then drove them out of their dominions. Philip Augustus received indeed the exiles in his own territory, but he was chiefly actuated by covetousness. The Jews appealed to Innocent III to curb the violence of the crusaders; and in answer, the pontiff issued a Constitution which rigorously forbade mob violence and forced baptism, but which apparently had little or no effect.

The year 1204, in which closed the Fourth Crusade, marked the beginning of still heavier misfortunes for the Jews. That very year witnessed the death of Maimonides, the greatest Jewish authority of the twelfth century, and the first of the many efforts of Innocent III to prevent Christian princes from showing favour to their Jewish subjects. Soon afterwards, the Jews of southern France suffered grievously during the war against the Albigenses which ended only in 1229. In 1210, those of England were ill-treated by King John himself, and their wealth confiscated to the Exchequer. Next, the Jews of Toledo were put to death by crusaders (1212). The secular legislation of the time was generally unfavourable to the Jews, and it culminated in the anti-Jewish measures of the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), among which may be mentioned the exclusion of Jews from public offices, and the decree that they should wear a Jew badge. Besides being thus legislated against, the Jews were divided amongst themselves with regard to the orthodoxy of the writings of Maimonides. Gradually, the Lateran decrees against them were enforced wherever this was possible, and active persecutions from kings and crusaders were started, the rulers of England being particularly conspicuous for their extortions of money from their Jewish subjects.

In many places the severity of the Lateran decrees was outdone, so that in 1235 Gregory IX felt called upon to confirm the Constitution of Innocent III, and in 1247 Innocent IV issued a Bull reproving the false accusations and various excesses of the time against the Jews. Writing to the bishops of France and of Germany the latter pontiff says: "Certain of the clergy, and princes, nobles and great lords of your cities and dioceses have falsely devised certain godless plans against the Jews, unjustly depriving them by force of their property, and appropriating it themselves: they falsely charge them with dividing up among themselves on the Passover the heart of a murdered boy. In their malice, they ascribe every murder, wherever it chance to occur, to the Jews. And on the ground of these and other fabrications, they are filled with rage against them, rob them of their possessions without any formal accusation, without confession, and without legal trial and conviction, contrary to the privileges granted to them by the
Apostolic See. . . . They oppress the Jews by starvation, imprisonment, and by tortures and sufferings; they afflict them with all kinds of punishments, and sometimes even condemn them to death, so that the Jews, although living under Christian princes, are in a worse plight by the former than by the Pharaohs. They are driven to leave in despair the land in which their fathers have dwelt since the memory of man. . . . Since it is our pleasure that they shall not be disturbed, . . . we ordain that ye behave towards them in a friendly and kind manner. Whenever any unjust attacks upon them come under your notice, you shall not tolerate them, and you shall not suffer them to be visited in the future by similar tribulations." The protestations of the Roman pontiffs do not seem to have been much heeded in the Christian states generally. In 1254, nearly all the French Jews were banished by St. Louis from the king's domains. Between 1257 and 1296, Alfonso X of Castile compiled a code of laws which contained several clauses against the Jews and countenanced the blood accusation which had been condemned by Innocent IV. For the last three years of Henry III (d. 1272), the Jews of England fared worse and worse. About this time, Pope Gregory XIV belived in more that the Jews would be inficted upon their persons or their property (1273); but the popular hatred against them on the charge of usury, use of Christian blood at their Passover, etc., could not be restrained; and the thirteenth century which had witnessed their persecution in all parts of Christendom, except Austria, Portugal, and Italy, closed with their total emulsion from England in 1290, under Edward I, and their carnage in Germany in 1283 and 1298. During the same period, public disputations had been resorted to—but with little success—for the conversion of the Jews. Further light on the severity of measures and on the hatred directed against the Jews, as well as on the motives of popular prejudice and hatred, will be found below, under section JUDAISM:

(4) Judaism and Church Legislation. (9) Last Part of the Middle Ages (1300–1500). At the beginning of the fourteenth century, Jewish rabbis were divided concerning the value of the Zohar, the sacred book of the Kabbalists (see KABBALA), which Moses of Leon had recently published. A still deeper division prevailed among them with regard to the cultivation of Aristotle's philosophy and the humanistic sciences and literature, and it resulted in 1305 in a bloody persecution. In France, they were torn with disputes against the study of science. The next year (1306), Philip IV plundered and expelled all the French Jews, some of whom travelled as far as Palestine to enjoy there freedom under the rule of the mameluke sultan, Nasir Mohammed (d. 1341), while most remained on the border of France, thinking that the royal avarice which had caused their banishment would bring about their early return. Meantime, their coreligionists of Castile narrowly escaped the carrying out of stringent measures against their own rights and privileges (1313). The banished French Jews were actually reacquired in 1320, in the person of Edward. In England, they flourished for twelve years. But as early as 1320, there arose against them the bloody persecution of some 40,000 pastoureux who pretended to be on their way to the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. In 1321, the Jews were accused by the lepers of having poisoned the wells and rivers, whereupon a new persecution ensued. The same year, owing to intrigues against them, the Jews of Rome, then very flourishing in society and literature, would have been expelled from Roman territory by John XXII who resided in Avignon, had it not been for the timely intervention of Robert of Anjou, Vicer-General of the Papal States. In 1323, with the strong influence with Alfonso XI (1312–1350), the various plans against them actually failed, and the king showed himself favourable to them till the day of his death. Their enemies were more successful in Na-

varre on the occasion of the war of independence which this province waged against France. As the Jews were apparently in the way of the secession, they were subjected to a violent persecution during the course of the war (1328), and to oppressive measures after Navarre had become a part of the French kingdom. In Germany, they fared still worse during the riots and the civil wars under Louis IV (1314–1347). For three consecutive years (1336, 1337), the Arméieder, or peasants wearing a piece of leather wound around their arm, inflicted untold sufferings upon the Jewish inhabitants of Alsace and the Rhineland as far as Swabia. In 1337, also, on the charge of having profaned a consecrated Host, the Jews of Bavaria were subjected to a slaughter which soon extended to those of Bohemia, Moravia, and Austria, although Benedict XII had issued a Bull promising an inquiry into the matter. Besides, Louis IV, who always treated his Jewish subjects as mere slaves, subjected them (c. 1342) to a new and most onerous poll-tax. Greater Jewish massacres occurred in 1348–1349 while the fearful scourge, known as the "Black Death", desolated Europe. The report that the Jews had caused the scourge by poisoning the wells used by Christians spread rapidly and was believed in most of Central Europe, despite the Bulls issued by Clement VI in July and September, 1348, declaring their falsity. Despite the fact, too, that the same pontiff had solemnly ordered that Jews be not forced into baptism, that their sabbaths, festivals, synagogues, and cemeteries be respected, that no new exactions be imposed on them, they were plundered and murdered in many countries of Central and Northern Europe. The next years were, on the whole, a period of respite from persecution for the Jewish race. In Castile, the Jews attained to a great influence under Don Pedro (1360–1369), and the misfortunes which fell on them arose partly from the prevalent view that they availed themselves of their power to tap up the people's possessions with their tax-farming, and partly from their constant loyalty to Don Pedro's cause, during the civil war which broke out between him and Don Henry. The latter, after reaching the throne, showed himself friendly to the Jews, and agreed only reluctantly to some of the restrictive measures urged by the Cortes in 1371. In Germany, they were readmitted as early as 1355 into the very towns which had sworn that for 100 or 200 years no Jew should dwell within their walls.

From the special privileges by King John (1361), which they enjoyed to the full extent under his successor, Charles V (1364–1380). But the last twenty years of the fourteenth century were again disastrous for the European Jews. In France, scarcely was Charles V dead, when popular riots were started against them because of their exorbitant usury and encouragement to baptized Jews to recant, and finally brought about the permanent exile of the Jewish population (1394). In Spain, the reign of John I (d. 1390) witnessed a great curtailing of the Jews' power and privileges; and that of Henry III (d. 1406) was marked by bloody persecutions in the cities of Castile and Aragon and even in the island of Majorca, on account of which numerous Jews embraced Christianity. In Germany (1384), and in Bohemia (1389, 1399), the Jews were likewise persectuated. Boniface IX had protested, but in vain, against such outrages and slaughters (1380); and it is only in his states, in Italy, and in Portugal, that the Jewish race had any measure of peace during these years of carnage.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Jews enjoyed some manner of respite in nearly all the countries where they have had a history, and such they had fled from persecuting France and Spain. But these peaceful days did not last long. As early as 1408, there appeared in the name of the infant King of Castile, John II, an edict which revived the dormant
anti-Jewish statutes of Alfonso X; and soon afterwards (1412), a severer edict was issued, intended to isolate the Jews from the Christians lest intercourse should injure the true Faith, and calculated to induce them to give up their religion. In fact, degraded in every way, parked in "Juderias", and deprived of practically every means of subsistence, many Jews surrendered to the shortations of St. Vincent Ferrer, and received baptism, while the others persevered in Judaism and saw their misery somewhat alleviated by the royal edict of 1414. The persecution gradually extended to all the provinces of Spain, where St. Vincent also effected many conversions. At length, brighter days dawned for the Spanish Jews upon the death of Ferdinand, King of Aragon (1416) and of Catherine, Regent of Castile (1419), and upon the publication of the following solemn declaration of Martin V (1419), in their behalf: "Whereas the Jews are made to the image of God, and a remnant of them will one day be saved, and whereas they have besought our protection: following in the footsteps of our predecessors we command that they be not molested in their synagogues; that their laws, rights, and customs be not assailed; that they be not baptized by force, constrained to observe Christian festivals, nor to wear badges; and they be not hindered in their business relations with Christians." But then began new persecutions against the Jewish population of Central Europe. In their distress, the Austrian and the German Jews appealed to the same pontiff who, in 1420, also raised his voice in their favour, and who, in 1422, confirmed the ancient privileges of their race. Nevertheless, the Jews of Cologne were expelled in 1426, and those of several towns of southern Germany burned on the old blood accusation (1431). To add to their misfortune, the Council of Basle renewed the old and devised new restrictive measures against the Jews (1434); the unfavourable Archduke of Austria, Albert, became Emperor of Germany (1437-1439); and the new pope, Eugenius IV (1431-1447), at first well-disposed towards them, showed himself by this time a firm friend of Christendom.

Meantime, the Jewish communities of Castile prospered under John II, who promoted several Jews to public offices, and who in 1432 confirmed the statute of the Jewish Synod of Avila prescribing the establishment of separate schools. In the course of time, however, Spanish Christians complained to the pope of the arrogances of the Castilian Jews, and, in consequence, Eugenius IV issued an unfavourable Bull (1442) which but a mask. Even after Ferdinand II and Isabella had united Castile and Leon under one sceptre (1479), the Jews remained undisturbed — except in Andalusia—until the fall of Granada, protected as they were by Isaac Abrabanel, the ruler's Jewish minister of finance. But the conquest of the rich Kingdom of Granada apparently led Ferdinand and Isabella to regard the Spanish Jews as no longer indispensable, as in fact out of place in their estates, which they wished altogether Christian. Without the approval of Innocent VII, the decree appeared (1492) banishing all Jews from Spain, and it was carried out despite Abrabanel's supplication and offer of an immense sum of money.

Great indeed were the misfortunes which befell the impoverished Jewish exiles. In Navarre, they had ultimately to choose between expulsion and baptism. In the African seaports, when allowed to land, they were decimated by plague and starvation. The Genoese ships, they were submitted to the most brutal treatment, and those who landed near Genoa reduced
to starve or give up Judaism. In Rome, their fellow-Jews offered 1000 ducats to Alexander VI to prevent their admission, an offer which was indignantly refused. In Naples, they were compassionately received by Ferdinand I, but also carried off in numbers by the people. In Florence, they were ejected in 1497 and not until 1516 after a very bitter fight, and in 1517 they were expelled. The country where the Spanish refugees were most hospitably received was Turkey, then ruled over by Bajazet II.

(10) Modern Period (1500–1700).—These expulsions of the Jews gave rise in the sixteenth century to the important division of the European Jews into "Sephardim" (Spanish and Portuguese Jews) and "Askhenazim" (German and Polish Jews), thus called from two Biblical words connected by medieval rabbis with Spain and Germany respectively. Wherever they settled, the Sephardim preserved their peculiar ritual and also their native refinement of character, maintaining their influence with those of the Askhenazim and secured for them an influence which the latter did not exercise despite their closer acquaintance with the Talmud and greater faithfulness to ancestral virtues and traditions. Thus, during this century, many Jewish physicians and others were favourable to the Jews and the Maranos of Portugal and Spain who again professed Judaism. In Naples, they enjoyed the high protection of Samuel Abraham, a wealthy Jew who apparently administered the finances of the viceroy, Don Pedro of Toledo. In Ferrara and Florence, Jews and Maranos were well treated by the respective rulers of these cities; and even in Venice, which considered the expediency of their expulsion lest their presence should injure the interests of native merchants, they were simply confined to the first Italian Ghetto (1516). The early Roman pontiffs of the sixteenth century had Jewish physicians and were favourable to the Jews and the Maranos of their states. Time soon came, however, when the Sephardic Jews of Italy faced difficulty. As the Sephardim in Holland tended to the Spanish domination, so did the Jews in England from which Jews had been strictly excluded since 1290. Oliver Cromwell, protector of the realm (1653–1658), was personally in favour of the movement, and he actively seconded the skilful pleadings of Manasses ben Israel, the leading rabbi of Amsterdam, for that purpose. Cromwell, however, did not dare openly to bring about a change generally hateful to the English clergy and nation. Under Charles II (d. 1685), the Jews stole insensibly into the kingdom, where they have ever since maintained their footing. The chief difficulties of the Sephardim in Holland were that their rabbis used rather freely the power of excommunication, one of the victims of which was the celebrated Spinoza (1656); and the majority of the Jewish population of Amsterdam was more or less seriously disturbed, about this time, by the Messianic pretensions of Sabbatian Zevi.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Askhenazim or German Jews were less fortunate than their Sephardic contemporaries. Their general condition remained much the same as during the preceding period. It is often, but wrongly, asserted that the invention of printing by Jewish scholars did not promote the Protestant Reformation to be beneficial to the Jews. When, early in the sixteenth century, the German Jews began to use the printing press for their own literature, sacred or otherwise, the Emperor Maximilian (d. 1519) was urged to order all Hebrew books to be burned, and but for the strenuous exertions of Reuchlin, the burning of the Talmud would have taken place. "That the Reformation itself had nothing to do with the subsequent ameliorations in the conditions of the Jews, is plain from the fact that in many parts of Germany, Protestant as well as Catholic, their lot became ac-

other." (Myth and History, vol. x, New York, 1903). Luther himself, towards the end of his life, was their greatest opponent. "He poisoned the Protestant world for a long time to come, with his Jew-hating testament. Prot-
estants became even more bitter against Jews than Catholics had been. The leaders of Catholicism demanded absolute submission to canonical law; but on that condition granted them permission to remain in Catholic countries; Luther, on the other hand, required their absolute expulsion. . . . It was reserved for him to place Jews on a level with Gypsies. . . . He was the cause of their being expelled by Protestant princes" (Grässl). In general, the emperors of the period acted with equity towards their Jewish subjects. At times, however, they expelled them from their crown lands, or connived at their banishment from other places. During the Thirty Years' War, Ferdinand II (d. 1638) treated the Jews with great consid-
period just sketched, Christian scholars began to cultivate Hebrew under the guidance of Jewish grammarians; Hebrew studies were introduced into German and French universities; and Richard Simon made the learned world acquainted with rabbinical literature.

(11) Recent Times (since 1700).—In dealing with this last period, it will be convenient to narrate briefly the events relative, first to the Jews of the Old World, and next to those of the New. The internal condition of the Jews in the Old World during the first half of the eighteenth century was that of a general demoralization which made them appear all the more disreputable because the recent works of Christian scholars, such, for instance, as the history of the Jews by Basnage,
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had forcibly directed the attention of the learned world towards them. They were not indeed subjected to the wholesale massacres of former days, but they remained in the eyes of all a despised race liable to all kinds of disabilities. In Sweden, they were allowed (1718) to enter the kingdom under unfavourable conditions; in France, new restrictions were imposed on their settlements (1718) at Metz and Bordeaux; in Prussia, the laws of Frederick William I (1714, 1730) breathed a spirit of great intolerance against them; at Naples, the concessions made to the Jews by Charles III, in 1740, were soon revoked; in Austria, charges that they were in league with the country's enemies during the War of the Austrian Succession were readily believed, led to bloody riots against them, wellnigh entailed (1745) under Maria Theresa their perpetual expulsion from Bohemia and Moravia, and caused the Jews of Prague to be placed under the most severe restrictions; in Russia, Catherine I (1727) took active measures against the Ukraine Jews and banished the Jewish population from Russia. Anna Ivanowa (1739) decreed their expulsion from Little Russia, and Elizabeth (1741-1762) harshly enforced anti-Jewish meas-
ures; and finally, in England, the Jews were simply tolerated as aliens, and a naturalisation act, which was passed by parliament in 1882, and confirmed by the act of 1735, was actually repealed (1754) owing to the nation's opposition to it.

Gradually, however, a number of circumstances lessened this spirit of hostility against the Jews. Among these circumstances may be particularly mentioned: (a) the rise of servitude and Mendelssohn (1729-1786), who, by his literary attainments and his strong personality, proved to the world that his race could produce men worthy of admittance into the highest society, and showed to his fellow-Jews the way to remove prejudices against them; and (b) the vigorous stand made by a Jewish writer Dohm, who, in his work "Upon the Amelioration of the Condition of the Jews" suggested many practical measures which Joseph II of Austria partly accepted in 1781, when he abolished the Jewish poll-tax and granted civil liberties to the Jews. Under these, and other similar circumstances, a more liberal spirit towards the Jews prevailed in Prussia and in France, where William II and Louis XVI, respectively, abolished the Jewish body tax. It made itself felt also in Russia where Catherine II (1762-1796) even decreed the civil and religious liberty of the Jews, but under whose rule the Jews were allowed to organize the "Russian Settlement," or portion of Russia in which Jews are allowed to reside and to enforce other anti-Jewish measures. It culminated in the decrees of the French Revolution which actually opened the era of Jewish emancipation: in 1790, the French National Assembly granted citizenship to the Sephardic Jews, and, in 1791, it extended full civil rights to all the Jews of the country. With French victories and influence, Jewish liberty naturally followed, and, in 1796, the Batavian National Assembly decreed citizenship for the Jews. Napoleon I summoned in 1806 an assembly of Jewish notables which succeeded, in calming his prejudices against the Jews and, in ordaining the French rabbinate; and, in 1808, he pronounced the "Code Napoléon" universally applicable to all French Jews. With the exception of some local regulations, it was the first and only legal code of the Jews in the world.

The fall of Napoleon and the consequent period of European reorganization gave a setback to Jewish liberty, especially in Germany, which was for a while the scene of bloody riots against the Jews; but gradually, and nearly everywhere in the Old World, Jewish liberty increased. In France, for instance, the rabbinical court was established, under Louis Philippe (1831), on the same footing with regard to salary as the curés of the Catholic Church; in 1846, the oath "More Judaico" was abolished as unconstitutional; and since the wave of anti-Semitism which culminated in the well-known case of Alfred Dreyfus, the Jewish population of the country has been left untroubled. In England, it was not before 1858 that Parliament was freely opened to the Jews by the suppression of the clause "On the true faith of a Christian" from the oath of office, and not before 1870, that all restrictions for every position (except that of sovereign) in the British Empire were abolished. In Northern Germany, the various states allowed civil liberty to their Jewish population in 1848, and after 1870, all restrictions disappeared, although since that time, owing to anti-Semitism, minor disabilities have been publicly enacted or quietly tolerated. In Prussia, Denmark, the Jews of the Empire. The Dutch government in 1842, emancipated the Jews in 1849, whereas Sweden and Norway still subject them to certain disabilities. In 1867, the Jews of Austria were emancipated, and in 1895, those of Hungary obtained, moreover, that Judaism be considered as "a legally recognized religion." In Switzerland, after a long and bitter struggle, the Federal Constitution of 1874 granted to the Jews full liberty. In Italy, the Jewish disabilities, revived on the fall of Napoleon I, and the application of which occasioned in 1835 the celebrated case of Dr. Bismarck (1735), was actually repealed (1754) owing to the nation's opposition to it.

In Palestine, their number is rapidly increasing (they are now 78,000) despite the sultan's restrictions (1888, 1895) concerning the accession of Jewish immigrants in numbers; and agricultural colonies are established in various parts of the land. In Fez and chiefly in Morocco, Jews have still much to fear from the fanaticism of Mohammedans. In Persia, they are gradually pushed into the desert, and every time occupation of the "Ritom" proceeds farther towards them. Their fate has been, and still is, deplorable in Russia where lives nearly one-half of the total Jewish population of the globe. The liberty of trade and commerce granted to them by Alexander I (1801-1825) was replaced, under Nicholas I (1825-1855), by a legislation calculated to diminish their number, to deprive them of their religious and national character, and to render them morally and commercially harmless to Christians. Alexander II (1855-1881) was very favourable to the Jews; but the reaction against them under Alexander III (1881-1884) was of the most intolerable character. The promulgation of the Ignatius law of 1882, the most restrictive measures have been piled up against the Jews, and since 1891 they have been applied with such severity that Russian Jews have emigrated in hundreds of thousands, mostly to the United States. Under the present emperor, Nicholas II, new restrictions have been devised; riots against the Jews occurred in 1896, 1897, 1899, and culminated in the massacre of Kishineff, Homel, etc., from 1903 to 1906, helped in various ways by Russian officials and soldiers; during the year 1909, the persecution took the form of orders of expulsion, and the trials prescribed for the Duma rabble. The perpetrators of the massacres of some years ago are apparently free.

Jews at an early date settled in South America, exiled from Spain and Portugal, or taking part in the Dutch and English commercial enterprises in the New World. Brazil was their main centre. Those found there in the sixteenth century were Maranos who had been sent in company with convicts. They acquired wealth and became very numerous at the beginning of the seventeenth century. They helped the Dutch in wresting Brazil from Portugal (1624), and were joined in 1642 by many Portuguese Jews from Amsterdam. At the end of the Dutch rule over Brazil (1654), most Jewish settlers returned to Holland; some emigrated to French settlements—Guadaloupe, Martinique, and Cayenne; others took refuge in Curacao, a Dutch possession; and finally, a small band reached New York. The Jews who had settled on the French islands were compelled to turn to friendly Dutch possessions, and to other places of refuge, notably to Surinam (then belonging to England) where they became increasingly prosperous. The other early settlements of Jews in Mexico, Peru, and the West Indies do not require more than a passing mention. Of much greater im-
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Israel. It was that religion which had prompted the exiles to return to the land promised by Yahweh to their ancestors, and they were now determined to maintain it in its purity. From the Captivity they had learned that in His justice, God had punished their sins by delivering them into the power of pagan nations, as the Prophets of old had repeatedly announced; and that in His love for the people of His choice, the same God had brought them back, as Isaias (xl-xlvii) had particularly foretold. Thence they naturally drew the conclusion that, cost what it may, they must prove faithful to Yahweh, so as to avert a like punishment in the future. The same conclusion was also brought home to them, when some time after the completion of the Temple, Ezra solemnly read the Law in their hearing. This reading placed distinctly before their minds the unique position of their race among the nations of the world. The Creator of heaven and earth, in His mercy towards fallen man (Gen., i-iii), had made a covenant with their father Abraham, in virtue of which his seed, and in his seed all the peoples of the earth, should be blessed (Gen., xii; xvii; II Esd., ix). From that time forth, He had watched over them with jealous care. The other nations, once fallen into idolatry, He had allowed to grovel amid their impure rites; but He had dealt differently with the Israelites, whom He wished to be unto Him a "priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Exod., xix, 6). Their repeated falls into idolatry He had not left unpunished, but He kept alive among them the revealed religion which ever represented God as the true and adequate object of their devotion, trust, gratitude, of their obedience and service.

All the past misfortunes of their race were thus distinctly seen as so many chastisements intended by God to recall His ungrateful people to the observance of the Law, whereby they would secure the holiness necessary for the blissless discharge of their priestly mission to the rest of the world. They, therefore, pledged renewed faithfulness to the Law, leaving it to God to bring about the glorious day when all the earth,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1,777,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Empire</td>
<td>350,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinia</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>204,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria-Hungary</td>
<td>1,984,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>36,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>5,215,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China and Japan</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servia</td>
<td>9,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>12,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>45,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>38,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripoli</td>
<td>18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>607,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>6,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey and Afghaniastan</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>105,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuasula</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>52,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,530,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triumphal Coin of Titus
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Importance were those affected chiefly by Sephardim in North America. There were Jews in New Amsterdam as early as 1652; others came from Brazil in 1654. As these were not received in a friendly manner by the governor, Peter Stuyvesant, some of them betook themselves to the Colony of Rhode Island, where they were first landed in the course of time by command from Curacao (1690) and from Lisbon (1755). The condition of those who had remained at New Amsterdam was, on the whole, fair, for they were sustained by the Dutch home Government; and it remained substantially so after 1694, at which date the British captured New Amsterdam and changed its name to New York. At the end of the seventeenth century there were some Jews in Maryland. The next places of settlement were Pennsylvania (with a large percentage of Ashkenazim), Georgia, and the Carolinas. During the War of the American Revolution, the Jews generally took the colonial side; some fought bravely for it; and Haym Solomon aided the Continental Congress with his money. Following the Declaration of Independence (July, 1776) most of the states of the Union placed all citizens upon an equality, the only notable exception being Maryland, in which state all debts only were removed only in 1826.

During the nineteenth century, the Jews spread over all the United States and recently into their possessions, after the Spanish American War (1898), in which some 2000 Jewish soldiers took part. Important congregations have also grown up in the larger cities of Canada where the Jews possess full civil rights since 1831. From 1830 to 1870, the immigration into the United States came largely from the Rhine Provinces, South Germany, and Hungary. Since 1882, the riots and persecutions in Russia have led to an immense emigration, a small portion of which was directed by Baron von Hirsch to the Argentine Republic, or went to Canada, but the great bulk of which came to the United States. To these have been added numerous Jews from Galicia and Rumania. The total Jewish immigration to the United States through the three chief ports of entry (New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore) from 1881 to 30 June, 1909, was 3,197,423, out of which upwards of 54,000 reached the country between 1 July, 1908, and 30 June, 1909. In consequence, the United States have the third largest Jewish population in the world, the latest estimates being 5,215,805 for Russia, 2,694,591 for Austria-Hungary, and 1,777,185 for the United States. For the immig-

The Jewish statistics in the table below are taken from the "American Jewish Year Book" for the current year 5670 (16 September, 1910, to 3 October, 1910).

Judaism.—At the present day, the term designates the only union which survived the despotism of the Jewish nation by the Assyrians and the Babylonians. A brief account of Judaism thus understood may be given under the following heads: (1) Judaism before the Christian Era; (2) Judaism and Early Christianity; (3) Judaism since a. d. 70; (4) Jewish Legislation, and (5) Judaism in Modern Times.

(1) Judaism before the Christian Era.—Upon the Return from Babylon (538 B. C.), Judah was conscious of having inherited the religion of pre-Exilic
with Jerusalem as its centre, would recognize and worship Yahweh; they broke every tie with the surrounding nationalities, and formed a community wholly sacred unto the Lord, chiefly concerned with the preservation of His faith and worship by a strict compliance with all the ritual prescriptions of the Law. On the one hand, this religious attitude of the Judean Jews secured the preservation of sacred, historic sites among them. History proves that the Persians and the Macedonians respected their religious freedom and even to some extent favoured their worship of Yahweh. It remains true, however, that in the time of the Machabees, the children of Israel escaped being thoroughly hellenized only through their attachment to Judaism, and adherence to the persecutions which they then underwent, confirmed instead of rooting out their belief in the true God. On the other hand, the rigour with which the letter of the Law became enforced gave rise to a narrow "legalism". The mere external compliance with ritual observances gradually superseded the higher claims of conscience; the Prophet was replaced by the "scribe", the casuistic interpreter of the Law; and Israel, in its sacred isolation, looked down upon the rest of mankind. A similarly narrow spirit animated the Babylonian Jews, for it was from Babylon that Esdras, "a ready scribe in the Law of Moses", had come, together with the Jews of Jerusalem, and their existence in the midst of heathen populations made it all the more imperative for them to cling tenaciously to the creed and worship of Yahweh.

Apparently, things went on smoothly with the priestly community of Judah as long as the Persian supremacy lasted. It was the policy of ancient Asiatic empires to grant to each province its autonomy, and the Judean Jews availed themselves of this to live up to the requirements of the Mosaic Law under the headship of their high-priests and the guidance of the official LXX. But the spirit of the Law were no burden to them, and gladly did they even increase the weight by additional interpretations of its text. Nor was this happy condition materially interfered with under Alexander the Great and his immediate successors in Syria and in Egypt. In fact, the structure and the content of the Jewish civilization seemed to open to them a wider field for their theocratic influence, by giving rise to a Western Dispersion with Alexandria and Antioch as its chief local centres and Jerusalem as its metropolis. However much the Jews living among the Greeks mingled with them, absorbed their language, or even became acquainted with Hellenistic philosophy, they remained Jews to the core. The Law as read and explained in their local synagogues regulated their every act, kept them from all defilement with idolatrous worship, and maintained intact their religious traditions. With regard to creed, worship, and morality, the Jews felt themselves far superior to their pagan fellow-citizens, and the works of their leading writers of the time were in the main those of apologists bent on convincing pagans of this superiority and on attracting them to the service of the sole living God. In fact, through this intercourse between Judaism and Hellenism in the Graeco-Roman world, the Jewish religion won the allegiance of a certain number of Gentile men and women, while the Jewish beliefs themselves gained in clearness and precision through the efforts then made to render them acceptable to Western minds.

The chief question confronting the Palestinian Jews was not, therefore, the extension of Judaism among the nations, but its very preservation among the children of Israel. No wonder then that Judaism assumed there an attitude of direct antagonism to everything hellenistic, that the Mosaic observances were gradually enforced with extreme rigour, and that the oral Law, or rulings of the Elders relative to such observances as were not explicitly laid down by the Lord, was enforced by the most scrupulous compliance, not only with the Law of Moses, but also with the "Traditions of the Elders". The former of these leading parties was pre-eminently concerned with the maintenance of the status quo in politics, and in the main sceptical with regard to such prominent beliefs or expectations of the time as the existence of angels, the resurrection of the dead, the reference of the oral Law to Moses, and the future Redemption of Israel. The latter party strenuously maintained these positions. Its extreme wing was made up of Zealots always ready to welcome any false Messiah to deliver Israel from the hated foreign yoke; while its rank and file earnestly prepared by the "works of the Law" for the Messianic Age variously described by the Prophets of old, the apocalyptic writings and the apocryphal Psalms of the time, and generally expected as an era of earthly felicity and legal righteousness in the Kingdom of God. The rise of the Essenes is also ascribed to this period (see ESSENES).

(2) Judaism and Early Christianity.—At the beginning of our era, Judaism was in external appearance thoroughly prepared for the advent of the Kingdom of God, its earthly abode, its "City", whither repaired in hundreds of thousands Jews of every part of the world, anxious to celebrate the yearly festivals in the "City of the Great King". The Temple was in the eyes of them all the worthy House of the Lord, both by the magnificence of its structure and by the holiness of its service. The Jewish priesthood was not only numerous, but also most exact in the offering of the daily, weekly, monthly, and other, sacrifices, which it was its privilege to perform before Yahweh. The high-priest, a person most sacred, stood at the head of the hierarchy, and acquired the most important and controversial. The Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, or supreme tribunal of Judaism, watched zealously over the strict fulfilment of the Law and issued decrees readily obeyed by the Jews dispersed throughout the world. In the Holy Land, and far and wide beyond its boundaries, besides local Sanhedrins, there were synagogues supplying the ordinary religious and educational needs of the people, and wielding the power of excommunication against breakers of the Law, oral and written. A learned class, that of the Scribes, not only read and interpreted the text of the Law in the synagogues meeting, but were the repository of Jewish traditions, in the "Traditions of the Elders", the collection of which formed a "fence to the Law", because whoever observed them was sure not to trespass in any way against the Law itself. Legal righteousness was the watchword of Judaism, and its attainment by separation from Gentiles and sinners, by purifications, fasts, almsgiving, etc., in a word, by all the external enactments which applied the Law to each and every walk of life and to all imaginable circumstances, was the one concern of pious Jews wherever found. Plainly, the Pharisees and the Scribes who belonged to their party had generally won the day. In Palestine, in particular, the people blindly followed their leadership, confident that the present rule of pagan
Rome would speedily come to an end at the appearance of the Messias, expected as a mighty deliverer of the faithful "children of the kingdom". Meantime, it behoved the Jews to do all within their power to spread the "righteousness of the Scribes and the Pharisees" whereby they would secure admittance into the Messianic world-wide empire, of which Jerusalem would be the capital, and of which every Jewish member would be superior in things temporal as well as spiritual. The world then rallied to the worship of the one true God.

In reality, the Jews were far from prepared for the fulfilment of the promises which the Almighty had repeatedly made to their race. This was first shown to them, when a voice, that of John, the son of Zachary and the herald of the Messias, was heard in the wilderness of Juda. It summoned, but with little success, all the Jews to a genuine sorrow for sin, which was indeed foreign to their hearts, but which could alone, despite their title of "children of Abraham", fit them for the kingdom near at hand. This was next shown to them by Jesus, the Messias Himself. Who, at the very beginning of His public life, commanded His apostles to repentance (Mark, i, 15), and Who, throughout His ministry, endeavoured to correct the errors of Judaism of the day concerning the kingdom which He had come to found among men. With authority truly Divine He bade His hearers not to be satisfied with the outward show of the works and the wisdom of the Scribes if they wished to enter into that kingdom, but to aim at the inner perfection which alone could lift up men's moral nature and render them worthy worshippers of their heavenly Father. The Kingdom of God, He plainly declared, had come upon His contemporaries, since Satan, God's enemy and man's, was under their eyes cast out by Himself and by His chosen disciples (Mark, xii, 20; Luke, x, 18).

The kingdom which the Jews should expect is the Kingdom of God in its modest, secret, and as it were, insignificant origin. It is subject to the laws of organic growth as all living things are, and hence its planting and early developments do not attract much attention; but it is not so with its further extension, destined as it is to pervade and transform the world.

This kingdom is indeed rejected by those who had the first claim to its possession and seemingly were the best fitted for its inheritance, for the Jews and Gentiles, who earnestly availed themselves of the invitation of the Gospel will be admitted. This is really a new Kingdom of God to be transferred to a new nation and governed by a new set of rulers, although it is no less truly the continuation of the King- dom of God under the Old Testament. This kingdom is organized upon earth, its king, the true son and lord of David, goes to a far country, relying upon His representatives to be more faithful than the rulers of the old kingdom. Upon the king's return, this kingdom of grace will be transferred into a kingdom of glory. The duration of the kingdom on earth will outlive the ruin of the Holy City and of its Temple; it will be coextensive with the preaching of the Gospel to all nations, and this, when accomplished, will be the sign of the near approach of the kingdom of glory. In thus describing God's kingdom, Jesus justly treated as vain the hopes of His Jewish contemporaries that they should become masters of the world in the event of a conflict with Rome; He also set aside the fabric of legalism which their leaders regarded as to be perpetuated in the Messianic kingdom, but which in reality they should have considered as either useless or positively harmful now that the time had come to extend "salvation... to the nations and their sacrifices" beyond the nation of Israel. 

Plainly, the legal sacrifices and ordinances had no longer any reason of being, since they had been instituted to prevent Israel from forsaking the true God, and since Monotheism was now firmly established in Israel; plainly, too, the "traditions of the Elders" should not be tolerated any longer, since they had gradually led the Jews to disregard some of the most essential precepts of the moral law embodied in the Decalogue. Hence Jesus did not hesitate to destroy the Law of the Prophets, that is those sacred writings which He, no less than His Jewish contemporaries, distinctly recognized as inspired by the Holy Spirit; His mission, on the contrary, was to secure their fulfilment. Indeed, He would have destroyed the Law, if He had sided with the Scribes and Pharisees in their "fence to the Law, which actually encroached upon the sacred territory of the Law itself; but He fulfilled it by proclaiming the new Law of perfect love of God and man, whereby all the precepts of the Old Law were brought to completion. Again, He would have destroyed the Prophets, if He had taken the same attitude as the Scribes and Pharisees. He had pictured an image of God's kingdom and God's Messias solely by means of the glorious features contained in the prophethical writings; but He fulfilled them by drawing a picture which took into account both glorious and inglorious delineations of the Prophets of old, setting both in their right order and perspective. John the Baptist had proclaimed and founded Jesus has an historical name. It is the Christian Church, which was able silently to leave the Roman Empire, which has outlived the ruin of the Jewish Temple and its worship, and which, in the course of centuries, has extended to the confines of the world and the knowledge of the Messias and Abraham, while Judaism has remained the barren fig-tree which Jesus condemned during His mortal life.

The death and resurrection of Jesus fulfilled the ancient types and prophecies concerning Him (cf. Luke, xxiv, 26, 27), and the visible bestowment of the Holy Ghost upon His assembled followers on Pentecost Day gave them the light to realize this fulfilment (Acts, iii, 15) and the courage to proclaim it even in the hearing of those Jewish authorities who thought that they had by the stigmata of the Cross put an end forever to the Messianic claims of the Nasarene. From this moment the Church which Jesus had silently organized during His mortal life with Peter as its head and the other Apostles as his fellow-rulers, took the independent attitude which it has maintained ever since. Conscious of their Divine mission, its leaders boldly charged the Jewish rulers with the death of Jesus, and frequently "fanned the flames of hatred and of disputations and of without disregarding the threats and injunctions of men whom they considered as in mad revolt against God and His Christ (Acts, iv). They solemnly proclaimed the necessity of faith in Christ for justification and salvation, and that of baptism for membership in the religious community which watched over God's people, and which recognized the risen Son of God as its Divinely constituted "Lord and Christ", "Prince and Saviour", in a real, although invisible, manner, during the present order of things. According to them, these are plain Messianic times as proved by the realization of Joel's prophecy concerning the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh, so that the Jews "first" and next the Gentiles are now called to receive the Divine blessing so long promised in Abraham's Seed for all nations. Much as in these early days the infant Church was Jewish in external appearance, it even then caused Judaism to feel threatened in its whole system of civil and religious life (Acts, vi, 13, 14). Hence followed a severe persecution against the Christians, in which Saul (Paul) took an active part, and in the course of which he was converted miraculously.

At his conversion Paul found the Church spread far and wide by the same principles as it was spreading, and multiplying it, and officially pursuing its differentiation from Judaism by the reception into its fold of Samaritans, which rejected the Temple worship in Jerusalem, of the Ethiopian eunuch, that is, of a class of men distinctly excluded from the Judaic community by the Deuteronomistic Law, and especially of the uncircumcised...
cised Cornelius and his Gentile household with whom Peter himself broke bread in direct opposition to legal traditions. When, therefore, Paul, now become an ardent Apostle of Christ, openly maintained the freedom of Gentile converts from the Law as understood and enforced by the Jews and even by certain Jewish Churches, it was in thorough disagreement with the official leaders of the Church at Jerusalem, and it is well known that the same official leaders positively approved his course of action in this regard (Acts, xv; Gal., ii). The real difference between him and them consisted in his fearlessness in preaching Christian freedom and in vindicating by his unyielding perseverance the purity and efficiency of faith in Christ for justification and salvation independently of the “works of the Law”, that is, the great principles acknowledged and acted upon before him in the Christian Church. The result of his polemics was the sharp setting forth of the relation existing between Judaism and Christianity; in Christ’s kingdom, only believing Jews and Gentiles recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (cf. Matt., viii, 11); they are coheirs of the promise made to the father of all the faithful when he was yet uncircumscribed; the Law and the Prophets are fulfilled in Christ and His body, the Church; the Gospel must be preached to all nations, then comes the end of the world. The result of his consuming zeal for the salvation of souls redeemed by the blood of Christ was the formation of religious communities bound together by the same faith, hope, and charity as the churches of Palestine, sharing in the same sacred mysteries, governed by pastors likewise vested with Christ’s authority, and forming a vast Church organism vivified by the same Holy Spirit and clearly distinct from Judaism. Thus the small mustard seed planted by Jesus in Judea had grown into a great tree fully able to bear the storms of persecution and heresy (see Colossians, Epistle to the Ephesians; Galatians, etc.).

(3) Judaism since A.D. 70.—While Christianity thus asserted itself as the new kingdom of God, the Jewish theocracy, guided by leaders unable “to know the signs of the times”, was hastening to its total destruction. The Romans came, and in A.D. 70 put an end forever to the Jewish Temple, priesthood, sacrifices, and nation, whereby it should have become clear to the Jews that their national worship was rejected of God. In point of fact, Judaism, shorn of these its essential features, soon “assumed an entirely new aspect. All the parties and sects of a former generation—Pharisees and Sadducees, each quarrel with each other; the Temple was supplanted by the synagogue, sacrifices by the prayer, the priest by any one who was able to read, teach, and interpret both the written and the oral law. The Sanhedrin lost its juridical qualification, and became a consultory to advise people in regard to their religious duties. Judaism became a science, a philosophy, and ceased to be a political institution” (Schindler, “Dissolving Views in the History of Judaism”). This new system, treated at first as simply provisional because of the survival of hope of restoring the Jewish commonwealth, had soon to be accepted as the fixed and crushing of Bar-Cochba’s revolt by Hadrian. Then it was that Rabbinical or Talmudical Judaism fully asserted its authority over the two great groups of Jewish families east and west of the Euphrates respectively. For several centuries, under either the “Psi” or “Phi” names of the West or “Or” of the East, in the form of the Mishna “Oral Teaching” completed by Rabbi Juda I, committed ultimately to writing in the form of the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds (see Talmud), and expounded by generations of teachers in the schools of Palestine and Babylonia, held undisputed grip over the minds of the Jewish believers.

In fact, this long acception of the Talmud by the Jewish race, before its centre was shifted from the East to the West, so impressed this Second Law (Mishna) upon the hearts of the Jews that down to the present day Judaism has remained essentially Talmudical both in its theory and in its practice. It is indeed true that as early as the eighth century of our era the authority of the Talmud was denied in favour of Biblical supremacy by the sect of the Karaites, and that it has been in thorough disagreement with certain Jewish sects such as Judahites, Kabbalists, Sabbatians, Chasidim (old and new), Frankists, etc. Nevertheless, these sects have all but disappeared and the supremacy of the Talmud is generally recognized. The most important religious division of Judaism at the present day is that between the orthodox “Reform” Jews, with many subdivisions to which these names are more or less loosely applied. Orthodox Judaism includes the greater part of the Jewish race. It distinctly admits the absolutely binding force of the oral Law as finally fixed in the “Shulhan Aruk” by Joseph Caro (sixteenth cent.). Its beliefs are set forth in the following thirteen articles, first compiled by Maimonides in the eleventh century:—

(a) I believe with a true and perfect faith that God is the creator (whose name be blessed), governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he hath wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever. I believe with a perfect faith that the creator (whose name be blessed) is one; that there is no unity like unto his in any way; and that he alone was, is, and will be our God.

(b) I believe with a perfect faith that the creator (whose name be blessed) is incorporeal, that he has not any corporeal qualities, and that nothing can be compared unto him. (c) I believe with a perfect faith that the creator (whose name be blessed) was the first, and will be the last. (d) I believe with a perfect faith that the creator (whose name be blessed) is to be worshiped and none else. (e) I believe with perfect faith that all the words of the Scriptures are true. (f) I believe with a perfect faith that the prophecies of Moses our master (may he rest in peace) were true; that he was the father and chief of all prophets, both of those before him and those after him. (h) I believe with perfect faith that the Law, at present in our hands, is the same that was given to our master Moses (peace be with him). (i) I believe with perfect faith that this Law will not be changed, and that no other Law will be revealed by the creator (blessed be his name). (j) I believe with a perfect faith that God (whose name be blessed) knows all the deeds of the sons of men and all their thoughts; it is said, “Hiddeces can hide nothing from the sight of his face, neither he knoweth all their deeds”. (k) I believe with a perfect faith that God (whose name be blessed) rewards those who keep his commandments, and punishes those who transgress them. (l) I believe with a perfect faith that the Messiah will come; and although he tarry I wait nevertheless every day for his coming. (m) I believe with a perfect faith that there will be a resurrection of the dead, at the time when it shall please the creator (blessed be his name).

With regard to the future life, Orthodox Jews believe, like the Universalists, in the ultimate salvation of all men; and like the Catholics, in the offering of prayers for the souls of their departed friends. Their Divine worship does not admit of sacrifices; it consists in the reading of the Scriptures and in prayer. While they do not insist on attendance at the synagogue, they enjoin all to say their prayers at home and to fire the common fires of the poor. They repeat also blessings and particular praises to God at meals and on other occasions. In their morning devotions they use their phylacteries and a praying scarf (talith), except on Saturdays, when they use the talith only. The following are their principal blessings:—

(a) Peace, of the house of Israel, for eight days. On the evening before the feast, the first-born of every family observes a fast in remembrance of God’s kindness to the nation. During the feast un-
Jews

Bread is exclusively used for the Sabbath and holidays. The Passover meal includes the Seder, a ritual meal with traditional foods. The Jewish calendar is based on the Hebrew calendar, which is lunar and has a different timing than the Gregorian calendar used in most countries. The Jewish year 1896 corresponds to the year 1953 in the Gregorian calendar. The Jewish community in Palestine had a long history, dating back to the days of the Temple in Jerusalem. The modern state of Israel was established in 1948, and it celebrates its independence day on May 14, which falls on the 15th day of the Hebrew month of Iyar. The Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, is the most important fast day in the Jewish calendar. It is observed by Jews worldwide, and it is a time for reflection and repentance. The Jewish Sabbath is observed from Friday evening to Saturday night, and it is a time of rest and family gathering. The Jewish calendar is determined by the sighting of the new moon, and it is used for religious purposes and for marking important dates in the Jewish calendar. The Jewish calendar is used for religious purposes and for marking important dates in the Jewish calendar.
Jezabel (גְּזָבָל; Sept., יְגָבָּל, יְגָבָּה), wife of Achab, King of Israel. She was the daughter of Ethbaal I, King of the Sidonians, who was also a grand pontiff of the goddess Astarte (the Istar of the Assyrians) worshipped by that people. It is probable that the marriage of this princess was arranged about in order to strengthen the house of Amri (father of Achab) against the Syrians. She introduced into Samaria various forms of Phoenician luxury hitherto unknown in that capital of the Northern Kingdom, and also prevailed upon Achab to establish there the worship of the Phoenician gods and goddesses of which she was a fanatical devotee (III Kings, xvi, 31, 32). She maintained 450 priests for the worship of Baal and 400 for that of Astarte (III Kings, xvii, 19). Consistently she persecuted and slew the prophets (III Kings, xvii, 4), but to prevent their complete extermination Achab gave a hundred of them to hide themselves in caves where they were secretly sustained. After the slaying of the 450 priests of Baal by Elias on Mount Carmel (III Kings, xviii, 40), Jezebel sought the life of the prophet and he fled to the kingdom of Juda (III Kings, xix, 3). How she brought about the death of Naboth in order to confiscate a vineyard which he had refused to sell to Achab is related in III Kings, xxi. Elias again appears on the scene and declares the Divine retribution which is to fall upon the perpetrators of the crime. The blood of Achab shall be licked by the dogs in the valley of the hares, and the dogs shall eat Jezebel in the field of Jezreel. After the death of Achab, Jezebel continued to exercise a strong and baneful influence over her two sons Ochozias and Joram who reigned successively in his place, and through her daughter Athaliah who married...
Jíbaro, King of Juda, the same evil influence was extended even to the Southern Kingdom. At last the Divine vengeance came upon Jezabel, and the predictions of Elias and Eliseus were literally fulfilled at the beginning of the reign of Jehu, as related in IV Kings, ix. 30–37.

Salvador Peres de Vigo-Brux, Dictionnaire da la Bible, s. v.; Salis in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, s. v. Jezabel.

JAMES F. DRISSCOLL.

Jíbaro Indians.—Jíbaro (Spanish orthography), "forest man," i.e. native, an important tribal group of Ecuador, comprising a great number of small tribal linguistic groups, and together constituting a distinct linguistic stock, holding the extensive forest regions between the Santiago and Pastaza rivers and southward to the Amazon. Owing to similarity of name—also written Xíbaro, Zíbaro—they have been frequently confounded with their eastern neighbours, the Zaparo, and the confusion is increased by the fact that in earlier times the name Jíbaro was often loosely used to designate any of the wild Indians of eastern Ecuador. More than any other tribe of the upper Amazon region, the Jíbaro are notable for their determined and successful efforts toward christianization, and notwithstanding more than three centuries of more or less intimate Spanish contact they still retain their primitive manners to a remarkable degree. They have no villages, the houses of each small community being scattered about in the forest within easy communicating distance, and always close to a stream. The houses are communal, from fifty to eighty feet in length, with a door at each end, one exclusively for the men and the other for the women. Near the women's door are the fire-places for cooking, one for each family, while outside the men's door is the funerary, or grave, drum, made of a hollow log, the sound of which can be heard for a distance of ten miles through the forest, and by means of which, according to a well-understood code, the Jíbaro can signal to his farthest acquaintance.

War is their normal condition, the favourite weapons being the lance, the javelin with throwing stick, the blow-gun with poisoned arrows, and the shield for defence. The heads of enemies are smoked by an ingenious process which in a measure preserves the features. The women are expert potters. The Jíbaro are agricultural, cultivating corn, beans, bananas, yuca, and other native vegetables. Besides corn, beans, and yuca, they have chickens and hogs, which were introduced among them by the whites. They use no salt, but like many other tribes of the Amazon and Oriconco are addicted to eating a certain saltpetrous clay. Their favourite drink is chicha, a mild intoxicant fermented from the yuca or bananas or some other native plant. They wear a cotton dress below the waist, flowing hair, pink, feather ornaments, ear pendants, and—among women—labrets. They are robust and comparatively handsome, although not tall. They are very fond of music, visiting, and ceremonial dances. Polygamy exists, as also, according to some travellers, the curious custom of the couvade. The dead are usually laid away in small shelter structures in the woods or in hollow tree-trunks placed in the house where the death occurs, the house being then abandoned. There is apparently no tribal organization or chiefly authority, the only bond among families being their habitual residence. In each family group one man has the duty of reciting a long historical and didactic discourse each morning while the women are preparing breakfast. Very little is known of their religious or mythologic beliefs, but witchcraft flourishes, and almost every young man professes to be a sorcerer. Sheltered by their forests, the Jíbaro successfully withstood the efforts of the Peruvian Incas to subjugate them. The first Spanish entrance into their country was made by Vergara in 1541, and in 1569, under order from Governor Salinas, five towns were established in the Jíbaro country, first and chief of which was Logroño. Under enforced labour in the mines, and other oppressions, at the hands of their Spanish taskmasters, the Indians rapidly withered away or were saved themselves by retreating to the forests. In 1599 a fresh tribute signaled the Jíbaro into rebellion, and under the leadership of Anirula a force estimated by many to be 20,000 warriors stormed Logroño in a night attack, killing every inhabitant to the number of 12,000, excepting the young women, and burning the town to the ground. Anirula was killed by pouring molten gold down his throat, "in order that he might have his fill of gold". The inhabitants of the other towns took refuge in Sevilla del Oro, which was next attacked, but resisted so stoutly that the Indians finally retired after having killed nearly 14,000 of the besieged. The young women were carried off as wives to the savages, and it is said that the admixture of blood is still evident in the clearer skin and more abundant beard of many of the tribe. Successive expeditions failed to reduce the Jíbaro, until it was resolved to call in the help of the missionaries. In 1646 two Franciscan fathers, Laurieño de la Cruz and Antonio Ferrante, with a military escort, entered the territory from the west, and in 1656 Commander Agüere with a detachment of troops and a company of mission Indians under the Jesuit Father Raimundo Santa Cruz, attempted a settlement at the mouth of the Pastaza, but the attempt was a failure through the bad conduct of the soldiers. Other unsuccessful missionary attempts were made in 1690, and in 1692 a combined force of Spanish troops and mission Indians, the latter under the superior of the Jesuit missions, Father Viva, began a series of manuhunts in the Jíbaro country, but with so little result that in five months thirty-three Indians were killed and seventy-two Indians were captured, most of whom escaped later. In these raids the Indian mothers frequently slew their children with their own hands to prevent their falling into the hands of the Spaniards.

In 1677 the Jesuit Father André Camacho made another effort, with some fair promise of success, when the decree of expulsion banished the Jesuits from their missions, which were then turned over to Franciscans and secular priests and speedily fell into decay. This may be considered the end of any systematic attempt at Christianizing the Jíbaro. As far back as 1581 the Dominicans of Guayaquil had made a few missionary efforts at the Jíbaro, and in 1642 the Jesuit Fathers at Mache and others often went into the Jíbaro country, but with little success. In 1680 Father Cisneros, who had a mission at Cila in the Pastaza country, went with a party of forty native Indians and a number of soldiers, composed of thirty-four Jibaro, into Jíbaro country, a distance of forty leagues, but was compelled to return, as they were not able to penetrate the country.

The Jíbaro country is very extensive, having an area of 25,000 square leagues, and throughout the interior of the country is thickly covered with dense forests, with numerous streams and lakes. The climate is very healthy, the mean temperature being 72 degrees, during the year, the highest temperature being 86 degrees and the lowest 56 degrees. The country is of very diversified character, the eastern slopes of the Andes being covered with a magnificent forest of tall trees, while the southern and western parts are thickly covered with small trees. The Jíbaro Indians have the reputation of being very warlike, and it is said that they are much given to robbery and murder. They are said to have lived in large villages, but it is probable that they are now scattered through the forest and have little knowledge of the white man.

JAMES MOONEY.
JOAB (Ieb. נָּוִח, Sept. יְואָב, general in chief of the army of King David. He was the son of Sarvia, sister of David, and had two brothers, Abissai and Assael. He appeared at the head of the forces of David after the latter's defeat at the battle of Rabbah (I Kings ii, 13–32). Abner, general of Saul's army, after having for a time espoused the cause of Ishoboth, offered his services to David who accepted them, but he was treacherously slain by Joab to avenge the death of his brother Assael who had been slain by Abner in a preceding battle (II Kings ii, 27). Joab was in command of David's army in the campaign against the Ammonites, when, at the suggestion of David, he brought about the death of Urías the Hethite (xi, 14–17). It was also Joab who with his own hand slew Absalom as he hung from the branches of a tree in which he had become entangled in his flight (iii, 1–15). Heartbroken by this act of Joab, David placed his nephew Amasa at the head of the army, but he was soon assassinated by Joab who again resumed command. Fear and self-interest caused David to retain him in that position, but he charged his successor Solomon to avenge the many crimes he had committed (III Kings, ii, 5, 6). After the accession of Solomon, Joab, fearing the wrath of the king, took refuge in the Tabernacle of the Lord, hoping to enjoy the inviolability of the sanctuary, but he was slain there by Banaias at the command of Solomon (III Kings, ii, 23–34).

See LAMÈTRE in VIGNOBROUX, Dic. de la Bible, s. v.; SELBIE in HASTINGS, Dic. of the Bible, s. v.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Joachim (meaning Yahweh prepares), SAIN'T, father of the Blessed Virgin Mary.—If we were to obey the warning of St. Peter Damian, we should consider it a blamable and needless curiosity to inquire about those things that the Evangelists did not deem it advisable to relate, and, in particular, about the parents of the Blessed Virgin (Serm. iii de Nativ. B. V. M.). Tradition, nevertheless, grounded on very old testimonies, very early hailed Saints Joachim and Anne as the father and mother of the Mother of God. True, this tradition seems to rest ultimately on the so-called "Gospel of James," the "Gospel of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary," and the Pseudo-Matthew, or "Book of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin," and of the "Gospel of Joseph," and this origin is likely to rouse well-founded suspicions. It should be borne in mind, however, that the apocryphal character of these writings, that is to say, their rejection from the canon, and their unguenuine-ness do not imply that no heed whatever should be taken of some of their assertions; on the contrary, with unwarranted and legendary facts, they contain some historical data borrowed from reliable traditions or documents; and difficult though it is to distinguish in them the wheat from the tares, it would be unwise and uncritical indiscriminately to reject the whole. Something that must be taken into account is the question whether the Gospel of St Luke that is that of the Blessed Virgin, find the mention of Joachim in Heli (Luke, iii, 23: Ei-achim, i.e. Jeho-achim), and explain that Joseph had, in the eyes of the Law, become by his marriage the son of Joachim. That such is the purpose and the meaning of the Evangelist is very doubtful, and so is the identification proposed between the two names Heli and Joachim. Neither can it be asserted with certainty, in spite of the authority of the Bollandists, that Joachim was Heli's son and Joseph's brother; nor, as is sometimes affirmed, from sources of very doubtful value, make no concession in herding the flocks. Much more interesting are the beautiful lines in which the "Gospel of James" describes how, in their old age, Joachim and Anne received the reward of their prayers to obtain issue. Tradition has it that the parents of the Blessed Virgin, who, apparently, first lived in Galilee, came later on to settle in Jerusalem; there the Blessed Virgin was born and reared; there also they died and were buried. A church, known at various epochs as St. Mary, St. Mary of the Sperchios, known as St. Anne, was built during the fourth century, possibly by St. Helena, on the site of the house of St. Joachim and St. Anne, and their tombs were there honoured until the close of the ninth century, when the church was converted into a Moslem school. The crypt which was formerly connected with the holy tombs was rediscovered on 18 March, 1589.

St. Joachim was honoured very early by the Greeks, who celebrate his feast on the day following the Blessed Virgin's birthday; the Latins were slow to admit it into their calendar, where it found place sometimes on 16 Sept. and sometimes on 9 Dec. Assigned by Julius II to 20 March, the solemnity was suppressed some fifty years later, restored by Gregory XV (1622), fixed by Clement XII (1738) on the Sunday after the Assumption, and finally raised to the rank of double of the second class by Leo XIII (1 Aug., 1879).


CHARLES L. SOUVAT.

Joachimites. See JOACHIM OF FLORA.

Joachim of Flora, Cistercian abbott and mystic; b. at Celico, near Cosenza, Italy, c. 1132; d. at San Giovanni in Fiore, in Calabria, 30 March, 1202. His father, Maurus de Celico (whose family name is said to have been Tabellone), a notary he held his office under the Norman kings of Sicily, placed him at an early age in the royal Court. While on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, Joachim was converted from the world by the sight of some great calamity (perhaps an outbreak of pestilence). He passed the whole of Lent in contemplation on Mount Tabor, where he is said to have received celestial illumination for the work of his life. Returning to Italy, he retired to the Cistercian Abbey of Sambucina, probably in 1159, and for some years devoted himself to lay preaching, without taking the religious habit, receiving an office of the Savigny type and in this way is likely to rouse well-founded suspicions. He should be borne in mind, however, that the apocryphal character of these writings, that is to say, their rejection from the canon, and their unguenuine-ness do not imply that no heed whatever should be taken of some of their assertions; on the contrary, with unwarranted and legendary facts, they contain some historical data borrowed from reliable traditions or documents; and difficult though it is to distinguish in them the wheat from the tares, it would be unwise and uncritical indiscriminately to reject the whole. Something that must be taken into account is the question whether the Gospel of St Luke that is that of the Blessed Virgin, find the mention of Joachim in Heli (Luke, iii, 23: Ei-achim, i.e. Jeho-achim), and explain that Joseph had, in the eyes of the Law, become by his marriage the son of Joachim. That such is the purpose and the meaning of the Evangelist is very doubtful, and so is the identification proposed between the two names Heli and Joachim. Neither can it be asserted with certainty, in spite of the authority of the Bollandists, that Joachim was Heli's son and Joseph's brother; nor, as is sometimes affirmed, from sources of very doubtful value, make no concession in herding the flocks. Much more interesting are the beautiful lines in which the "Gospel of James" describes how, in their old age, Joachim and Anne received the reward of their prayers to obtain issue. Tradition has it that the parents of the Blessed Virgin, who, apparently,
approved by Celestine III in 1196. In 1200 Joachim publicly submitted all his writings to the examination of Innocent III, but died before any judgment was passed. It was held to be in answer to his prayers that he died on Holy Saturday, "the Satur-
day of Saturdays", St. Stillman thought the truth of the story even as the hart panteth after the fountains of waters". The holiness of his life is unquestionable; miracles were said to have been wrought at his tomb, and, though never officially beatiﬁed, he is still vener-
ated as a beatus on 29 May.

Joachim voiced the general opinion of his age in declaring Joachim one "endowed with prophetic spirit". But he himself always disclaimed the title of prophet. The interpretation of Scriptural proph­­ecy, with reference to the history and the future of the Church, is the main theme of his three chief works: "Liber Concordiae Novi ac Vetus Testamenti", "Expositio in Apocalypsim", and "Psal­­terium Decem Cordarum". The mystical basis of his teaching is the doctrine of the "Eternal Gospel", founded on a strained interpretation of the text in the Apocalypse (xiv, 6). There are three states of the human heart corresponding to the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. In the ﬁrst age the Father ruled, representing power and inspiring fear, to which the Old-Testament dispensation corresponds; then the wisdom hidden through the ages was revealed in the Son, and we have the Catholic Church of the New Testament. The third era corresponded with the Holy Spirit, a new dispensation of universal love, which will proceed from the Gospel of Christ, but transsend the letter of it, and in which there will be no need for disciplinary institutions. Joachim held that the second period was drawing to a close, and that the third age (which is referred to in the Gospels, but not in St. Benedict) would actually begin after some great cataclysm which he tentatively calculated would befall in 1260. After this Latinus and Greeks would be united in the new spiritual kingdom, freed alike from the fetters of the letter; the Jews would be converted, and the "Eternal Gospel" abide until the end of the world.

Although certain doctrines of Joachim concerning the Blessed Trinity were condemned by the Lateran Council in 1215, his main teaching does not seem to have excited suspicion until the middle of the cent­­ury, and then only in a general meaning; while the speciﬁc doctrines which were wrongly attributed to Joachim. Among these the "De Oneribus Prophetae", the "Expo­­sitio Sybille et Merlini", and the commentaries on Jeremiah and Isaiah are the most famous. The sect of the "Joachists" or "Joachimites" arose among the "spiritual" party among the Franciscans, many of whom saw Antichrist already in the world in the person of Frederick II, nor was their faith shaken by his death in 1250. One of their number, Fra Gherardo of Borgo San Donnino, wrote a treatise entitled "Intro­­ductorium in Evangelium Aeternum", of which the contents were drawn up by the extracts made by the commission of three cardinals who examined it in 1255. From these it is clear that the Joachists went far beyond what the abbot himself had taught. They held that, about the year 1200, the spirit of life had gone out of the two Testaments, and that Joa­­chim's three books themselves constituted this "Eter­­nal Gospel", which was not simply to transsend, but to supersede, the Gospel of Christ. The Catholic priesthood and the whole teaching of the New Testa­­ment was to be rendered void in a few years.

This work was solemnly condemned by Alexander IV in 1256, and the condemnation involved the teaching of Antichrist in the world in the person of the Roman Emperor. It was suppressed by St. Thomas in the Summa Theologica (I–II, Q. xvi, a. 4), and its Franciscan exponents were sternly re­­pressed by St. Bonaventure. Another blow was given to the movement when the fatal year 1260 came, and nothing happened. "After Frederick II died who was Emperor," writes Fra Salimbene of Parma, "and the year 1260 passed, I entirely laid aside this doc­­trine, and I am disposed henceforth to believe nothing save what I see." It was revived in a modiﬁed form by the later leader of the Joachimite movement, Pier Gio­­vanni Olivi (d. 1297), and his follower, Ubertino da Casale, who left the order in 1317. We hear a last echo of these theories in the letters of Blessed Giovanni dalle Celle and the prophecies of Telesphorus of Co­­senza during the Great Schism, but they were no longer taken seriously.

Divini voto Abbatia Joachim Liber Concordiae Novi ac Vetus Testamenti (Venice, 1519); Expositio magna prophetarum Abbatia Joachim in Apocalypsim; Beatum Psalterium Decem Cordarum out corpus divinum (Venice, 1527); Liber Concordiae Novi ac Vetus Testamenti: Aufklarung im Mittelalter, II (Berlin, 1877); Tocco, Della vita nel Medio Evo (Florence, 1884); DENYNCK, Des Eterni­­gelm dispensation et de la Commission au Annoni in Archiv für Literatur­­- und Kirchen­-Geschichte, I (Berlin, 1885); HOLLER­­EGGER, Cronica Fratris Salimbene de Adamo, Christian Muner (Harwood, 1905–08); WIGGINS, The Everlasting Gospel in The Inquirer (London, 1899); FOURNIER, Etudes sur Joachim de Florre et ses doctrines (Paris, 1906). The only contemporary account is the sketch, Vrštvum B. Joachimi zynipseis, by LEON DE COHENA, his secretary, "written by order of BUD GELCUS STYLANUS, written in 1612, is professedly drawn from an ancient manuscript then preserved at Fiore. Both are printed by the Holländers, Acta SS., May, VI.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

JOAN, PONTIFEX.—The fable about a female pope, who afterwards bore the name of Joanna (Joan), is ﬁrst noticed in the third period of the legend, in which the first person who appears to have had cognizance of it was the Dominican chronicler Jean de Mailly (Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichte, xii, 17 sq., 409 sq.) from whom another Dominican, Etienne de Bourbon (d. 1261), adopted the tale into his work on the "Seven Gifts of the Spirit" (1703), and HOF­­tif-Echeid, "Scriptores Ordinis Precltorum", I, Paris, 1719). In this account the alleged popeess is placed about the year 1100, and no name is yet as­­signed her. The story runs that a very talented woman, dressed as a man, became notary to the Curia, then cardinal and ﬁnally pope; that one day this person went out on horseback, and on this occa­sion gave birth to a son; that she was then bound to the tail of a horse, dragged round the city, stoned to death by the mob, and was buried at the place where she died; and that an inscription was put up there as follows: "Petre palatae post ipsum". In her reign, the story adds, the Ember days were introduced, called therefore the "fasts of the popess". A different version appears in the third recension of the chronicle of Martin of Troppau (Martinus Po­­lonus) possibly inserted by the author himself and not by a subsequent transcriber. Through this version of the legend the tale became best known in the following form: After Leo IV (847–55) the Englishman John of Mainz (Johannes Anglicus, natione Moguntinus) occupied the papal chair two years, seven months and four days. He was, it is alleged, a woman. When a girl, she was taken to Athens by her father, a scholar, and there made such progress in learning that no one was her equal. She came to Rome, where she taught science, and thereby attracted the attention of learned men. She enjoyed the greatest respect on account of her conduct and erudition, and was ﬁnally chosen as pope, but becoming pregnant by one of her trusted attendants, she gave birth to a child during a procession from St. Peter's to the Lateran, somewhere between the Colosseum and St. Clement's. There she died almost immediately, and it is said she was buried at the same place. In their proc­­essions the popes always avoided this road; many believe that they do this in abhorrence of that calamity (Mon. Germ. Hist. Ser., xxxi, 379–475).

Here occurs for the ﬁrst time the name of Joanna (Joan) as that of the alleged popeess. Martin of Troppau had lived at the Curia as papal chaplain and
penitentiary (he died 1278), for which reason his papal history was widely read, and through him the tale obtained general acceptance. One MS. of his chronicle related, without assigning the author, the Meeting of the popes (Mon. Germ., loc. cit., 428), i.e., after her confinement Joan was immediately deposed, and did penance for many years. Her son, it is added, became Bishop of Ostia, and had her interred there after her death. Later chroniclers even give the name of the latter, though popes were given the choice, in a vision, of temporal disgrace or eternal punishment; she chose the former, and died at her confinement in the open street ("Mirabilia Romae", ed. Parthey, Berlin, 1869). In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries this popess was already counted as an historical personage, whose existence no one doubted. She had her place among the carved busts which stood in Siena cathedral. Under Clement VIII, and at his request, she was transformed into Pope Zacharias. The heretic Hus, in the defence of his false doctrine before the Council of Constance, referred to the popess, and no one doubted to question the existence. She is not found in the "Liber Pontificalis" nor among the papal portraits in St. Paul's Outside the Walls, at Rome.

This alleged popess is a pure figment of the imagination. In the fifteenth century, after the awakening of historical criticism, a few scholars like Zeneus Silvius (Epist., I, 30) and Platina (Vita Pontificum, No. 106) saw the untenableness of the story. Since the sixteenth century Catholic historians began to deny the existence of the popess, e.g., Onofrio Panvinio (Vite Pontificum, Venice, 1557), Aventinus (Annales Boiorum, lib. IV), Baronius (Annales ad a. 879, n. 5), and others. A few Protestants also, e.g., Blondel (Joanna papissa, 1657) and Leibniz ("Flores sparsae in tumulum Papiasae" in "Bibliotheca Historica", Göttingen, 1758, 267 sq.), admitted that the popess never existed. Numerous Protestants, however, made use of the fable in their attacks on the papacy. Even then, when the untenableness of the legend was recognized by all serious historians, a few Protestants (e.g., Kist, 1843; Suden, 1831; and Andréa, 1866) attempted, in an anti-Roman spirit, to prove the historical existence of the popess. Even Hase ("Kirchengesch.", I, 1836, 1837), Leitzing, 1838, 81), could not refrain from a spiteful and absolutely unhistorical note on this subject.

The principal proofs of the entirely mythical character of the popess are: (1) Not one contemporaneous historical source among the papal histories knows anything about her; also, no mention is made of her until the middle of the thirteenth century. Now it is incredible that the appearance of a "popess", if it was an historical fact, would be noticed by none of the numerous historians from the tenth to the thirteenth century. (2) In the history of the popes, there is no place where this legendary figure will fit in. Between Leo IV and Benedict III, where Martinus Polonus places her, she cannot be inserted, because Leo IV died 17 July, 855, and immediately after his death Benedict III was elected by the clergy and people of Rome; but owing to the setting up of a pretender to the papacy (Gemma), he was deposed. After the content of Anastasius, he was not consecrated until 29 Sept. Coins exist which bear both the image of Benedict III and of the Emperor Lothair, who died 28 Sept., 855 (Garampi, "De nummo argenteo Benedicti III.", Rome, 1749); therefore Benedict must have been recognized as pope before the last-mentioned date.

On 7 Oct., 855, Benedict III issued a charter for the Abbey of Corvey (Jaffé, "Regesta Pont. Rom.", 2nd ed., n. 2863). Hinemar, Archbishop of Reims, in his vita of St. Remigius, who died 26 July, 836, says that he had sent to Leo IV learned on his way of the death of this pope, and therefore handed his petition to Benedict III, who decided it (Hinemar, ep. xi in P. L., CXXVI, 85). All these witnesses prove the correctness of the dates given in the lives of Leo IV and Benedict III, with the exception that the former, as we have seen, between these two popes, so that at this place there is no room for the alleged popess. Further, it is even less probable that a popess could be inserted in the list of popes about 1100, between Victor III (1067) and Urban II (1088-99) or Paschal II (1099-1110), as is suggested by the chronicle written by Jean de Mailly.

This fable of a Roman popess seems to have had an earlier counterpart at Constantinople. Indeed, in his letter to Michael Cerularius (1053), Leo IX says that he would not believe what he heard, namely that the Church of Constantinople had already seen eunuchs, indeed even a woman, in its episcopal chair (Manas "Concil.", IX, 635 sq.). The origin of the whole legend of Popess Joan, different hypotheses have been advanced. Bellarmine (De Romano Pontifice, III, 24) believes that the tale was brought from Constantinople to Rome. Baronius (Annales ad a. 879, n. 5) conjectures that the tradition emanated effeminately with the Greek Church in Byzantium (VII, 872-82) in dealing with the Greeks may have given rise to the story. Mai has shown (Nova Collectio Patr., I, Proleg., xlvii) that Photius of Constantinople (De Spir. Sanct. Myst., lxxxix) refers emphatically three times to this popes as "the Manly", as though he would remove from him the stigma of effeminacy. Other historians point to the degradation of the papacy in the tenth century, when so many popes bore the name John; it seemed therefore a fitting name for the legendary popess. Thus Aventinus sees in the story a satire on John IX; Blondel, a satire on John XI; Panvinio (note ad Platina, De vita Rom. Pont.) applies it to John XII, while Neander (Kirchengesch., II, 200) understands it as applicable generally to the baneful female influence on the papacy during the tenth century. Other investigators endeavour to find in various occurrences and reports a real historical foundation for the story. Thus M. Allatius (Dis. Fab. de Joanna Papissa) connects it with the false prophetess Theota, condemned at the Synod of Mainz (847); Leibniz recalls the story that an alleged bishop Johannes Anglicus came to Rome and was there recognized as a woman. The legend has also been connected with the Isadora Decretals, e.g., by Karl Blascus ("Diatribe de Joanna Papissa", Naples, 1779), and Gförrer (Kirchengesch., III, iii, 978).

Döllinger's explanation has met with more general approval ("Papstfabeln", Munich, 1863, 7-45). More recognizes the fable of Popess Joan as a survival of some local Roman folk-tale originally connected with certain ancient monuments and peculiar customs. An ancient statue discovered in the reign of Sixtus V, in a street near the Colosseum, which showed a figure with a child, was popularly considered to represent the popess. In the same street a monument was discovered with an inscription at the end of which occurred the well-known formula P. P. P. (propin peuculid posuit) together with a prefixed name which read: Pop. (Papirius) pater potrum. This could easily have given origin to the inscription mentioned by John, who would thus have been an effeminate popess. The pope did not pass along this street in solemn procession (perhaps on account of its narrowness). Further it was noticed that, on the occasion of his formal inauguration in front of the Lateran Basilica, the newly-elected pope always seated himself on a marble chair. This seat was an ancient bath-stool, of which
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there were many in Rome; it was merely made use of by the pope to rest himself. But the imagination of the pope was not the only reason why so many of the pope was thereby tested, in order to prevent any further instance of a woman attaining to the Chair of St. Peter. Erroneous explanations—such as were often excogitated in the Middle Ages in connexion with ancient monuments—and popular imagination are responsible for the third of "Portait"--Joan" that unctural chroniclers, since the middle of the thirteenth century, dignified by consigning it to their pages.

Quintus Sixius, Vite Fisumica (Venice, 1557); Idem, Vita de Plutarchum, De vita Romanorum Principum (Louvain, 1571); BARCHUS, Annales, ad ann. 879; Leo Allatius, Diarium, it was expunged from the Papian (1557); LEIBNIZ, Flora saprce in tumulam Papinica in Bibliotheca historica (Gottingen, 1758), 287 sqg.; HEMANN, Dissertation de origine et fabula de Joanne Pastoris (Gottingen, 1732); DOLLINGER, Papstgeburt (Munich, 1863), 7-45; HERBST, Kirchengeschichte, 4th ed. by KIRCH, II, 109-111, 2016.

J. P. FIERCE.

Joanna of Portugal, Blessed, b. at Lisbon, 16 February, 1452; d. at Aveiro, 12 May, 1490; the daughter of Alfonso V, King of Portugal, and his wife Elizabeth. She is chiefly remarkable for the courage and persistency with which she opposed all attempts on the part of her father and brother to make her marry. She had resolved from childhood to be the spouse of Christ, and, when possible, to enter the religious state; but, being the next heir to the throne in default of male issue, her wish was particularly obnoxious to her family and to the country. Joanna was very beautiful, and her hand was sought by several princes. Once, in her father's absence, she had to act as regent of the kingdom, and in that office is said to have shown great capacity.

After many struggles, she entered the Dominican house called the Convent of Jesus, at Aveiro, where the rule was severe and very strictly kept. For a time she was compelled, for political reasons, to leave it and go back to Court. Finally, however, she was pressing; and her life in the convent was so penitential, holy, and heroically humble, that she died in the odour of sanctity, and miracles followed her decease.


F. M. CAPE.

Joannes Anglicus. See BACON, JOHN.

Joannes Cantabrigiensis. See HEBSTARG.

Joannes de Sacrobosco (JOHN HOLYWOOD), a monk of English origin, lived in the first half of the thirteenth century as professor of astronomy at Paris; d. in that city, 1256. He owed his reputation as an astronomer chiefly to his astronomical textbook "De Sphaera," which was used at many universities for several centuries. There is much difference of opinion as to the place and time of his birth. As the Latinized name de Sacrobosco (de Sacrobusto or Sacarobusus) seems to be a translation of the English name Holywood or Holybush, many say that Hollywood (now Halifax), in Yorkshire, was his birthplace. Others give it as Oxford; and a vague tradition agues that he came from Nithdale in Scotland. John went to studies at Oxford, but soon came to France, where, as a contemporary of St. Thomas Aquinas, he proved himself an efficient teacher of mathematics and astronomy. As many were deterred from undertaking the study of astronomy by such tedious and to a great extent obscure works, the labours of Sacrobosco, and Albategnus, Holywood wisely resolved to write a compendium of spherica astronomy, which professors of this branch of knowledge could use as a textbook in their course of instruction. How well-timed his work was is shown by the numerous editions (amounting to almost one hundred) published before the middle of the seventeenth century, that is to say, before the new Copernican theory was generally adopted. The first printed copy dates from 1472, e.g., by Rhotof (1462), Giraldi (1494), and Capua, Fabri (1495); Georgi, Boneti (1500), etc. Among the best known is the commentary of Father Christopher Clavius, S. J., which also saw many editions. In spite of the numerous revisions which Sacrobosco's book went through, indeed perhaps even owing to them, the work still preserved the proper historical appreciation of the different questions which exercised men's minds from the thirteenth century onwards to the time of the reform of astronomy under Copernicus, Kepler, and Newton. Sacrobosco also wrote a treatise on the computation of feast days (Computus), a tract on arithmetic (Algorithmus), and a small work in the field of practical geometry (De Compositione quadrantis simplicis et compositi et utilisatis usurisque). In the latter there is one of the oldest examples of the figures then found almost invariably on the reverse of the so-called armillary spherab, a graduated quadrant, one could obtain the different hours of the day from the observation of the sun's height.

DELMARE, Hist. de l'Astronomie du Moyen Age (Paris, 1818); Bull. Univ. (Paris, 1855); S. v. Joannes de Sacrobosco, der Astronomie (Munich, 1877); HOUFBE, Vade-mecum de l'Astronomie (Brussels, 1883); CANTOR, Gesch. der Mathematik, II (Leipzig, 1900).

ADOLF MULLER.

Joannes de Turrecremata. See TORQUEMADA, JUAN DE.

Joan of Arc (Jeanne d'Arc), Blessed, by her contemporaries commonly known as la Pucelle (the Maid); b. at Domremy in Champagne, probably on 6 January, 1412; d. at Rouen, 30 May, 1431. The village of Domremy lay upon the confines of territory which recognized the suzerainty of the Duke of Bourgundy, but in the protracted conflict between the Armagnacs (one party of Charles VII, King of France), on the one hand, and the Burgundians in alliance with the English, on the other, Domremy had always remained loyal to Charles. Jacques d'Arc, Joan's father, was a small peasant farmer, poor but not needy. Joan seems to have been the youngest of a family of five. She had learned to read or write but she was skilled in sewing and spinning, and the popular idea that she spent the days of her childhood in the pastures, alone with the sheep and cattle, is quite unfounded. All the witnesses in the process of rehabilitation spoke of her as a singularly pious child, grave beyond her years, who often knelt in the church absorbed in prayer, and loved the poor tenderly. Great attempts were made at Joan's trial to connect her with some superstitious practices supposed to have been performed round a certain tree, popularly known as the "Fairy Tree" (L'Arbre des Dames), but the sincerity of her answers baffled her judges; she was sung and danced there with the other children, and had woven wreaths for Our Lady's statue, but since she was twelve years old she had lived aloof from such diversions.

It was at the age of thirteen and a half, in the summer of 1425, that Joan first became conscious of that mysterious manifestation, whose supernatural nature and now is rash to question, which she afterwards came to call her "voices" or her "counsel." It was at first simply a voice, as if someone had spoken quite close to her, but it seems also clear that a blaze of light accompanied it, and that later on she clearly discerned in some way the appearance of those who spoke to her, recognizing them individually as St. Michael (who
was accompanied by other angels), St. Margaret, St. Catherine, and others. Joan was always reluctant to speak of her voices. She said nothing about them to her confessor, and constantly refused, at her trial, to be inveigled into descriptions of the appearance of the saints and to explain how she recognized them. None the less, she told her judges: "I saw them with those very eyes, as well as I see you." Great efforts have been made by rationalistic historians, and most recently by M. Anatole France, to explain these voices as the result of a condition of religious and hysterical exaltation which had been fostered in Joan by priestly influence, combined with certain prophecies current in the country-side of a maiden from the bata chenu (oak wood), near which the Fairy Tree was situated, who was to save France by miracle. But the baselessness of this analysis of the phenomena has been fully exposed by Mr. Andrew Lang ('The Maid of France', 1900, 25 sq.) and other non-Catholic writers. There is not a shadow of evidence to support this theory of priestly advisers couching Joan in a part, but much which contradicts it. Moreover, unless we accuse the Maid of deliberate falsehood,

which no one is prepared to do, it was the voices which created the state of patriotic exaltation, and not the exaltation which preceded the voices. Her evidence on these points is clear.

Although Joan never made any statement as to the date at which the voices received her mission, it seems certain that the call of God was only made known to her gradually. But by May, 1428, she no longer doubted that she was hidden to go to the help of the king, and the voices became insistent, urging her to present herself to Robert Baudricourt, who commanded for Charles VII in the neighboring town of Vaucouleurs. This journey she eventually accomplished a month later, but Baudricourt, a rude and dissolute soldier, treated her and her mission with scorn, respect, saying to the cousin who accompanied her: "Take her home to her father and give her a good whipping." Meanwhile the military situation of King Charles and his supporters was growing more imminent. Orleans was invested (12 October, 1428), and by the close of the year complete defeat seemed imminent. Joan's voices became urgent, and even threatening. It was in vain that she resisted, saying to them: "I am a poor girl; I must now have you to ride or fight." The voices only reiterated: "It is God who commands it." Yielding at last, she left Domremy in January, 1429, and again visited Vaucouleurs. Baudricourt was still sçcceptual, but, as she stayed on in the town, her persistence gradually made an impression on him. On 19 Feb, she announced a great defeat which had befallen the French army near Orleans—La Treille and the Herringies. As this statement was officially confirmed a few days later, her cause gained ground.

Finally she was suffered to seek the king at Château, and she made her way there with a slender escort of three men-at-arms, she being attired, at her own request, in male costume—undoubtedly as a protection to her modesty in the rough life of the camp. She always slept fully dressed, and all those who were intimate with her declared that there was something lovely about her which represented every unseemly thought in her regard. She reached Château on 6 March, and two days later was admitted into the presence of Charles VII. To test her, the king had disguised himself, but she at once saluted him without hesitation among a group of attendants. From the beginning a strong suspicion rested at the king, and foremost amongst them—opposed her as a crazy visionary, but a secret sign, communicated to her by her voices, which she made known to Charles, led the king, somewhat half-heartedly, to believe in her mission.

What this sign was, Joan never revealed, but it is now most commonly believed that this "secret of the king" was a doubt which Charles had conceived of the legitimacy of his birth, and which Joan had been supernaturally authorized to set at rest. Still, before Joan could be employed in military operations she was sent to Poitiers to be examined by a numerous committee of learned bishops and doctors. The examination was of the most searching and formal character. It is regrettable in the extreme that the minutes of the proceedings, to which Joan frequently appealed later on in her trial, have altogether perished. All that we know is that her ardent faith, simplicity, and honesty made a favourable impression. The theologians found nothing heretical in her claims to supernatural guidance, and, without pronouncing upon the reality of her mission, thought that she might be safely employed and further tested.

Returning to Château, Joan made her preparations for the campaign. Instead of the sword the king offered her, she begged that search might be made for an ancient sword buried, as she averred, behind the altar in the chapel of Ste-Catherine-de-Fierbois. It was found in the very spot her voices indicated. There was made for her at the same time a standard bearing the words Jesus, Maria, with a picture of God the Father, and kneeling angels presenting a fleur-de-lis. But perhaps the most interesting fact connected with this early stage of her mission is a letter of one Sire de Rotselaer written from Lyons on 22 April, 1429, which was delivered at Brussels and duly registered, as the manuscript of this day and the events referred to received their fulfillment. The Maid, he reports, said: "that she would save Orleans and would compel the English to raise the siege, that she herself in a battle before Orleans would be wounded by a shaft but would not die of it, and that the King, in the course of the coming summer, would be crowned at Rheims, together with other things which the King keeps secret." (See the facsimile in Wallo, "Jeanne d'Arc", p. 86.) Before entering upon her campaign, Joan summoned the King of England to withdraw his troops from French soil. The English commissioners were furious at the audacity of this demand, but Joan by a rapid movement entered Orleans on 30 April. Her presence there at once worked wonders. By 8 May the English forts which encircled the city had all been captured, and the siege raised, though on the 7th Joan was wounded in the breast by an arrow. As far as the Maid went, her triumph was complete, partly from a sound warlike instinct, partly because her voices had already told her that she had only a year to last. But the king and his advisers, especially La Trémoille and the Archbishop of Reims, were slow to move. However, at an earnest entreaty a short campaign was begun upon the Sino, which, though a series of defeats, ended on 18 June with a great victory at Patay, where the English reinforcements sent from Paris under Sir John
Fastol were completely routed. The way to Reims was now practically open, but the Maid had the greatest difficulty in persuading the commanders not to retire before Troyes, which was at first closed against them. They captured the town, and then, still reluctantly, followed her to Reims, where, on Sunday, 17

July, 1429, Charles VII was solemnly crowned, the Maid standing by with her standard, for—as she explained—"as it had shared in the toil, it was just that it should share in the victory".

The principal aim of Joan's mission was thus attained, and some authorities assert that it was now her wish to return home, but that she was detained with the army against her will. The evidence is to some extent conflicting, and it is probable that Joan herself did not always speak in the same tone. Probably she saw clearly how much might have been done to bring about the speedy expulsion of the English from French soil, but on the other hand she was constantly oppressed by the apathy of the king and his advisers, and by the suicidal policy which snatched at every diplomatic bait thrown out by the Duke of Burgundy.

An abortive attempt on Paris was made at the end of August. Though St-Denis was occupied without opposition, the assault which was made on the city on 8 Sept. was not seriously supported, and Joan, while heroically cheering on her men to fill the moat, was shot through the thigh with a bolt from a crossbow. The Due d'Alençon removed her almost by force, and the assault was abandoned. The reverse unquestionably impaired Joan's prestige, and shortly afterwards, when, through Charles' political counselors, a truce was signed with the Duke of Burgundy, she sadly laid down her arms upon the altar of St-Denis. The inactivity of the following winter, mostly spent amid the worldliness and the jealousy of the Court, must have been a miserable experience for Joan. It may have been with the idea of consoling her that Charles, on 29 Dec., 1429, ennobled the Maid and all her family, who henceforward, from the lilies on their coat of arms, were known by the name of Du Lis. It was April before Joan was able to take the field again at the conclusion of the truce, and at Meulan her voices made known to her that she would be taken prisoner before Midsummer Day. Neither was the fulfilment of this prediction long delayed. It seems that she had thrown herself into Compiègne on 24 May at sunrise to defend the town against Burgundian attack. In the evening she resolved to attempt a sortie, but her little troop of some five hundred encoun-

tered a much superior force. Her followers were driven back and retired desperately fighting. By some mistake or panic of Guillaume de Flavy, who commanded in Compiègne, the drawbridge was raised while still many of those who had made the sortie remained outside, Joan amongst the number. She was pulled down from her horse and became the prisoner of a follower of John of Luxemburg. Guillaume de Flavy has been accused of deliberate treachery, but there seems no adequate reason to suppose this. He continued to hold Compiègne resolutely for his king, while Joan's constant thought during the early months of her captivity was to escape and come to assist him in his task of defending the town.

No words can adequately describe the disgraceful ingratitude and apathy of Charles and his advisers in leaving the Maid to her fate. If military force had not availed, they had prisoners like the Earl of Suffolk in their hands, for whom she could have been exchanged. Joan was sold by John of Luxemburg to the English for a sum which would be the equivalent of £22,000 (about $110,000) in modern money. There can be no doubt that the English, partly because they feared their prisoner with a superstitious terror, partly because they were ashamed of the dread which she inspired, were determined at all costs to take her life. They could not put her to death for having beaten them, but they could get her sentenced as a witch and a heretic. Moreover, they had a tool ready to their hand in Pierre Cauchon, the Bishop of Beauvais, an unscrupulous and ambitious man who was the creature of the Burgundian party. A pretext for invoking his authority was found in the fact that Compiègne, where Joan was captured, lay in the Diocese of Beauvais. Still, as Beauvais was in the hands of the French, the trial took place at Rouen—the latter see being at that time vacant. This raised many points of technical legality which were summarily settled by the parties interested. The Vicar of the Inquisition at first, upon some scruple of jurisdiction, refused to attend, but this difficulty was overcome before the trial ended. Throughout the trial Cauchon's assessors consisted almost entirely of Frenchmen, for the most part theologians and doctors of the University of Paris. Preliminary meetings of the court took place in January, but it was only on 21 Feb., 1431, that Joan appeared for the first time before her judges. She was not allowed an advocate, and, though accused in an ecclesiastical court, she was throughput illegally confined in the Castle of Rouen, a secular prison, where she was guarded by dissolute English soldiers. Joan bitterly complained of this. She asked to be in the church prison, where she would have had female attendants. It was undoubtedly for the better protection of her modesty under such conditions that she persisted in retaining her male attire. Before she had been handed over to the English, she had attempted to escape by desperately throwing herself from the window of the tower of Beaurevoir, an act of seeming presumption for which she was much browbeaten by her judges. This also served as a pro-
text for the harshness shown regarding her confinement at Rouen, where she was at first kept in an iron cage, with the necks, hands, and feet. On the other hand she was allowed no spiritual privileges—e.g. attendance at Mass—on account of the charge of heresy and the monstrous dress (difformitate habitus) she was wearing.

As regards the official record of the trial, which, so far as the Latin version goes, seems to be preserved entire, we may probably trust its accuracy in all that relates to the questions asked and the answers returned by the prisoner. These answers are in every way favourable to Joan. Her simplicity, piety, and good sense appear at every turn, despite the attempts of the judges to confuse her. They pressed her regarding her visions, but upon many points she refused to answer. Her attitude was always fearless, and, upon 1 March, Joan boldly announced that “within seven years’ space the English would have to forfeit a bigger price than Orleans”. In point of fact Paris was lost to Henry VI on 12 Nov., 1437—six years and eight months afterwards. It was probably because the Maid’s answers perceptibly won sympathizers for her in a large assembly that Cauchon decided to conduct the rest of the enquiry before a small committee of judges in the prison itself. We may remark that the only matter in which any charge of prevarication can be reasonably urged against Joan’s replies occurs especially in this stage of the enquiry. Joan, pressed about the secret sign given to the king, declared that an angel brought him a golden crown, but on further questioning she seems to have grown confused and to have contradicted herself. Most authorities (like, e.g., M. Petit de Julleville and Mr. Andrew Lang) are agreed that she was trying to guard the king’s secret behind an allegory, herself being the angel; but others—for instance F. Ayroles and Canon Dunand—insistuate that the accuracy of the procès-verbal cannot be trusted. On another point she was prejudiced by her lack of education. The judges asked her to submit herself to “the Church Militant”. Joan clearly did not understand the phrase and, though willing and anxious to appeal to the pope, grew puzzled and confused. It was asserted later that Joan’s reluctance to pledge herself to a simple acceptance of the Church’s decisions was due to some insidious advice treacherously imparted to her to work her ruin. But the accounts of this alleged perfidy are contradictory and improbable.

The examinations terminated on 17 March. Seventy propositions were then drawn up, forming a very disorderly and unfair presentation of Joan’s “grimes”, but, after she had been permitted to hear and reply to these, another set of twelve were drafted, better arranged and less extravagantly worded. With this summary of her misdeeds before them, a large majority of the twenty-two judges who took part in the deliberations declared Joan’s visions and voices to be “false and diabolical”, and they decided that if she refused to retract she was to be handed over to the secular arm—which was the same as saying that she was to be burned. Certain formal admonitions, at first, private, and then public, were administered to the poor victim (18 April and 2 May), but she refused to make any submission which the judges could have considered satisfactory. On 9 May she was threatened with torture, but she still held firm. Meanwhile, the twelve propositions were submitted to the University of Paris, which, being extravagantly English in sympathy, denounced the Maid in violent terms. Strong in this approval, the judges, forty-seven in number, held a final deliberation, where two reconfirmed that Joan ought to be declared heretical, but the third, adhering to the civil power, if she still refused to retract. Another admonition followed in the prison on 22 May, but Joan remained unshaken. The next day a stake was erected in the cemetery of St-Ouen, and in the presence of a great crowd she was solemnly admonished for the last time. After a courageous protest against the preacher’s insulting reflections on her king, Charles VII, the accessories of the scene seem at last to have worked upon mind and body worn out by so many struggles. Her courage for once failed her. She consented to sign some sort of retractation, but what the precise terms of that retractation were will never be known. In the official record of the process a form of retractation is inserted which is most humiliating in every particular. It is a long document which would have taken half an hour to read. What was read aloud to Joan and was signed by her must have been something quite different, for five witnesses at the rehabilitation trial, including Jean Massieu, the official who had himself read it aloud, declared that it was only a matter of a few lines. Even so, the poor victim did not sign unconditionally, but plainly declared that she only retracted in so far as it was God’s will. However, in virtue of this concession, Joan was not then burned, but conducted back to prison.

The English and Burgundians were furious, but Cauchon, it seems, placated them by saying, “We shall have her yet.” Undoubtedly her position would now, in case of a relapse, be worse than before, for no second retractation could save her from the flames. Moreover, as one of the priests upon which she had been condemned was the wear-
ing of male apparel, a resumption of that attire would alone constitute a relapse into heresy, and this with her enemies were determined to have her blood upon some pretext, once more put on the man’s dress which had been purposely left in her way. The end now came soon. On 29 May a court of thirty-seven judges decided unanimously that the Maid must be treated as a relapsed heretic, and this sentence was carried out the next day (30 May 1431) amid circumstances of intense pathos. She is said, when the judges visited her early in the morning, first to have charged Cauchon with the responsibility of her death, solemnly appealing from him to God, and afterwards to have declared that “her voices had deceived her.” About this last speech a doubt must always be felt. We cannot be sure whether such words were ever used, and, even if they were, the meaning is not plain. She was, however, allowed to make her confession and to receive Communion. Her demeanour at the stake was such as to move even her bitter enemies to tears, for a cry, which she had embraced it, was held up before her while she called continuously upon the name of Jesus. “Until the last,” said Manchon, the recorder at the trial “she declared that her voices came from God and had not deceived her.” After death her ashes were thrown into the Seine.

Twenty-four years later a revision of her trial, the procès de réhabilitation, was opened at Paris with the consent of the Holy See. The popular feeling was then very different, and, with but the rarest exceptions, all the witnesses were eager to render their tribute to the virtues of the Maid. Her trial had been conducted without reference to the pope, indeed it was carried out in defiance of the Maid’s appeal to the head of the Church. Now an appellate court constituted by the pope, after long inquiry and examination of witnesses, reversed and annulled the sentence pronounced by a local tribunal under Cauchon’s presidency. The illegality of the former proceedings was made clear, and it speaks well for the sincerity of this new inquiry that it could not be made without inflicting some degree of reproach upon both the King of France and the Church at large. The case of the Maid had been drawn out and had so long been suffered to continue undressed. Even before the rehabilitation trial, keen observers, like Zénée Sylvius Piccolomini (afterwards Pope Pius II), though still in doubt as to her mission, had discerned something of the heavenly character of the Maid. In Shakespeare’s day she was still regarded in England as a witch in league with the fiends of hell, but a juster estimate had begun to prevail even in the pages of Speed’s “History of Great Britain” (1611). By the beginning of the nineteenth century the sympathy for her even in England was general. Such was the case of the late Sir John Flamsteed, Turner, Landor, and, above all, De Quincey greeted the Maid with a tribute of respect which was not surpassed even in her own native land. Among her Catholic fellow-countrymen she had been regarded, even in her lifetime, as Divinely inspired. At last the cause of her beatification was opened on occasion of the papal visit to England in 1689, by Mgr Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, and, after passing through all its stages and being duly confirmed by the necessary miracles, the process ended in the decree being published by Pius X on 11 April, 1909. A Mass and Office of Blessed Joan, taken from the Commune de l’Escurial in Spain, have been approved by the Holy See for use in the Diocese of Orleans.

Some account of Joan of Arc will be found in most general encyclopaedias as well as in every history of England. Lingard’s estimate, however, is curiously nationalistic and almost depreciatory. For a compendious and sympathetic narrative which is recommended we may recommend P.L.T. de Julliéville, Jeanne d’Arc in ses faits et ses temps (Paris, 1902); DUMAND, Études et documents (5 vols., Paris, 1905); Roehl, Jeanne d’Arc (3 vols., Paris, 1899). The tone of both these last-named writers is receptively polemical. WALDON, Vie de Jeanne d’Arc (Paris, 1877), and DEBOUT, Joan of Arc (Paris, 1896, translated into English by A. M. Bungay), are also interesting. The most useful of the various contemporary chronicles, such as the Chronicque de la France, the Journal du siege d’Orléans, the Journal d’un bourgeois de Paris, etc., have also been incorporated in these five volumes. Some fresh material, especially in the reign of Charles VII, collections of gestes that have accumulated since ascribed to Chaucer’s time. The greater part will be found translated into French in the work of Ayoles. The edition of commendation has been translated into French by Vallet de Virville (1867), and both trials by POULAC (1894). There is a version in English by MURRAY, Jeanne d’Arc; The Maid of Her Life (London, 1902).

NON-CATHOLIC BIOGRAPHIES.—Foremost among these may be mentioned LANGE, La vie de Jeanne d’Arc (Paris, 1908), of which a modified French presentation, entitled La Jeune d’Arc d’Anatole France (Paris, 1908), but in which the book loses some of its intimate appeal of M. France, though it is full of the most devoted sympathy for the Maid. LOWELL, Joan of Arc (New York, 1898), is also an excellent biography. MARSHALL, Joan of Arc (New York, 1898), is thrown into the form of an imaginary memoir. Among a number of works which of late years have pretended to explain the social processes and the victories of the Maid upon a purely natural basis of hallucination and ecclesiastical suggestion, one of the most important is the translation, Fausse Jeanne d’Arc, 1884). No better criticisms of his theories can be recommended than the work of Lang mentioned above.

MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES.—Only a few works of special importance can be mentioned here: QUICHERAT, La Parcourant en some other parts, 1915, etc., is a work which has been the subject of much discussion which has remained the work of the Maid even more of interest. LEW, Jeanne d’Arc à Domremy (Paris, 1806), though thoroughly rationalistic, has collected valuable facts. These books have been answered in detail by Duhem and Duhem. Other works dealing with particular points are GOLAY, Jeanne d’Arc et son temps (La Bessière, 1897); BEYER, Jeanne d’Arc (Paris, 1897); Guillaume de Flavy (Paris, 1898); SARRASIN, Joanne de Cauchon (Paris, 1901); DUMAS, Jeanne d’Arc et l’Université de Paris (1907), which much fuller bibliography will be found in Chavelier, Bio-bibl.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Job (Heb. יב), one of the books of the Old Testament, and the chief personage in it. In this article it is primarily the book which is treated. As opportunity, however, occurs, and so far as is permissible, Job himself will be considered. The subject will be discussed under the following heads: I. Position of the Book in the Canon; II. Authority; III. The Characters of the Poem; IV. Contents; V. Arrangement of the Main, Poetic Portion of the Book; VI. Design of the Book; VII. Teaching as to the Future Life; VIII. Integrity of the Book; IX. Condition of the Text; X. Technical Skill of the Author and the Metre; XI. Time of its Composition.

I. Position of the Book in the Canon.—In the Hebrew Bible Psalms, Proverbs, and Job are always placed together, the Psalms coming first, while Job is put between the other two or, at times, comes last. The three books form a part of the Hagiographa (Ketubim), having sometimes the first place among the Hagiographa in the Hebrew Bible (as in the Vulgate), but sometimes placed by Ruth, or Paralipomenon, or Paralipomenon with Ruth (cf. lists in Ginsburg, “Introduction to Heb. Bible” (London, 1897, 7). In the Greek Bible and the Vulgate Job now stands before Psalms and follows directly after the historical books. The old Greek and the Latin MS. traditions are in opposition; see, for example, the list of Melito of Sardis, and that of Origen as given by Eusebius, “Hist.
II. Authority.—(1) Historical Accuracy.—Many look upon the entire contents of the book as a freely invented parable which is neither historical nor intended to be considered historical; no such man as Job ever lived. Catholic commentators, however, almost without exception, hold Job to have actually existed and his personality to have been preserved by popular tradition. Nothing in the text makes it necessary to doubt his historical existence. The Scriptures seem repeatedly to take this for granted (cf. Ezek., xiv, 14; James, v, 11). There is no such name as Job in the Greek text of Tobias (there is no mention of Job). All the Fathers considered Job an historical person; some of their testimonies may be found in Knabenbauer, "Zu Job" (Paris, 1886), 12-13. The Martyrology of the Latin Church mentions Job on 10 May, that of the Greek Church on 6 May (cf. Acta SS., II, May, 494). The Book of Job, therefore, has a kernel of fact, with which have been united many imaginative additions that are not strictly historical. What is related by the poet in the prose prologue and epilogue is in the main historical: the persons of the hero and heroine, the region where he lived; his wealth, fortune and virtues; the great misfortune that overcame him and the patience with which he bore it; the restoration of his prosperity. It is also to be accepted that Job and his friends discussed the origin of his sufferings, and that in so doing views were expressed similar to those the poet puts into the mouths of his characters. The details of the execution, the poetic form, and the art shown in the arrangement of the arguments in the dispute are, however, the free creation of the author. The figures expressive of the wealth of Job both before and after his trial are imaginatively rounded. Also in the narrative of the misfortunes it is impossible not to recognize a poetic conception which need not be considered as strictly historical. The scene in heaven (i, 6; ii, 1) is plainly an allegory which shows that the Providence of God guides the destiny of man (cf. St. Thomas, In Job). The method of God (xxviii, 1-4) is generally received as a literal interpretation from commentators. St. Thomas, however, remarks that it may also be taken metaphorically as an inner revelation accorded to Job.

(2) Divine Authority of the Book.—The Church teaches that the book was inspired by the Holy Spirit. Thus all that its author gives as historical fact or otherwise, is guaranteed as true by the divine witness. The question, however, arises, what does the book guarantee? (a) Everything in prologue or epilogue that is the comment of the author is Divine truth; nevertheless, what is perhaps poetic ornament must not be confounded with historical verity or objective dogmatic propositions. The statements by the utterances assigned by the poet to God. The like is true of the speeches of Elihu. Some think the speeches of Elihu are to be judged just as are those of Job and his friends. (b) The speeches of Job and his three friends have in themselves no Divine authority, but only such human importance as Job and his three friends are personally entitled to. They have, however, Divine authority when, and in as far as, they are approved by the author expressly or tacitly. In general, such tacit approbation is to be understood for all points concerning which the disputants agree, unless the author, or God, or Elihu, shows disapproval. Thus the words of Job have in large degree Divine authority, because the view he maintains against the three friends is plainly characterized by the author as the one relatively correct. Yet much that the three friends say is of equal importance, because it is at least tacitly approved. St. Paul argues (I Cor., iii, 19) from a speech of Eliaphas (Job, v, 13) as from an inspired writing. (c) In particular places, especially of things about which no sameness of other sacred matters are referred to, the caution prescribed by the rules of hermeneutics should be observed.

III. The Characters of the Poem.—Apart from the prologue and epilogue, the Book of Job consists of a succession of speeches assigned to distinct persons. There are six speakers: Yahweh, Eliu, Job, and Job's three friends, Eliphaz, Baldad, and Sophar.

(1) Job.—The chief personality is Job. (a) Name.—He is called the "persecuted one", that is, the one tempted by (personified) suffering, the one hard pressed, the patient sufferer. In the same way as יִֽשְׂרָאֵל, "the one born", is related to יִֽשָּׁר, "the per- son", so Job (Ixx, 11) to יִֽשָּׂרָאֵל (xxvi, 11), is related to determine whether the name was originally different and was later changed into the expressive יִֽשָּׂרָאֵל in folklore on account of Job's fate. Many commentators do not accept this explanation of the name.

(b) Age in which Job lived.—According to the usual and well-founded assumption, Job lived long before Moses. This is shown by the great age he attained. He was no longer young when overtaken by his great misfortune (xii, 12; xxx, 1); after his restoration he lived one hundred and forty years longer (xili, 10). His wealth, like that of the Patriarchs, consisted largely in flocks and herds (i, 3; xxviii, 12); furthermore, the piece of money mentioned in xili, 11, belongs to patriarchal times; the only other places in which the expression occurs are Gen., xiii, 19, and Jos., xxiv, 32. The musical instruments referred to (xxi, 12; xxx, 31) are only those mentioned in Genesis (Gen., iv, 21; xxxi, 27); organ, harp, and timbrel. Job himself offers sacrifice as the father of the family (i, 5), as was also the custom of the Patriarchs. An actual offering for sin in the Mosaic sense he was not acquainted with; the holocaust took its place (i, 5; xili, 8).

(c) Religion of Job.—Job evidently did not belong to the chosen people. He lived, indeed, outside of Palestine. He and the other characters betray no knowledge of the specifically Israelitic institutions. Even the name of God peculiar to the chosen people, Yahweh, is carefully avoided by the speakers in the poetic part of the book, and is only found, as if accidentally, in xili, 9, and according to some Masoretes (xxviii, 28). The sacrifice of Balaam (Num., xxiii, 1), consequently a custom outside of Israel. For the solution of the problem of suffering the revelations made to the Patriarchs or even Moses are never referred to. Nevertheless Job and his friends venerated the one true God. They were known of the people of Edom (i, 2), and the first man (xx, 7, and Hebrew, xxxi, 33).

(d) Country in which Job lived.—Job belonged to the "people of the East" (i, 3). Under this name were included the Arabian (Gen., xxv, 6) and Amaran (Num., xxxiii, 7) tribes which lived east of the Jordan branch of the Euphrates (cf. xxix, 1). Job seems to have been an Amaran, for he lived in the land of Hus (i, 1; יִֽעָל, יַֽעַר). Hus, a man's name in Genesis, is always used there in close connexion with Aram and the Arameans (Gen., x, 23; xxii, 1; xxxvi, 28). His home was certainly not far from Edom where Eliphaz lived, and it must be sought in Eastern Palestine, not too far north, although in the region inhabited by the Amaran. It was located on the border of the Syro-Arabian desert, for it was exposed to the attacks of the marauding bands which wandered through this desert: the Chaldeans, the Medes, the Sabaeans (i, 15), or Arabs. Many, following an old tradition, place the home of Job in the Hauran, in the district of Naiwa (or Neve), which is situated about 36° East of Greenwich and in almost the same latitude as the northern end of Lake Genesareth. The loca-
is accustomed to reward virtue and to punish wickedness (xxvii, 7-23; xxxi). He even threatens his friends with the judgment of God on account of their unfriendly suspicion (vi, 14; xii, 7-12; xvii, 4, 9; xir, 6-15). He rightly thus it is a symbol of Job's wealth. The same name is mentioned in Jer., xxxii, 20, and Lam., iv, 21. In the first reference it is used in a general sense for the whole East; in the latter it is said that the Edomites live there.

(c) The Standing of Job. Job was one of the most important men of the land (xxix, 1-6); he had many bondsmen (xxx, 39). The same is true of the friends who visited him; in the Book of Tobias these are called "kings" (Tob., ii, 15, in Vulgate). In the Book of Job also Job seems to be described as a king with many vassals under him (xxxix). That he had brothers, a holy man, is tried by Satan with severe affictions, in order to test his virtue. In succession Job bears six great temptations with heroic patience, and without the slightest murmuring against God or wavering in loyalty to Him. Then Job's three friends, Eliphaz, Balaad, and Sophar, come to console him. They lower the level of the conversation and the greatest trial.

(2) The poetical, main division of the book presents in a succession of speeches the course of this temptation. The three friends are fully convinced that trouble is always a result of wrongdoing. They consider Job, therefore, a great sinner and stigmatize his assertions of innocence as hypocrisy. Job is hurt by the suspicion of his friends. He protests that he is no evil-doer, that God punishes him against his deserves. In the course of his speech he fails in reverence towards God, Who appears to him not unrighteous, but more as a severe, hard, and somewhat inconsiderate ruler that considers on blasphemy, or that being a poet, he is the language that is poetic, it is true that his expressions cannot be pushed too far, but the sharp reproofs of Eliu (xxxiv, 7-9, 36-37; xxxv, 16) and of Yahweh (xxxviii, 2; xl, 3-9) leave no doubt of his sin. In answering his friends Job emphasizes that God indeed

V. ARRANGEMENT OF THE MAIN, EN'TIC PORTION
of the Book.—(1) The poetic portion of the book may be divided into two sections: chs. iii—xxii and xix—xx. The former include the colloquies: the three friends in turn express their views, while to each speech Job makes a rejoinder. In the second section the three friends are silent, for Baldad's interposition (xxv) is as little a formal discourse as Job's brief comments (xxvii, 34–35 and xlii, 2–6). Job, Elihu, and Yahweh speak successively, and each utters a series of monologues. The length of the two sections is exactly, or almost exactly, the same, namely 510 lines each (cf. Hontheim, "Das Buch Job", Freiburg im Br., 1904, 44). The second division begins with the words: "Now also my words are bitter within me; A. V. - "Even my tongue is connective to bitterness". This shows not only that with these words a new section opens, but also that the monologues were not uttered on the same day as the colloquies. The first monologue is evidently the opening of a new section, not a rejoinder to the previous speech of Eli- phas (xxii).

(2) The colloquies are divided into two series: chs. iii—xiv and xv—xxiii. In each series Eliphaz, Baldad, and Sophia speak in turn in the order given (v—v, vii, xi, and xv, xviii, xx), while Job replies to each of their discourses (vi—vi, ix—xii, xv—xxiii). The first series begins with a lament from Job (iii), and the second closes with a speech by Eliphaz in which he weakly reproaches Job (xxii—xxv—xxvi) it is generally held that this chapter begins a new series, which rightly leaves this address unanswered. Each series contains seven speeches. In the first the friends try to convince Job of his guilt and of the necessity and good results of amendment. Eliphaz appeals to Revelation (iv, 12—21), Baldad to the authority of the Fathers (viii, 8—10), Sophia to understanding or philosophy (xi, 5—12). Eliphaz lays weight on the goodness of God (v, 9—27), Baldad on his justice (vi—vii), Sophia on his power (viii, 16). To which Job's secret sins were plain, even those which Job himself had almost forgotten (xi, 5—12). In the second series of speeches the friends try to terrify Job: one after the other, and in much the same form of address, they point out the terrible punishment which overtakes hidden sin. During the first series of speeches Job's despondency continually increases, even the thought of the future brings him no comfort (xiv, 7—22); in the second series the change to improvement has begun, and Job once more feels joy and hope in the thought of God and the future life (xv, 15—35; xvi, 25—28).

(3) The monologues may also be divided into two series. The first includes the monologues of Job, seven in number. First Job repeats his complaint to God (xxii—xxv), asserts, however, in three speeches his unchangeable devotion to God by lauding in brilliant discourse the power (xxvi), justice (xxvii), and wisdom (xxviii) of the Almighty. Finally in three further speeches he lays his case before God, impairing investigation and recognition of his innocence: How happy was I once (xxx), how unhappy am I now (xxx), and I am not to blame for this change (xxx). The second series contains the discourses of Elihu and Yahweh, also seven in number. In three speeches Elihu explains the sufferings which befell man. Trouble is often a Divine instruction, a warning to the godless to reform (xxxii—xxxiii, 30), thus revealing the goodness of God; it is often simply a punishment of the wicked (xxxii, 34), perhaps in some way better for him (xxxiii, 31—xxxiv), thus revealing the justice of God. Finally, troubles can also overtake the just as a trial which purifies and increases their virtue (xxxv—xxxvii), thus revealing God's unfathomable wisdom. The following four utterances of Yahweh illustrate the influence of the Elohist, already closely united by Elihu, of the Divine wisdom by dwelling upon the unchangeable of the animate nature (xxxviii, 1—38), of the animal world (xxxviii, 39—xxxix), and especially by referring to the great monsters of the animal world, the hippopotamus and the whale. Here the petrol is the first to rebuke Job for expressing himself too despondently and irreverently concerning his sufferings, upon which Job confesses his guilt and promises amendment (xxxix, 31—xl, 9 and xlii, 1—6); it appears that xxxix, 31—xl, 9, should be inserted after xlii.

VII. Teaching as to the Future Life.—In his sufferings Job abandoned all hope for the restoration of health and good fortune in this world (xvii, 11—18; xx, 24—26; xliv, 13). If therefore, is opened up to him a new hope, in its bearing on the ends intended in the government of the world. The Book of Job is further intended for edification, for Job is to us an example of patience. It is, finally, a book of consolation for all sufferers. They learn from it that misfortune is not a sign of hatred, but only a proof of special Divine love. For the mystical explanation of the book, especially of Job as a type of Christ, cf. Knaabenbauer, "In Job", 23—32.

VIII. Integrity of the Book.—Prologue and epilogue (i—ii; xlii, 7 sqq.) are regarded by many as not parts of the original work. The prologue, though, is absolutely essential. Without it the colloquies would be unintelligible, nor would the reader know until near the end whether the sufferings are brought by his own innocence or not. Upon hearing the rebukes of Elihu and Yahweh, he might be exposed to the danger of siding against Job. Without the epilogue the close of the work would be unsatisfactory, an evident humiliation of the righteous. For detailed treatment of this and kindred questions see the previous notes.

(2) Many a wrong ch. xxvii, 7—23, as a later addition; in this passage Job maintains that the
wicked suffer in this world, while elsewhere he has declared the contrary. The answer is: Job teaches that God is accustomed even in this world to reward the good and punish the wicked. In other passages he does not deny this rule, but merely says it has many exceptions. Consequently there is no contradiction. [See above, IV (2).] Besides it may be conceded that Job is not always logical. At the beginning, when his depression is extreme, he lays too much emphasis on the prosperity of the godless; gradually he becomes more composed and corrects somewhat his earlier extreme statements. Not everything that Job says is the doctrine of the book. [See above, II (2).]

(3) Many regard ch. xxviii as doubtful, because it has no connection with what goes before or follows and is in no way related to the subject-matter of the book. The answer to this is that the poet has to show how the suffering of Job does not separate him from God, but, against the intent of Satan, drives him into closer dependence on God. Consequently he represents Job, after his complaints (xxii-xxv), as glorifying God again at once, in which he lauds God’s power and righteousness. The praise of God is brought to a climax in xxviii, where Job extols God’s power and righteousness. After Job has thus surrendered himself to God, he can with full confidence receive the new revelation of the true original. Nearly all the prophets are of the opposite, that the Septuagint was produced by cutting down an original which varied but little from the Massoretic Text. This was also Bickell’s view in earlier years, and is the real state of the case. To avoid repetition and discursive statements, the translators of the Septuagint omitted much, especially where the reading seemed doubtful, translation difficult, the content anthropomorphic, unworthy of Job, or otherwise objectionable. In doing this the translation frequently disregards the fundamental principle of Hebrew poetry, the parallelism of the lines. In brief the critical value of the Septuagint is not great; in almost all instances the Massoretic Text is to be preferred. Taken altogether, the Massoretic has preserved the original form of the consonantal text fairly well, and needs but a moderate amount of critical emendation. The punctuation (vowel signs and accents) the Septuagint translators did not always understand the often difficult text; at times also words are not properly divided.

2. TECHNICAL SKILL OF THE AUTHOR AND THE TEXT.—Chapters ii-xiii, are poetical in form. This impression has been strengthened by the general recognition of the verse form in which do not always correspond with the Massoretic versed of our editions, are generally divided into two clauses or lines which are parallel in content. There are also a number of verses, about sixty, of three clauses each, the so-called triplets. It is an unjustifiable violence to the text when a critic by removing one clause changes these triplets into couplets. The verses form the twenty-eight speeches of the book which, as already stated, make four series of seven speeches each. The speeches are divided, not directly into lines, but into strophes. It is most probable that the speeches formed from strophes often, perhaps always, follow the law of “choral structure” discovered by Father Zenner. That is, the speeches often or always consist of pairs of strophes, divided by intermediate strophes not in pairs. The two strophes forming a pair are parallel in content and have each the same number of words, and the same construction. For this subject see Hontheim, op. cit. Investigators are not agreed as to the construction of the line. Some count the syllables, others only the stresses, others again the accented words. It would seem that the last view is the one to be preferred. There are about 2100 lines in the Book of Job, containing generally three, at times two or four, accented words. Besides

means for judging the Massoretic Text are the old translations made directly from the Hebrew: the Targum, Peshito, Vulgate, Septuagint, and the other Greek translations made from the Hebrew. With the exception of the Septuagint, the original of all these translations was essentially identical with the Massoretic Text; only unimportant differences can be proved. On the other hand, the Septuagint in the form it had before Origen, was about four hundred lines that is one-fifth shorter than the Massoretic Text. Origen supplied what was lacking in the Septuagint from the Greek translations and marked the additions by asterisks. Copyists generally omitted these critical signs, and only a remnant of them, mixed with many errors, has been preserved in a few manuscripts. Consequently knowledge of the old form of the Septuagint is very imperfect. The best means now of restoring it is the Copto-Sahidic translation which followed the Septuagint and does not contain Origen’s additions. This translation was published by Ciasca, “Sacerorum Bibliorum fragmenta Copto-Sahidica” (2 vols., Rome, 1889), and by Amelineau in “Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archeology,” IX (1893), 409-75. Hatch and Bickell claim that the shorter text of the Septuagint is in general the earlier one, consequently that the present Massoretic Text is an expansion of a shorter original. Nearly all the prophets are of the opposite, that the Septuagint was produced by cutting down an original which varied but little from the Massoretic Text. This was also Bickell’s view in earlier years, and is the real state of the case. To avoid repetition and discursive statements, the translators of the Septuagint omitted much, especially where the reading seemed doubtful, translation difficult, the content anthropomorphic, unworthy of Job, or otherwise objectionable. In doing this the translation frequently disregards the fundamental principle of Hebrew poetry, the parallelism of the lines. In brief the critical value of the Septuagint is not great; in almost all instances the Massoretic Text is to be preferred. Taken altogether, the Massoretic has preserved the original form of the consonantal text fairly well, and needs but a moderate amount of critical emendation. The punctuation (vowel signs and accents) the Septuagint translators did not always understand the often difficult text; at times also words are not properly divided.

X. TECHNICAL SKILL OF THE AUTHOR AND THE TEXT.—Chapters ii-xiii, are poetical in form. This impression has been strengthened by the general recognition of the verse form which do not always correspond with the Massoretic versed of our editions, are generally divided into two clauses or lines which are parallel in content. There are also a number of verses, about sixty, of three clauses each, the so-called triplets. It is an unjustifiable violence to the text when a critic by removing one clause changes these triplets into couplets. The verses form the twenty-eight speeches of the book which, as already stated, make four series of seven speeches each. The speeches are divided, not directly into lines, but into strophes. It is most probable that the speeches formed from strophes often, perhaps always, follow the law of “choral structure” discovered by Father Zenner. That is, the speeches often or always consist of pairs of strophes, divided by intermediate strophes not in pairs. The two strophes forming a pair are parallel in content and have each the same number of words, and the same construction. For this subject see Hontheim, op. cit. Investigators are not agreed as to the construction of the line. Some count the syllables, others only the stresses, others again the accented words. It would seem that the last view is the one to be preferred. There are about 2100 lines in the Book of Job, containing generally three, at times two or four, accented words. Besides

• EX. CONNECTION OF THE TEXT.—The most important
Jocelin, Cistercian monk and Bishop of Glasgow; d. at Melrose Abbey in 1199. On 22 April, 1170, being then prior of Melrose, he was chosen abbot, on the resignation of Abbé William, and four years later (23 May, 1174) was elected Bishop of Glasgow at Perth, in succession to Abbot Andrew. He was consecrated at Caen- vaux on 1 June, 1175, by Eustis, Archbishop of Lund, papal legate to Denmark. In the following January he attended a council at Northampton, and Hoveden reports a speech made by him in opposition to the claims of York to jurisdiction over the Scottish Church. In 1182 Jocelin visited Rome, obtained from Lucius III the absolution of King William the Lion from ecclesiastical censures, and brought back to him the Golden Rose in token of the papal forgiveness. We find Jocelin engaged for several succeeding years in negotiations between Scotland and Rome as to the augmentation of the See of St. Andrews. He undertook also the restoration and enlargement of Glasgow cathedral, of which he built the beautiful crypt, and himself performed the dedication ceremony on 6 July, 1197. The number of prebends and canons of the cathedral was considerably augmented by him, and he bestowed large benefactions upon Paris, Kelso, and other monasteries. Bishop Jocelin died at Melrose in 1199, and was buried in the choir of the abbey church. The Melrose Chronicle describes him as a man of mild, courteous, and moderate character.

Jocelin de Brakelond, English chronicler, of the late twelfth century. He was the monk of Bury St. Edmund's whose history of the abbey under the seeble Abbot Hugh and the energetic Abbot Sampson furnished Carlyle with the material for the powerful and sympathetic second book of "Past and Present". When Jocelin entered the abbey in 1173 Sampson was his novice-master, and when nine years later Sampson became abbot he chose Jocelin as his chaplain and constant companion. He filled this office from 1181 to 1183, and in 1183 and 1192 he was almoner. There is no record of his death. He is last mentioned on 24 April, 1215 when Abbot Hugh II consulted him as to the abbey manors. His chronicle covers the history of the abbey from 1173 to 1202 and includes the story of Henry I of England. It was first edited for the Royal Historical Society by J. G. Rokewode in 1843; this edition was used by Carlyle. It has been re-edited by Thomas Arnold in the "Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey", Rolls Series, 1890. His book on St. Robert, the boy alleged to have been murdered by Jews, is not extant. Jocelin's work is marked by shrewd observation and acute humour. Carlyle wrote of him: "The man is of patient, peaceable, loving, clear-smiling nature; open for this and that. A wise simplicity is in him; much natural sense; a veracity that goes deeper than words." He is described by a brother monk as a "man of religious inclinations, a poet and writer."
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Joel (Heb. יְהוָּא, Yeho'aw), the son of Phatuel, second in the list of the twelve Minor Prophets. Nothing is known of him save that he was a priest of the Southern Israelite Kingdom of Judah, and probably its capital Jerusalem, for he repeatedly refers to temple and altar. The frequent apostrophes to the priests (i, 9, 13–14; ii, 17) also lead to the inference that Joel himself was of priestly descent.

CONTENTS OF JOEL.—The seventy-three verses of this small book, in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament, are divided into four, and in the Septuagint and Vulgate into three, chapters, the second and third chapters of the Massoretic text forming one chapter, the second, in the Septuagint and Vulgate. The references given below show the order.

The contents of the Prophecy of Joel may be regarded, taken altogether, as a typical presentation in miniature of the chief themes of prophetic discourse: sombre warnings of the judgment of Jehovah, intended to rouse the people from the existing moral lethargy, and joyful, gloweringly expressed tidings of Jehovah's work of salvation, designed to keep alive the faith in the coming of the Kingdom of God. These two fundamental thoughts seem to be united, as the misfortunes of the judgment are a process of purification to prepare the people for the reception of salvation, and are in reality only the antitheses of the Divine work of redemption. In the first main division of the Book of Joel (i, 2–ii, 17) the prophecies are threatenings of the day of judgment; the prophecies in the second division, which embraces the rest of the book (ii, 18–xxii, 21), are consolatory descriptions of the day of grace. The first of these divisions is divided into two discourses on the judgment: Chapter i, 2–20, describes a terrible scourge, a plague of locusts, with which the Prophet's land had been visited; these pests had so completely devoured the fields that not even the material for the meat-and-drink-offerings existed. For this reason the prophet exclaims in exaltation, "Who among the gods has foretold, and declared from of old, and the Lord has established, and set in array before your eyes?" (i, 17). Chapter ii, 1–17, repeats the same thought more emphatically: all these plagues are only the forerunners of still greater scourges in the day of the Lord, when the land of the Prophet shall become a wilderness. The people must, therefore, return to Jehovah, and the priests must entreat the Lord in the holy place. The prophecies in the second section are also divided into two discourses: in chapter ii, 18–32, the Lord is appealed to by the repentance of the nation and gives the blessing of bounteous harvests. Just as in the earlier part the failure of the harvests was a type and forshadowing of the calamity in the day of judgment, so now the plenty serves as an illustration of the fullness of grace in the kingdom of grace. The Lord will pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, and all who call upon His name shall be saved. In chapter iii, 1–21, the redemption of Israel is, on the other hand, a judgment upon the heathen nations. He shall be king over the house of Jacob, in the four quarters of the earth, upon those who oppressed His people, upon the Philistines, Phenicians, Hitomites, and Egyptians, for the nations are ripe for the harvest in the valley of Josephat.

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF JOEL.—Examined as to logical connexion, the four discourses of Joel show a closely united, compact scheme of thought. In regard to form they are a Biblical model of rhetorical symmetry. The law of rhetorical rhythm, which as the law of harmony regulates the construction of the Prophet, prompts the regular alternation of descriptions in direct or indirect speech, as in the sections given in the first or third person, and in the apostrophes in the second person singular and plural. The first two speeches are alike in construction: Chapter ii, 1–11, resembles i, 2–12, and ii, 12–17, is like i, 12–20. Also in the latter two speeches there is a verbal similarity along with the agreement in thought; cf. in iii, 17, and ii, 27, the like expression. The language of Joel is full of colour, rhythmically animated, and rhythmic. The passages from i, 13 sq., and ii, 17, are still used in the Liturgy of the Church. The study of the prophecy of the pouring out of the spirit upon all flesh (i, 28–32) was afterwards adopted as the first Biblical text of the first Apostolic sermon (Acts, ii, 16–21). Joel's discourses of the day of judgment, and of the abundance of grace which Jehovah in the fullness of time shall bestow from Sion form one of the most beautiful pages in the eschatology of the Prophets. Some of his fiery pictures seem even to have been borrowed by the writer of the Apocalypse of the New Testament (cf. Joel, iii, 13, and Apoc., xiv, 15).

The swarm of locusts, which has so frequently received a symbolic interpretation, is a picture; neither is it a description of the progress of a hostile army under the figure of the imaginary advance of locusts. The passages in iii, 4–7, "They shall run like horses . . . like men of war they shall scale the wall," make it absolutely certain that a hypothetical swarm of locusts was not taken as a symbol of a hostile army, but that, on the contrary, a hostile army is used to typify an actual swarm of locusts. Consequently, Joel refers to a contemporary scourge, and in the rhetorical style of prophecy passes from this to the evils of the day of judgment.

LITURGY ON THE PROPHECIES OF JOEL.—The most difficult problem in the investigation of Joel is the date, and the many hypotheses have not led to any convincing result. The first verse of the book does not convey, as other prophetic books do, a definite date, nor do the discourses contain any references to it. The dates given by the divination of the Prophet. General history took no notice of plagues of locusts which were of frequent occurrence, and it is an arbitrary supposition to interpret the swarm of locusts as the Thycyan horde, which, according to Herodotus (I, 103 sq.; IV, i), devastated the countries of Thrace from Thrace to Egypt between the years 630–620 B.C. The Book of Joel has been variously ascribed to nearly all the centuries of the prophetic era. Rothstein even goes so far as to assign the discourses to various dates, an attempt which must fail on account of the close connexion between the four addresses. The early commentators, in agreement with Jerome, placed the era of composition in the eighth century B.C.; they took Joel, therefore, as a contemporary of Osee and Amos. In justification of this date they pointed out that Joel is placed among the twelve Minor Prophets between Osee and Amos; further, that among the enemies of Judah the book does not mention the Assyrians, who were anathematized by each Prophet from the time they appeared as a power in Asia. However, in a book of three chapters not much weight can be attached to an argument from silence. Those also who assert in placing the book in the time of Charles the Great in identifying the king in whose reign Joel lived. The assignment to the period of King Josias is supported by the fact that Joel takes for his theme the day of the Lord, as does the contemporary Prophet Sophonias; to this may be added that the anathema upon the Egyptians may be influenced by the battle of Megiddo (605 B.C.). Later commentators assign the
book to the period after the Exile, both because chapter iii assumes the dispersal of the Jews among other nations, and because the eschatology of Joel presupposes the later period of Jewish theology. It is, however, impossible for Joel to have written a commentary of the Prophet Malachias, because of the manner in which the former looks upon the priests of his period as perfect leaders and mediators for the nation. None of the chronological hypotheses concerning Joel can claim to possess convincing proof.

See the introduction to the Sermons of CORNELIUS, VICTO-
ROUX, GIGOU, DREYER, CORNILL, and STRACK. For special ques-
tions: FRANKEN, The Prophecy of Joel (Leipzig, 1865); SBAKJAER, De Prophetiae XIIII Libri Commentaria (Copenhagen, 1887); KESSENBACH, Das Zauberer der Propheten Joel (Leipzig, 1890); WEBER, Erkennung (Leipzig, 1897). The Com-
mentaries on Joel—Catholic: SCHOLLE (Würzburg, 1865); KESSENB-
RACH (Paris, 1890); VAN HOOGENBACHT (Paris, 1898), Protes-
tant: SMITH (London, 1837); DAVIES (Cambridge, 1889); ADAMS (London, 1902); NOWACK (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1903); MATZ (Tübingen, 1904); KESSELBRENNER (New York, 1907); ORSINI (3rd ed., Munich, 1908). Further bibliography in commentaries.

MICHAEL FAULHABER.

JOEST (VAN KALKAR), JAN, otherwise JAN JOOST VAN CALCER, Dutch painter, b. at Calcker, or Calcar, about 1460; d. at Haarlem in 1519. This painter was practically unknown until 1574, when Canon Wolff and Dr. Eisenmann established his identity. Joest's greatest works were between 1565 and 1569. He was representing scenes from the life of Christ, painted on the wings of the high altar in the church of St. Nicholas at Deventer, Haarlem, and Calcker, had been familiar to critics, but not so the painter. Canon Wolff found many references to him in the archives of his native place, and was able to prove the date of the painting of the masterpiece, and the fact that in 1518, Joest was working at Cologne for the important family of Hackeneger. After leaving Cologne he appears to have gone to Italy, and to have visited Genoa and Naples, returning thence to Holland, and settled down at Haarlem, where he executed a painting for the church of St. Bavo. In the last edition of Van der Wijligen's work on the paintings of Haarlem is the reference to the burial of the artist, there called Jan Joosten, under the date 1519. There are paintings attributed to Joest at Wesel and Rees, and the "Death of the Virgin" in Munich is believed to be his. He was an artist of high merit, and has been compared with David and Memling, but he more properly belongs to the school of Sorel, and one of the special features of his work is the exquisite transparency of his colouring and the subtle and very delicate modelling of the faces.

The leaving of this country is that by WOLF, DE NICOLAS KIRCHE ZU KALKAR, but reference should also be made to WALT-
mar, Geschichte der Malerei und der Zeichnung für Bildder Kunst (1876).

JOQUES, ISAAC, French missionary, born at Or-
leans, France, 10 Jan., 1607; martyred at Ossernenon, in the present State of New York, 15 Oct., 1646. He was the first Catholic priest who ever came to Manhattan Island (New York). He entered the Society of Jesus in 1624 and, after having been professor of literature at Rouen, was sent as a missionary to Canada in 1641. On coming out with the Mar-
ative successor of Champlain. From Quebec he went to the regions around the great lakes where the illustrious Father de Brébeuf and others were labouring. There he spent six years in constant danger. Though a daring missionary, his character was of the most prac-
ticical type, and he did not attempt to fix his people in permanent habitations. He was with Garnier among the Petuns, and he and Raymbautt penetrated as far as Sault Ste. Marie, and were the "first missionaries", says Bancroft (VII, 790, London, 1852), "to preach the gospel a thousand miles in the interior, five years before John Cabot pressed the Indians six miles from Boston Harbour". There is little doubt that they were not only the first apostles but also the first white men to reach this outlet of Lake Superior. No docu-
mentary proof is adduced by the best-known histo-
rians that Nicolet, the discoverer of Lake Michigan, ever visited the Sault. Jogues proposed not only to convert the Indians of Lake Superior, but the Sioux who lived at the head waters of the Mississippi.

His plan was thwarted by his capture near Three Rivers returning from Quebec. He was taken prisoner on 3 August, 1642, and after being cruelly tortured was carried to the Indian village of Ossernenon, now Auvi-
sville, on the Mohawk, about forty miles above the present city of Albany. There he remained for thirteen months in slavery, suffering apparently beyond the power of natural endurance. The Dutch Calvinists at Fort Orange (Albany) made constant efforts to free him, and at last, when he was about to be burnt to death, induced him to take refuge in a sailing vessel which carried him to New Amsterdam (New York).

His description of the colony as it was at that time has since been incorporated in the Documentary History of the State. From New York he was sent, in mid-
winter, across the ocean on a lugger of only fifty tons burden, and, after a voyage of two months, landed Christmas morning, 1643, on the coast of Brittany, in a state of absolute destitution. Thence he found his way to the nearest college of the Society. He was re-
ceived with great honour at the court of the Queen Regent, the mother of Louis XIV, and was allowed by Pope Urban VIII the very excep-
tional privilege of celebrating Mass, which the mutil-
ated condition of his hands had made canonically impossible; several of his fingers having been eaten or burned off. He was called a martyr of Christ by the pontiff. No similar concep-
tion, up to that, is known to have been granted.

In the early spring of 1644 he returned to Can-
da, and in 1646 was sent to nego-
 cinqueth peace with the Iroquois. He

Isaac Jogues

He followed the same route over which he had been carried as a captive. It was on this occasion that he gave the name of Lake of the Biscay to the armament to the body of water called by the Indians Hor-
icon, now known as Lake George. He reached Os-
sermenon on 5 June, after a three weeks' journey from the St. Lawrence. He was well received by his former captors and the treaty of peace was made. He started for Quebec one day for and arrived there 2 July. He immediately asked to be sent back to the Iroquois as a missionary, but only after much hesitation his supe-
riors acceded to his request. On 27 September he be-
gan his third and last journey to the Mohawk. In the interim sickness had broken out in the tribe and a blight had fallen on the crops. This double calamity was ascribed to Jogues whom the Indians always regarded as a sorcerer. They were determined to wreak vengeance on him for the spell he had cast on the place, and warriors were sent out to capture him. The news of this change of sentiment spread rapidly, and Jogues took full advantage of the danger Jogues continued on his way to Ossernenon, though all the Hurons and others who were with him fled except Lalande. The Iroquois met him near Lake George, stripped him naked, slashed him with their knives, beat him and
then led him to the village. On 18 October, 1646, when entering a cabin he was struck with a tomahawk and afterwards decapitated. The head was fixed on the palisades and the body thrown into the Mohawk.

In view of his possible canonization a preliminary court was established in Quebec by the ecclesiastical authorities to receive testimony as to his sanctity and the miracles attributed to his intercession.

Parkman, The Jesuits in North America (1867); Bancroft, History of the United States, III; J. O. Snel, Life of Father Jouques (New York, 1842-1847); Anne Forbin, Life of Jean Jouques, MSS. (St. Mary's College, Montreal); Memorial of the death of Jean Jouques and others, MSS. (University of Wisconsin, Oshawa). Hauser, Drama of the Canadian Missions in Western Canada (Toronto, 1923); Ecclesiastical Register, Historical Index, I (published by the State, 1891); Charlevoix, History of New France, I; Rochon-Dru, The Jesuits and New France, I, II.

T. J. CAMPBELL.

John I, Saint, Pope; d. at Ravenna on 18 or 19 May (according to the most probable calculation), 526. A Tuscan by birth and the son of Constantius, he was, after an interregnum of seven days, elected on 13 August, 523, and occupied the Apostolic see for two years, nine months, and seven days. We know nothing of the manner of his administration, for his Bulgarium contains only the two letters addressed to Archbishop Zacharias and to the bishops of Italy. Nothing whatever is certain that is not apocryphal. We possess information—though unfortunately very vague—only about his journey to Constantinople, a journey which appears to have had results of great importance, and which was the cause of his death. The Emperor Justin, in his zeal for orthodoxy, had issued in 522 a severe decree against the Arians, compelling them, among other things, to surrender to the Catholics the churches which they occupied. Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths and of Italy, the ardent defender of Arianism, keenly resented these measures directed against his coreligionists in the Orient, and was moreover much displeased at seeing the progress of a mutual understanding between the Latin and Greek Churches, such as might favour certain secret dealings between the Roman senators and the Byzantine Court, aiming at the re-establishment of the imperial authority in Italy. To avoid the eventual consequences, and force him to moderate his policy of repression in regard to the heretics, Theodoric sent to him early in 525 an embassy composed of Roman senators, of which he obliged the pope to assume the direction, and imposing on the latter the task of securing a written acknowledgment of the papacy (3 January, 525). The embassy arrived at Constantinople on 13 January, 525, and on the 15th the emperor signed the pact and, in the presence of the representatives of the Church, received the pope’s letter, in which he declared that he believed “Anonymous Valesianus”—of even urging the emperor to facilitate the return to Arianism of the Arians who had been converted.

There has been much discussion as to the part played by John I in this affair. The sources which enable us to study the subject are far from explicit and may be reduced to four in number: “Anonymous Valesianus”, already cited; the “Liber Pontificalis”; Gregory of Tours’s “Liber in gloria martyrum”; and the “Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis”. But it is beyond question that the pope could only counsel Justin to use gentleness and devotion towards the Arians; his position as head of the Church prevented his inviting the emperor to favour heresy.

That this analysis of the situation is correct is evident from the reception which the pope was accorded in the East—a reception which certainly would not have been kindly, had the Roman ambassador or the Catholic missionaries acted otherwise than advised by his imperial master.

The inhabitants of Constantinople went out in throngs to meet John. The Emperor Justin on meeting him prostrated himself, and, some time afterwards, he had himself crowned by the pope. All the patriarchs of the East made haste to manifest their communion in the Faith with the supreme pontiff; only Timothy of Alexandria, who had shown himself hostile to the Council of Chalcedon, held aloof. Finally, the pope, exercising his right of precedence over Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, solemnly ecclesiastified at St. Sophia in the Latin Rite on Easter Day, 19 April, 526. Immediately afterwards he made his way back to the West.

If this brilliant reception of John I by the emperor, the clergy, and the faithful of the Orient proves that he had not been wanting in his task as supreme pastor of the Church, the strongly contrasting behaviour of Theodoric towards him on his return is no less evident proof. This monarch, enraged at seeing the national party reviving in Italy, and investigating, sustained his hands with the murder of Boethius, the great philosopher, and of Symmachus, his father-in-law. He was exasperated against the pope, whose embassy had obtained a success very different from that which he, Theodoric, desired and whom, moreover, he suspected of favouring the defenders of the ancient liberty of Rome. As soon as John, returning from the East, had landed in Italy, Theodoric caused him to be arrested and incarcerated at Ravenna. Worn out by the fatigues of the journey, and subjected to severe privations, John soon died in prison. His body was transported to Rome and re-interred in the Basilica of St. Peter. In his epitaph there is no allusion to his historical rôle. The Latin Church has placed him among its martyrs, and commemorates him on 27 May, the ninth lesson in the Roman Breviary for that date being consecrated to him.


Léon Clouzet.

John I, Pope (533-535).—The date of the birth of this pope is not known. He was a Roman and the son of Projectus; if not born in the second region (Calimontium) he had at least been a priest of St. Clement’s Basilica on the slope of Mons Caelius. He seems to have been the first who changed his name on being raised to the papacy (3 January, 533). The basis of St. Clement still retains several memorials of “Johannes surnamed Mercurius”. Presbyter Mercurius is found on a fragment of an ancient ciborium, and several of the marble slabs which enclose the schola cantorum bear upon them, in the style of the sixth century, the monogram of Jo[ns] (Jan). At the beginning of the election of popes and bishops was rife among clergy and laity. After the death of the predecessor of John II there was a vacancy of over two months, and during that period shameful trafficking in sacred things was indulged in. Even sacred vessels were exposed for sale. The matter was brought before the Senate, and before the Arian Ostrogothic Court at Ravenna. As a result the last decree (Senatus consultum) which the Senate of Rome is known to have issued, and which, passed under Boniface II, was directed against simony in papal elections, was confirmed by the Gothic King Athalaric. He ordered it to be engraved on marble, and to be placed in the atrium of St. Peter’s (533). By one of Athalaric’s own additions to the decree, it was decided, that if a disputed election was carried before the Gothic officials of Ravenna by the Roman clergy and people, three thousand solidi were to be paid as a fine. This sum was to be given to the poor.

John himself, however, always remained on good terms with Athalaric, who referred to his tribunal all actions brought against the Roman clergy. Justinian also showed his good will to the See of Rome in John’s person. He sent him money and many valuable presents. Some time before John became pope, the East was agitated by the formula,
One of the Trinity has been crucified", which had been put forward as a means of reconciling various heretical sects that were condemned by Pope Hormisdas, the formuli fell out of use. Afterwards revived, it was in a modified form defined by Justinian, and opposed by the Acometite, or asleep monks. But they were condemned by the pope who informed the emperor of his action (24 March, 534). The crimes of Contumellosus, Bishop of Ries, in Provence, caused John to the death of St. Gaul to confine him in a monastery. Till a new bishop should be appointed he bade the clergy of Ries obey the Bishop of Arles. Two hundred and seventeen bishops assembled in council at Carthage (535) submitted to John II the question as to whether bishops who had lapsed into Arianism should or should not keep their rank or be admitted to lay communion. The answer to their question was given by Agapetus, as John II died 8 May, 535. He was buried in St. Peter's.


HORACE K. MANN.

John III, Pope (561-574), a Roman surnamed Catilinus, d. 13 July, 574. He was of a distinguished family, being the son of one Anastasius who bore the title of Comes. The year of his birth is not recorded, but he was consecrated pope seemingly on 17 July, 561. Owing to the necessity of waiting for imperial confirmation of his election, an interval of five months elapsed between the death of Pelagius I and the consecration just noted. Although John reigned nearly thirty years very little is known of his pontificate. It fell during the stormy times of the Lombard invasion, and practically all the records of his reign have perished. He would seem, however, to have been a magnanimous pontiff, zealous for the welfare of the people. An inscription still to be seen in the fifteenth century testified that "in the midst of straits he knew how to be bountiful, and feared not to be crushed amidst a crumbling world". Two most unworthy bishops, Salonius of Embren and Sagittarius of Gap, had been condemned in a synod at Lyons (c. 567). They succeeded, however, in persuading Guntram, King of Burgundy, that John had been condemned unjustly, and appealed to the pope. Influenced by the king's letters, John decided that they must be restored to their sees. It is to be regretted that the papal mandate was put into effect. The most important of the acts of this pope were those connected with the general Councils. Unfortunately the "Liber Pontificiæ" is enigmatic regarding them. By feminine intrigue at the court of Constantinople, a charge of treason was trumped up against the general, and, in consequence, the only man capable of resisting the barbarians was recalled. It is quite possible that Narses may then have invited the Lombards to fall upon Italy; but it is perhaps more probable that, hearing of his recall, they invaded the country. Knowing that Narses was the hope of Italy, John followed him to Naples, and implored him not to go to Constantinople. The general hearkened to the words of the pope, and returned with him to Rome (571). But seemingly the court party in the city was too strong for Narses and the pope. John retired to the catacomb of Prætextatnus, where he remained for many months. He even held ordinances there. On the death of Narses (c. 572), John returned to Ravenna. Tatianus, his son-in-law, in the catacomb, gave him a great interest in them. He put them in repair, and ordered that the necessaries for Mass should be sent to them from the Lateran. John died 13 July, 574, and was buried in St. Peter's.


HORACE K. MANN.

John IV, Pope (649-642), a native of Dalmatia, and the son of the scholasticon (advocate) Venerius. The date of his birth is uncertain; d. 12 October, 642. At the time of his election he was archdeacon of the Roman Church. As John's consecration followed very soon after his election, it is supposed that the papal elections were now confirmed by the exarchs resident at Ravenna. The motive of this action was caused by invasions of Slaves, directed John's attention there. To alleviate the distress of the inhabitants, John sent the abbot Martin into Dalmatia and Istria with large sums of money for the redemption of captives. As the ruined churches could not be rebuilt, the relics of some of the more important Dalmatian saints were brought to Rome. John erected an oratory in their honour which still stands. It was adorned by the pope with mosaics depicting John himself holding in his hands a model of his oratory. John apparently did not content himself with palliating the evils wrought by the Slaves. He endeavored to convert these barbarians. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus says that Porga, a prince of the Croats who had been invited into Dalmatia by Heraclius I, sent to an Emperor Heraclius for Christian teachers. It is supposed that the emperor to whom this message was sent was Heraclius I himself, and that the pope to whom he sent the message was John IV.

While still pope-elect, John, with the other rulers of the Roman Church, wrote to the clergy of the North of Ireland to tell them of the mistakes they were making with regard to the time of keeping Easter, and exhorting them to be on their guard against the Pelagian heresy. About the same time he condemned Monothelism. Emperor Heraclius immediately disowned the Monothelite document known as the "Ecthesis". To his son, Constantine III, John addressed his apology for Pope Honorius, in which he deprecated the attempt to connect the name of Honorius with Monothelism. Honorius, he declared, in speaking of one will in Jesus Christ, only meant to assert that there were not two contrary wills in Him. John was buried in St. Peter's.


HORACE K. MANN.

John V, Pope (685-686), a Syrian whose father was one Cyprian; when he was born is not known; d. 2 August, 686. As a deacon he was one of those who represented the Apostolic See at the Sixth Ecumenical Council. He returned to Rome in July, 682, with the official documents of the synod. He obtained such favour in the eyes of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus that the latter desired to be consecrated which had been imposed on the papal patronesses in Sicily and Calabria, and generally reduced the secular burdens from which the Church suffered. John's energy, learning, and moderation are highly praised by his biographer. It was no doubt the possession of these virtues which enabled him to maintain the balance in the basilica of St. John Lateran. The necessity of waiting for the imperial confirmation of papal elections having been abolished by Constantine Pogonatus, John was straightway conducted to the Lateran palace as pope. He was consecrated about 23 July, 685, and reigned for a little more than one year; during the days of St. Gregory the Great, the Archbishop of Cagliari in Sardegna enjoyed certain metropolitan powers. Although the right of consecrating the
bishops of the island was not one of his privileges. Citonetus of Cagliari proceeded to lay hands on the bishop-elect of Turris Libisonis. John, however, de
definitively declared the See of Turris directly subject to the Holy See. John's popularity was strengthened by his liberal donations. In his short pontificate he distributed 1900 solidi to the clergy and to the deaconries for the poor. After a long illness he died on 2 August, 686, and was buried in St. Peter's.

HEROZ K. MANN.

John VI, Pope (701–705), a Greek, the date of whose birth is unknown; d. 11 January, 705. He ascended the papal throne 30 October, 701. Some time during his reign there came to Rome from Sicily Theophylactus, "chamberlain, patriicus, and exarch of Italy". After the treatment which some of his predecessors in the exarchate had meted out to the popes, the Italian people suspected that his visit boded no good to John VI. And so from all parts the local militias hurriedly marched to Rome, and, encamping without the walls, made manifest their dislike of the exarch. To avoid bloodshed, John sent a number of priests to them, and succeeded in pacifying them, as far at least as the exarch himself was concerned. The exarch, however, would not disband, however, and John insisted that certain informers, whose denunciations had put the wealth of some of the citizens into the hands of the grasping officials, should be handed over to them for punishment. Taking advantage of this want of harmony between the exarch and the native Italians attached to the pope, the Lombards renewed their attacks on such parts of Italy as had hitherto resisted them. Several towns belonging to the Duchy of Rome were seized, Gisulf advanced as far as "Horreria" Puteoli—or perhaps the "fungus Horrea" at the fifth milestone on the Via Latina. As there was no one who had power to resist him by force of arms", the pope, distressed at the sufferings of the people, sent a number of priests furnished with money into the camp of the Lombard duke. Not only did they ransom all the captives whom Gisulf had taken, but they persuaded him to retire to his own territories. John VI was one of the popes before whom St. Wilfrid of York heard his appeals. Pointing out that the action of the Apostolic See was wont to be consistent, the saint adjured him to confirm in his behalf the decisions of his predecessors (704). This John did, and sent him back to England with letters for King Ethelred and others. It was not, however, till the following year that the papal mandates were obeyed. John sent the pallium to Brithwald, whom "he confirmed as Archbishop of Canterbury". He was buried in St. Peter's.

HEROZ K. MANN.

John VII, Pope (705–707).—The year of his birth is unknown; d. 18 October, 707. Few particulars of his life remain. Like many other popes during the period of Byzantine influence in Rome, John was a Greek. Speculation has gathered round the belief that he was the son of Blatta and Plato. The latter carried out various restorations in the imperial palace on the Palatine hill in Rome, and, for the sake, perhaps, of living where once his parents had lived, John after he had become pope (March 1, 705) constructed a palace (episcopium) near the church of St. Peter's. Before his elevation John was the warden of the papal patrimony on the Appian way. It was in that capacity that he erected a memorial "with a broken heart to a most loving and incomparable mother, and to the kindest of fathers" (687). One of the churches which John beautified or restored during his pontificate was the aforementioned church of Sancta Maria Antiqua.

He adorned with frescoes the basilica of the Holy Mother of God which is known as the Old Lady. When the remains of this church were brought to light in 1900, among the many figures found upon its walls, one with a square nimbus is supposed to represent John himself. There was also then discovered the base of his ambo. It bore upon it inscriptions which proclaimed him to be "the servant of Mary". John also evidently lived in St. Peter's. When this oratory was destroyed, some of his mosaics were preserved, and may be seen in the Roman Church of Sancta Maria in Cosmedin and in other places. Though John was a man of learning and eloquence, and though he was remarkable for his filial affection and piety, he was of a timorous disposition. Hence, when the fierce Emperor Justinian II sent him the decrees of the Quinisext Council, "in which were many articles against the See of Rome", with a request that he would set forth what he approved in them, John simply returned them, as though there was nothing to condemn in them. Indeed, they came from the Lombard King Aripert II the papal patrimoni in the Cottian Alps, which the Lombards had confiscated. John is credited with having prevailed upon the Anglo-Saxon clergy resident in Rome to renounce their secular style of dress, and with having written to those in England bidding them follow his example. John died in the palace he had built near the Palatine, and was buried in the oratory he had erected in St. Peter's.

HEROZ K. MANN.

John VIII, Pope (872–87) a Roman and the son of Gundus. He seems to have been born in the first quarter of the ninth century; d. 16 Dec., 882. In 853 and 869 he appears as archdeacon of the Roman Church, and it was as such that he became pope (14 Dec., 872). His election was opposed by Formoes, who remained in opposition to him throughout the whole of his pontificate. He was a man of learning and an historian, and was one of the greatest of the great popes who sat on the chair of Peter during the ninth century. Some, however, on what would seem to be insignificant grounds, regard him as cruel, passionate, worldly-minded, and inconsistent. The more important acts of John's reign may be divided into four groups, according as they relate to the affairs of Eastern Europe, to the empire of the West, to Southern Italy and the Saracens, or to those persons with whom he came into more frequent contact.

A year or two before John became pope, St. Methodius, the brother of St. Cyril, who had died in Rome (869), had been sent back to Moravia as an archbishop to continue his work for the conversion of the Slavs. He had received permission to use the Slavonic language in the liturgy of the Church. This act of Pope Hadrian II did not please either the German princes or bishops. The former had designs on the political, the latter on the ecclesiastical, independence of the Moravians. Methodius was seized and imprisoned (871), and it was not till 873 that any hint of his treatment and his appeal to Rome reached John. Though for the moment, in deference to German opposition, the popeyielded to the Slavonic tongue in the liturgy, he insisted on the immediate restoration of Methodius. After his orders were obeyed, John bade the archbishop come to Rome, as fresh accusations had been brought against him.
A careful examination convinced John of the orthodoxy of Methodius, who was sent back to Moravia with permission to make Slavonic the liturgy. By the pope's help the saint overcame all opposition, and continued his work of conversion till his death (6 April, 885). One result of John's work among the Slavs was that several of their tribes placed themselves under the protection of the Holy See. John also had much communication with the Eastern Slavs of Bulgaria. He strove to bring them back again under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy See. Papal rights in that country had been usurped by the patriarchs of Constantinople, and, though their faith and his, as John told the Bulgarian king Boris, were the same, the party pronouncing heresy and schism would ultimately lead the Bulgarians into both. But the Bulgarians gave no lasting heed to the exhortations of the pope, and what he foretold would happen actually came to pass. When Basil the Macedonian mounted the throne of Constantinople, he restored St. Ignatius to his see, and banished the usurper Photius (867). During his banishment, however, adroit flattery enabled the exile to win the emperor's favour, and, on the death of St. Ignatius (877), he was acknowledged as his successor. He then spared no pains to induce John to communiate with him; this he agreed to do on certain conditions. But, as Photius failed to observe them, he was solemnly condemned by the pope (881). Louis II, though not even master of Italy, bore at this time the title of Emperor of the Romans. To him, as a prince of character, John gave his support. He endeavoured to induce Charles the Bald, King of France, to yield up to him the kingdom of Lothaire; he aided him in his efforts against the Saracens, and, after his death (875), strove to comfort his widow Engelberga. When Louis II died, John's support of Charles the Bald resulted in his receiving the imperial crown (875), and in being made Duke of Lorraine. Charles was not ungrateful for the pope's assistance, and not only decreed that the Roman Church, as head of all the Churches, must be obeyed by all, but in 876 waived in John's behalf many of "the rights and customs of the empire". John, however, did not obtain much practical help from him. Charles was a man who attempted to do great things, but knew not how to adapt his means to the ends he had in view. He did at last, however, come to help John against the Saracens, who distressed him throughout the whole of his pontificate. His expedition was, however, and, before he could renew his attempt, he died (8 Oct., 877). Among the candidates for the vacant imperial throne, John thought that the only suitable one was Boso, soon to be King of Provence. But Boso would not move in the matter, so that at length the pope, setting aside the claims of Carloman on the ground of his ill-health which had forced him to entrust the care "of the Kingdom of Italy" to John himself, fixed upon Charles the Fat as the imperial successor of Charles the Bald, successfully established his candidate on the imperial throne, and crowned him in February, 881.

It was now decided that Charles should come in name, at least, the recognized sovereign of most of the states over which Charlemagne had held sway. But he was physically and mentally unfit for his position; yet John was in great need of help. From the first year of his reign to the last, he was harassed by the Saracens, and was worried by the unpatriotic conduct of some of the princely families of Italy; this was the encouragements of Guido II, Duke of Spoleto. In 840, colonies of Saracens had begun to establish themselves in South Italy. John had to write "that all our coasts have been plundered, and the Saracens are as much at home in Fundi and Terracina as in Africa". To make head against these terrible enemies of Christianness John spared not his person, his time, nor his money. He never ceased striving to stir up the emperors to take a high view of their position and responsibilities, to put an end to simony, and to take the field against the unrelenting foes of their faith and country. By conferences with the petty princes of Southern Italy, and by gifts of money to them, he endeavoured to detach them from alliances with the Saracens, or to unite them in battle against them. But it was not content with unavailing effort, but resolved to take action against them. He himself assumed the duties both of a general and an admiral. He fortified St. Paul's Outside-the-Walls, where his works were so extensive that they deserved to be called after his name, "Johannopolis". The new fortification was near the two miles of the Roman wall, and the remains of the old dotard Peter", as the Saracens contemptuously called Rome, John himself patrolled the coast. He overtook the pirate fleet of the Saracens off the promontory of Circe, and was completely victorious over them (878). But knowing they were but scattered, he implored the emperor to help him to make his victory of permanent value. Charles the Bald was not unwilling to help, but died (877) before he could effect anything. John had therefore to goon fighting single-handed against the Saracens till his death.

During the whole period of his pontificate, John was troubled almost as much by enemies in and around Rome as he was by the Saracens. When he mounted the throne of Peter, he found many of the chief officers of the Church in the hands of disreputable nobles, most of them connected with one another, and with a number of women who were as bad as themselves. Among the former were Gregory, the primicerius of the Roman Church, a shameless peccator; his brother Stephen, the secundicerius, as deep in crime as himself, and his infamous son-in-law, the murderer and adulterer, George of the Aventine. Allied with these, at the time of the antipope, was the lewd and licentious lady of the monastery. With some of these men, Formosus, Bishop of Porto, had the misfortune to be linked by some ties of friendship. The death of the Emperor Louis II (August, 875), who had been a patron of some of this nefarious clique, left John more at liberty to deal with them. When he began to proceed against them, they succeeded for a time in avoiding appearing before him. Meanwhile they hatched plots against him, and sought to obtain the aid of the Saracens. Finding at last that the pope was too strong for them, they fled from the city, carrying with them the treasures of the Church. Unfortunately for their revenge on them. Failing to appear for trial, the exiles were degraded and excommunicated. When in France, whither Formosus had fled, John caused the sentence passed against Gregory and his party to be repeated, and insisted on Formosus's signing a declaration that he would never return to Rome (878). John had not gone to France altogether of his own free will. Acting ostensibly in the interests of Carloman of Bavaria, who was aspiring to the empire, Lambert, Duke of Spoleto, put all the pressure he could on the pope, constantly harrying his territory (876). At length he seised Rome itself (878). Usually, in such a case, the pope was in danger of this petty tyrant, and anxious at the same time to come into personal contact with the different candidates for the imperial throne, vacant since the death of Charles the Bald (6 Oct., 877), John went to France. While there he crowned Louis as king (Sept., 878), but was unable to effect anything in the way of obtaining a suitable candidate for the throne. John's action was not confined to Italy, Germany, and France. In Spain we find him constituting Oviedo a metropolitan see. By his influence, also, a law against sacrilege was added to the Gothic Code of Spain. John received in Rome Burghard, Bishop of Merseburg, King of Meissen, who, to the annoyance which the Danes were causing throughout England had driven
to seek peace at the shrine of the Apostles. Edred, Archbishop of Canterbury, also turned to the pope for consolation. He was forced by the Danelaw and worried by King Alfred, who in his youth was not the wise monarch he afterwards became. John wrote to commiserate with him, and told him that he had written to urge the king to offer proper obedience to him and his prelates. Contemporary historians tell us simply that John died on 16 December 982. One, however, who wrote in distant Fulda, has given certain terrible details which are not accepted by the best modern historians. According to the annals of that monastery, one of John’s relations, who wished to seize his treasures, tried to poison him. Finding, however, that his intrigue had failed, he tried to murder him by striking him on the head with a hammer. Then, terrified by the hostility which was at once manifested towards him, he fell dead without any one laying a hand upon him. This introduction of the marvellous and the wrong date which the Fulda annals assign to John’s death have justly rendered this narrative suspected.

The see large portion of John’s Register, still extant in F. L., Des Annales de l’Eglise et de l’Etat en France (Leipzig, 1883): Liber Pontificum ed. DUCHESNE, II, 221 sq.; FLODOARD, Annales; various contemporary annals and authors in Gaufridi, Gottfried, II, and short, Scriptores, Bollandiae, 130, de pontif., in F. L., CXXXIX: AULÉE et VULGARIUS in Dommel, Auléius et Vulgarius (Leipzig, 1866); HISTORIENS du Palais, VII (Paris, 1885); HILLAT, Histoire de l’Église à la fin du Moyen Âge (Paris, 1900); GUGLIELMI, Il concilio di Giovanni VIII (Rome, 1880); GAT, L’Italie médiévale et l’Empire byzantin (Paris, 1904); HERSCH, 19, Fluctuations de la Littérature, 1867; KIMBALL, Histoire de la Vie du Christ (Paris, 1854); FORSTER, The Orthodox Eastern Church (London, 1867); D’AUBRÉY, Syntagma, II, 1003; Cyrille et Michel de Rome (1865); GIMEL, Gesch. der Slavonensprache (Vienna, 1861); MANN, Lives of the Popes, 1, 231 sqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

John IX, Pope (898–900).—Not only is the date of John’s birth unknown, but the date of his election as pope, and that of his death are alike uncertain. In the month of August, 916, John, early in the beginning of the year 900. He was a native of Tivoli, and the son of Rampoldi. Becoming a Benedictine, he was ordained priest by Pope Formosus. At this period factions filled the city of Rome, and one of them tried to force their candidate, Sergius, and not Sergius II, upon the pope, and in opposition to John. Perhaps because he was favoured by the ducal House of Spoleto, John was able to maintain his position, and Sergius was driven from the city and excommunicated. With a view to diminish the violence of faction in Rome, John, who is acknowledged to have been an able and courageous pontiff, held several synods in Rome and elsewhere (908). In them the hastily synod of Stephen (VI) VII was condemned, and its Acts were burnt. Re- ordinations were forbidden, and those of the clergy who had been degraded by Stephen were restored to the ranks from which he had dethroned them. The bishops of Germany, the Slavs of Moravia appealed to John to let them have a hierarchy of their own. Not heeding the hectoring letters with which some of the German bishops endeavoured to dissuade him from hearkening to the Moravians, John sanctioned the consecration of a metropolitan and three bishops for the Church of the Moravians. On John’s coins the name of the emperor (Lambert) figures along with his own. He was buried just outside St. Peter’s.

JOHN, Pope, b. at Tossignano, Romagna; enthroned, 914; d. at Rome, 928. First a deacon at Bologna, he became Archbishop of Ravenna about 905, as successor of Kailo. In a document dated 5 February, 914, he still appears as archbishop. Shortly afterwards, owing to the influence of the nobles dominant in such matters in Rome, he was raised to the see. The real head of this aristocratic faction was the elder Theodora, wife of the Senator Theophylactus. Liutprand of Cremona ("Antapodosis", II, ed. in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Scripta.", II, 297) affirms that Theodora supported John’s election in order to secure more easily her illicit relations with him. This statement is, however, generally and rightly rejected as a calumny. Liutprand wrote his history some fifty years later, and constantly slandered the Romans, whom he hated. At the time of John’s election Theodora was advanced in years, and is highly lauded by other writers (e.g. Vulgaris, Gaufridi, Gottfried, II, 1003) in connexion with John’s family, and this explains sufficiently why she secured his election. The new pope was an active and energetic ruler, and exerted himself especially to put an end to the Saracen invasions. He brought about an alliance between Prince Landulf of Beneventum, Berengarius of Friuli, King of the Lombards, and other Italian rulers, and, when Berengarius came to Rome in 915, the pope crowned him emperor. John himself led against the Saracens a large army gathered by the allied Italian princes. The Saracens had built fortresses on the river Garigliano, but in 916 John completely routed them near the mouth of that river.

Concerning the ecclesiastical administration of this pope we possess many particulars. He sent to Germany his trusted friend Petrus, Bishop of Orte, who held in 916 a synod at Hohenaltheim (near Nuremberg), and entered into friendly relations with King Conrad. John also concerned himself with affairs in France, where Count Heribert of Aquitaine held King Charles a prisoner, and demanded the election of his five-year-old son, Hugh of Vermandois, as Archbishop of Reims. John unhappily confirmed this choice after the death of the Breton king and an old woman brought to court the Slavs of Dalmatia into closer relations with Rome, and strove to induce the Archbishop of Spalato to adopt Latin as the liturgical language. His efforts to promote a more intimate union between the Bulgarians and Rome were frustrated by the opposition of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Another opportunity offered, when later the Byzantine patriarch, Nicolaus Mysticus, sought the aid of the pope. The patriarch had been deposed by a synod, because he would not recognize the fourth marriage of Emperor Leo VI. Before his death, however, Leo restored Nicolaus to his office, and his successor (Alexander) was also on his side. But many bishops were yet opposed to the patriarch on account of his deposition by the earlier synod. Under these circumstances Nicolaus wished to have the decree of deposition declared invalid by another council, and towards this end desired the assistance of the discipline to the discipline of the Western Church, which permitted as valid even a fourth marriage. Meanwhile, he was active in the political life of Italy. After the murder of King Berengarius in 924 the pope supported Hugh of Burgundy, and, when the latter landed in Pisa, John sent his legate to meet him and form an alliance. The dominant Roman faction disliked these measures. Foremost among them was the
elder Marozia, daughter of Theophylactus and Theodora. After the death of her first husband Alberic, Marozia had married (928) Guido, the powerful Margrave of Tuscany. The alliance of John and Hugh of Burgundy seemed to endanger her power in Rome, and so with her husband's aid she decided to remove John. Petrus, Prefect of Rome and brother of the pope, was murdered in June, 928. The pontiff himself was seized and cast into prison, where he died shortly after. According to a rumor recorded by Liutprand, and thus little to be relied on, he was smothered in his bed. Flocado of Reims asserts that he died of anxiety. He was probably buried in the Lateran, for the restoration of which he had been particularly solicitous.


J. P. KIRSCH.

John XII. Pope, date of birth unknown, became pope in 931; d. 936. He was the son of Marozia by her first marriage with Alberic; some, taking Liutprand and the "Liber Pontificalis" as their authority, assert that he was the natural son of Sergius III ("Johannes, natale Romanus ex patre Sergio papa," "Liber Pont," ed. Duchesne, II, 243). Through the intrigues of Alberic, he was elected, but immediately raised to the Chair of Peter, and was completely under the influence of the Senatarius et Patria of Rome. To strengthen her own power Marozia married her brother-in-law Hugh, King of Provence and Italy, whose reign in Rome was so tyrannical that a strong opposition party sprang up among the nobles under the leadership of Alberic II, the younger son of Marozia. This party succeeded in overthrowing the rule of Marozia and Hugh; Marozia was cast into prison, but her husband escaped from the city. In this way Alberic became ruler of Rome, and the pope, who suffered by his mother's fall, now became almost entirely subject to his brother, being only free in the exercise of his purely spiritual duties. All other jurisdiction was exercised through Alberic. This was not only the case in secular, but also in ecclesiastical affairs. It was at the instance of Alberic that the pallium was given to Urbanus, Patriarch of Constantinople in 935, and also to Artold, Archbishop of Reims (933). It was this pope who sat in the Chair of Peter during its deepest humiliation, but it was also he who granted many privileges to the Congregation of Cluny, which was later on so powerful an agent of Church reform.

J. P. KIRSCH.

John XII. Pope, date of birth unknown; reigned 955-64. The younger Alberic, after the downfall of his mother, Marozia (932), was absolute ruler at Rome. Before his death he administered an oath (954) to the Roman nobles in St. Peter's, that on the next vacancy of the papal chair his only son, Octavius, should be elected pope. After the death of the reigning pontiff, Agapetus II, Octavius, then eighteen years of age, was actually chosen his successor on 16 December, 955, and took the name of John. The temporal and spiritual authority in Rome were thus again united in one person—a coarse, immoral man, whose life was such that the Church could not forget it. Immoral corruption in Rome became the subject of general odium. War and the chase were more congenial to this pope than church government. He was defeated in the war against Duke Pandulf of Capua, and at the same time the Ecclesiastical States were conquered by the Normans. John, as若有, cast into prison and banished by Adalbert. In this dilemma the pope had recourse to the German king, Otto I, who then appeared in Italy at the head of a powerful army. Berengarius, however, did not risk an encounter, but retired to his fortified castles. On 31 January, 962, Otto reached Rome. He took an oath to recognize John as pope and ruler of Rome; to issue no decrees without the pope's consent; and, in case of his delivering the commenda, to return it to St. Peter's. On this promise an oath to defend to the utmost of his ability the pope and the patrimony of St. Peter. The pope on his part swore to keep faith with Otto and to conclude no alliance with Berengarius and Adalbert. On 2 February, 962, Otto was solemnly crowned emperor in the church of St. John Lateran. On the twenty-sixth day the Roman senate took place, at which John, at Otto's desire, founded the Archbishopric of Magdeburg and the Bishops of Merseburg, bestowed the pallium on the Archbishops of Salzburg and Trier, and confirmed the appointment of Rotther as Bishop of Verona. The next day, the emperor issued a decree, the famous Diploma Antonianum, in which he confirmed the Roman Church in its possessions, particularly those granted by Pepin and Charlemagne, and provided at the same time that in future the pope should be elected in canonical form, though their consecration was to take place only after the necessary pledges had been given to the emperor or his ambassadors. The authenticity of the decree and of this much-discussed document is certain, even should the extant document be only a duplicate of the original (Siekel, "Das Privilegium Otto I., für die römische Kirche", Innsbruck, 1883). On 14 February the emperor marched out of Rome with his army to resume the war against Berengarius and Adalbert. The pope now quickly changed his mind, while Otto on his part urged the imperial authority to excessive limits. John began secret negotiations with Adalbert, son of Berengarius, and sent envoys with letters to Hungary and to Constantinople for the purpose of inciting a war against Otto. They were tried and condemned by the imperial soldiers, and the emperor thus learned of the pope's treachery. John now sent an embassy to Otto to propitiate the latter, and at the same time to explain the pope's grievance, which was that the emperor had received for himself the oath of allegiance from those cities of the Ecclesiastical States, which he had reconquered from Berengarius. Otto sent an embassy to refute this accusation. At the same time Adalbert came in person to Rome, and was ceremoniously received by the pope. The faction of the Roman nobles which sympathized with the emperor now broke into revolt against Otto, and was put down for the second time in Rome (2 November, 963), while John and Adalbert fled to Tivoli. In the emperor's entourage was Liutprand (q. v.), Bishop of Cremona, who thus describes the occurrences as an eyewitness. Otto now promised to resign and extended the settlement formerly effected, by obtaining from the nobles a promise on oath not to elect or consecrate a pope without the consent of the emperor.

On 6 November a synod composed of fifty Italian and German bishops was convened in St. Peter's; John was accused of sacrilege, simony, perjury, murder, etc., excommunicated, deposed, and imprisoned by the emperor. John, resolving to defend himself. Refusing to recognize the synod, John pronounced sentence of excommunication (ferenda sententia) against all participants in the assembly, should they elect in his stead another pope. The emperor now came forward to accuse John of having broken the agreement ratified by oath, betrayed him, etc., and called in Adalbert, and excommunicated the synod deposed John on 4 December, and elected to replace him the protoscrinarius Leo, yet a layman. The latter received all the orders un canonically without the proper intercalations (intercalationes), and was crowned pope as Leo VIII. This proceeding was against the canons of the Church, and the enthroned in writing to defend himself. Refusing to recognize the synod, John pronounced sentence of excommunication (ferenda sententia) against all participants in the assembly, should they elect in his stead another pope. The emperor now came forward to accuse John of having broken the agreement ratified by oath, betrayed him, etc., and called in Adalbert, and excommunicated the synod deposed John on 4 December, and elected to replace him the protoscrinarius Leo, yet a layman. The latter received all the orders un canonically without the proper intercalations (intercalationes), and was crowned pope as Leo VIII. This proceeding was against the canons of the Church, and the enthroned in writing to defend himself. Most of
imperial troops now departing from Rome, John's adherents rose against the emperor, but were suppressed on 3 January, 964, with bloodshed. Nevertheless, at least one cardinal-deacon, John had his right hand struck off, Bishop Otgar of Speyer was banished, the bishopric of Worms was suppressed, and a high official lost nose and ears. On 26 February, 964, John held a synod in St. Peter's in which the decrees of the synod of 6 November were repealed; Leo VIII and all who had elected him were excommunicated; his ordination was pronounced invalid; and Bishop Sico of Ostia refused. On 30 March, John released the unhappy captive, and received the homage of dignitaries. The emperor, left free to act after his defeat of Berengarius, was preparing to re-enter Rome, when the pope's death changed the situation. John died on 14 May? 964, eight days after he had been, according to rumour, stricken by paralysis in the act of adoration. In Burgundy, John succeeded in getting the occasion the devil dealt him a blow on the temple in consequence of which he died.

John XIII., Pope, date of birth unknown; enthroned on 1 Oct., 965; d. 6 Sept., 972. After the death of John XII in 964 Benedictus Grammaticus was elected his successor by Benedict V. But Otto I brought back to Rome the anti-pope Leo VIII, whom he had set up in 963, and banished Benedict to Hamburg. Leo VIII died in March, 965, whereupon the Romans requested the emperor to send Benedict back to them as pope. But Otto refused, and Benedict died shortly after in July, 965. In presence of the imperial envoys, Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona, and Otgar, Bishop of Speyer, the emperor's candidate, John, Bishop of Narni, was elected pope, and crowned on 1 October, 965, as John XIII. He belonged to the family of the elder Theodora, who by her marriage with the Emperor Arnulf of Carinthia, and another daughter, the younger Theodora, who married the consul John. This John later entered the ecclesiastical state and became a bishop. From his union with Theodora sprung two daughters and three sons, among the latter one called John, who, while still in his youth, entered the priesthood at Rome, and later became Bishop of Narni. It was on this occasion of the Roman nobility that the choice of the electors fell. Some of the nobles were hostile to the new pope, because he was the imperial candidate, and, when he endeavoured to repress their encroachments, they plotted against him, and in December, 965, seized and incarcerated his person. They shut him up in the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and subsequently removed him to a fortified place in Campagna. John succeeded, however, in escaping from his prison, and found welcome and protection with Prince Pandulf of Capua. At Rome a reaction set in towards the exiled pope, and, when in 966 Emperor Otto undertook another expedition to Italy, the Romans were terrified and permitted John to return to the city on 14 November. In December the emperor arrived and dispersed stern justice to the conspirators, some of whom were hanged and others banished. The pope now allied himself closely with the emperor. On 11 January, 967, a synod was held in St. Peter's, concerning the results of which nothing is known. John travelled with Otto to Ravenna, where in April, 967, he held another synod in which the elevation of Magdeburg to metropolitan dignity was confirmed, disputes were decided, privileges conferred upon churches and convents, and Ravenna with its territory restored to the pope as part of the Ecclesiastical States. Relations between John and the emperor continued cordial. On Christmas Day, 967, the latter's thirteen-year-old son, Otto II, came to Rome, and was crowned joint emperor with his father. Shortly after, at one of the synods held in Ravenna, John, the emperor, had founded at Meissen in Saxony was also a see. John also favoured the negotiations held with the Byzantines for a matrimonial alliance between Otto II and the Princess Theophano. The marriage took place at Rome, and was blessed by the pope himself. On 14 April, 972. After the death of Archbishop William of Mainz and Bishop Bernard of Halberstadt in 968, the new metropolitan see at Magdeburg in Slavonic territory, for which the emperor had worked zealously and which had been confirmed by the pope, was finally realized. On Christmas day, 968, Abbot Adalbert was consecrated first Archbishop of Magdeburg, and consecrated by his candidate, first Bishop of Merseburg, Meissen, and Zeitz. The pope was also active in extending the hierarchy in other countries. Early in his pontificate he had raised Capua to metropolitan rank in gratitude for the shelter which Prince Pandulf had afforded him. At a Roman synod in 969 Boniface received the prerogative of residence at Pisa, the decrees of synods held in England and France. Privileges were granted to churches and convents, especially to Cluny, and the pope decided numerous questions of ecclesiastical law, referred to him from various countries. The plan of the Bohemian Duke Boleslaus II for the foundation of a see at Prague, though approved by the pope, had to be deferred to a later date. John XIII was succeeded by Benedict VI.

John XIV., Pope, date of birth unknown; d. 984. After the death of Benedict VII, Bishop Peter Campanula of Pavia, later Pope Clement II, was elected pope with the consent of Emperor Otto II, and was crowned at the end of November or beginning of December, 983, when he took the name of John. On 7 December of the same year the young emperor, Otto II, died at Rome, prepared for death by the pope, and was buried in the vestibule of St. Peter's. When the anti-pope Boniface VII, created in 974 by the Roman adherents of Crescentius, received at Constantinople news of the emperor's death, he returned to Rome (April, 984), and with the aid of his followers made Pope John a prisoner, threw him into the dungeons of the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and mounted the papal throne. After four months the unhappy John XIV died in prison on 20 August, 984, either from starvation and misery or murdered by order of Boniface.
some papal catalogues give as the immediate successor of Boniface another John, son of Robert, who is supposed to have reigned four months, and is placed by a few historians in the list of popes as John XV. Although this alleged Pope John never existed, still the name was catalogued by the early historians who has thrown into disorder the numeration of the popes named John, the true John XV being often called John XVI. At this time the patron John Crescentius, son of Duke Crescentius, with the help of his adherents, had obtained entire control of the temporal power in Rome. According to some chronicles the ascendancy of Crescentius became so irksome to the pope, to whom he even forbade access except in return for bribes, that John fled to Tuscany and sought aid from the Empress Theophano, but allowed himself to be induced by the promises of Crescentius to return. Gerbert tried to extricate himself throughout his pontificate under the influence of the powerful patricius, though he maintained friendly relations with the German court and with both empresses—Adelaide, widow of Otto I, and Theophano, widow of Otto II. The pope's mediation was sought by England in the quarrel between King Ethelred and Richard of Normandy. The papal legate, Leo of Trevi, brought about between the parties the Peace of Rouen (1 March, 991), which was ratified by a papal bull.

A serious dispute occurred during this pontificate over the archiepiscopal see of Reims, the pope's interference leading at first to no definite result. Hugh Capet, who had been raised to the throne of France, made Arnulf, a nephew of Duke Charles of Lorraine, Archbishop of Reims in 998. Charles was an adversary of Hugh Capet, and succeeded in taking Reims and making the archbishop a prisoner. Hugh, however, considered Arnulf a traitor, and demanded his deposition by the pope. Before the latter's answer was received, Hugh Capet captured both Duke Charles and Archbishop Arnulf, and called a synod at Reims in June, 991, which deposed Arnulf, and chose as his successor Abbot Gerbert (afterwards Pope Sylvester II). These proceedings were repudiated by Rome, although a synod at Chela had sanctioned the decrees of that of Reims. The pope summoned the French bishops to hold an independent synod at Aachen to reconsider the case. When they refused, he called them to a synod at Rome, but they urged the uncanonical condition of the French see, and Italy had no reason for not submitting to this summons. The pope then sent Abbot Leo of St. Boniface to France as legate, with instructions to call a council of French and German bishops at Mousson. At this council only the German bishops appeared, the French being stopped on the way by Kings Hugh and Robert. Gerbert, deposed himself at the synod convened on 2 June, 995, but was condemned and suspended until 1 July, when a new synod was held at Reims. Through the exertions of the legate, the deposition of Arnulf was pronounced illegal. After Hugh Capet's death (23 October, 996), Arnulf was restored to his see by the French synod. In 997 the pope restored Clement II. By the council at Proula, 998, and the synod at Mousson the see of Reims was declared vacated, and a synod was held in 999. In 999 the pope was restored to his title and authority. Gerbert became the patron of the monks of Cluny. In 996 Emperor Otto arranged with John to be present at the coronation of his son, but John died early in April, while Otto lingered until 14 April in Pavia, where he celebrated Easter.


J. P. Kirsch.

John XVI (XVII), anti-pope 997-998; d. probably in 1013. After the death of John XV, Bruno, a relative of Otto III and his chaplain, was raised through the royal influence to the papal throne as Gregory V, and crowned on 3 May, 996. On 21 May the new pope placed the imperial crown on the young King Otto III in Rome. After Otto's departure the patriarch Crescentius and his followers remained in power, and in September, 996, drove him out of the city. In the following May (997) Archbishop John Philagathus of Piacenza, who had returned shortly before from a mission to Constantinople whither he had been sent by Otto III, was made anti-pope by Crescentius. John was a native of Rossano in Calabria, at that time a part of the Byzantine Empire. He became a monk and was closely connected with Empress Theophano, through whose influence he received the Abbey of Noantola from Otto II. He was the godfather of the imperial Prince Otto, afterwards emperor. After the death of Otto II he remained the trusted friend of the empress dowager who, in 998, promoted him to the episcopal see of Piacenza, raised for him to an archiepiscopal, though later restored to its original rank. At the court of Otto III he retained his influential position. The king sent him at the end of 998 to Constantinople to arrange his marriage between the sovereign and a Byzantine princess. Notwithstanding this proof of favour on the part of the imperial family, John allowed himself on his return from Constantinople to be won over to the projects of Crescentius, who wished through him to bring about an alliance with Byzantium against the German emperor. St. Nilus of Rossano, the famous abbot and a patron of John, sought to dissuade him from the usurpation of the papal throne, but without avail.

At the Synod of Pavia held by Gregory V at Pentecontas, 997, Crescentius was excommunicated, and in July the pope issued a decree bringing Piacenza once more under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Ravenna. In the following winter Otto III returned to Italy at the head of an army, and in February, 998, entered Rome, while the anti-pope fled, and Crescentius entrenched himself in the Castle of Sant' Angelo. John XV was captured by the imperial soldiers, deposed of his sight, and, not being able to be mutilated, was brought in this condition to Rome. At the Lenten Synod of 998, held shortly after in Rome, Gregory V formally deposed the anti-pope, who, at the intercession of St. Nilus, was removed from prison to a monastery. When, in spite of all this, John again appeared before Gregory in episcopal robes, these were torn from him, and he was led through the streets of Rome on an ass amid the popular derision. According to the unreliable Vita of St. Nilus, he was thrown back into prison; but other sources relate that it was again confined in the monastery, and after he was dead, the "Archbishop Puleman" registered his death under date of 2 April, 1013. At Easter, 998, Otto III took the Castle of Sant' Angelo, and on 29 April Crescentius was beheaded.


John XVII (XVIII), date of birth unknown; d. 6 Nov., 1003. When Sylvester II died on 12 May, 1002, there was no actual authority in Rome which could curb the nobles. Thus the emperor again won the upper hand, and John Crescentius, son of the patricius whom Otto III had defeated and put
to death, seized the authority for himself. The three following popes were indebted to him for their elevation, and were made to feel his supremacy. A Roman, Sicco, was first elected, and consecrated on 13 June as John XVII, but died on 6 November. Before taking orders he had been married, and had three sons who also became ecclesiastics. Concerning his activities during the few months of his pontificate nothing has come down to us.


J. P. KIRSCH.

John XVIII (XIX), Pope, successor of John XVII, consecrated Christmas, 1056; died 1069. He was the son of a Roman priest named Leo, and, before his elevation to the papacy, his name was Phissianus. He, too, owed his elevation to the influence of Crescentius. The accounts of his pontificate consist almost exclusively of details of ecclesiastical administration. He confirmed the possessions and privileges of several churches and convents; sanctioned different gifts to religious institutions; conferred ecclesiastical privileges on the re-established See of Merseburg; gave his consent at the Roman Synod of June, 1007, to the establishment of the See of Bamberg, founded and endowed by the German king, Henry II; and conferred the dignity of archbishops on Trifon of Servia and Elphege of Canterbury. John XVIII energetically opposed the pretensions of Archbishop Letericus of Sens and Bishop Fulco of Orleans, who refused to allow the Abbot of Fleury, Goslin, to make use of the privileges granted him by Rome, and tried to make him burn the papal charters. The pope complained of this to the emperor, and called both bishops to his tribunal under threat of ecclesiastical censures for the entire kingdom. In Constantinople he was recognized as Bishop of Rome. His epitaph relates that he subdued the Greeks and dissolved schism. His name appears on the diplomas of the Byzantine emperors. According to one catalogue of popes, he died as a monk at St. Paul's near Rome in June, 1009.


J. P. KIRSCH.

John XIX (XX), Pope, enthroned in 1024; d. 1032. After the death of the last patricius of the House of Crescentius, the counsels of Tuscumim seized the authority in Rome, a scion of this family was raised to the papal throne as Benedict VIII (q.v.). Under Benedict Romanus exercised his temporal power in the city as consul and senator. After Benedict's death Romanus, though a layman, was elected pope between 12 April and 10 May, 1024, immediately after which he received all the orders in succession, took the name of John, and sought by lavish expenditure to win the Romans over to his cause. Soon after his elevation the Byzantine Emperor, Basil II, sent ambassadors to Rome to request in his name that the pope would recognize the title of ecclesiastical patriarch, which the patriarchs of Byzantium had assumed, thus sanctioning the latter's headship of all the Oriental Churches. Rich presents brought by the envoys were intended to win over the pope, and indeed he seemed not disinclined to accede to the Byzantine wishes. Though the negotiations were kept secret the affair became public, and roused to action the religiously minded circles, especially the promoters of ecclesiastical reform in Italy. Against Romanus' opinion compelled the pope to refuse the Byzantine requests and gifts, whereupon Patriarch Eustachius of Constantinople caused the pope's name to be erased from the diplachts of his churches. John invited the celebrated musician, Guido of Arezzo, to visit Rome and compose a musical notation. The pope, however, died in Germany, after the death of Henry II (13 July, 1024), Conrad the Salian was elected king, and was invited by the pope and also by Archbishop Heribert of Milan, to come to Italy. In 1026 he crossed the Alps, received the iron crown of Lombardy, and proceeded to Rome, where on 26 March, 1027, he was crowned emperor. Two kings, Rudolph of Burgundy and Canute of Denmark and England, took part in this journey to Rome.

On 6 April a great synod was held in the Lateran basilica, where the dispute between the Patriarchs of Aquileia and Grado was decided, through the emperor's influence, in favour of the former. Poppo of Aquileia was to be sole patriarch, with the Bishop of Grado under his jurisdiction. Moreover, the Patriarch of Aquileia was to take precedence over all the Italian bishops. Two years later (1029) John XIX revoked this decision, and at a new synod restored to the Patriarch of Grado all his former privileges. King Canute of Denmark and England obtained from the pope a promise that his English and Danish subjects would not be held in the same manner as the others; and that the archbishops of his kingdom should not be so heavily taxed for the bestowal of the pallium. John granted the Bishop of Silva Candida, near Rome, a special privilege to say Mass in St. Peter's on certain days. A dispute between the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna was settled by the pope in favour of the former. He took the Abbey of Cluny under its protection, and renewed its privileges in spite of the protests of Goslin, Bishop of Mâcon; at the same time he rebuked Abbot Odilo of Cluny for not accepting the See of Lyons. The feast of St. Martial, reputed disciple of the Apostles and founder of the church of Lignoges, was raised by John to the rank of the feast of an Apostle. In the case of certain French bishops the pope maintained the rights of the Holy See. He seems to have been the first pope to grant an indulgence in return for a banquet towards the end of 1032, probably on 6 November.
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John XX. See John XXI, Pope.

John XXX (XXI), Pope, b. at Lisbon between 1210 and 1220; enthroned, 1276; d. at Viterbo, 20 May, 1277. The son of one Julianus, he was baptized Peter, and was known as Petrus Juliani or Petrus Hispanus. After his earlier studies in the cathedral school at Lisbon, he entered the University of Paris and attended lectures on dialectics, logic, and, more particularly, those on Aristotle in physics and metaphysics, these being then given by Albertus Magnus. The natural philosophy of Aristotle had a special attraction for Peter. He zealously pursued the study of medicine, and also that of theology, attaching himself especially to the Minorite magister, John of Parna. On completing his studies, he was called in 1247 as professor of medicine to the University of Sienna, which was at that time being greatly enlarged. Here he wrote his "Summule logicæs", for almost three hundred years the favourite textbook on logic. Stapper's investigations (see below) have now established the authorship beyond the shadow of a doubt. In the fifteenth century the "Summule" was translated into Greek by George Scholarius, and was also translated into other languages. In content and form the book is based on the method current at the University of Paris, and on the compendium of William Shakespeare; Peter was professor there. While teaching at Siena, he also made a collection of medical prescriptions.
About 1261 Peter appears in the retinue of Cardinal Ottoboni Fieschi; towards this time also he was made deacon of the Church of Lisbon, an office which he later exchanged for the archidiocesate of Vermuy in the Diocese of Braga. From this period probably dates his acquaintance with Teobaldo Visconti. When, in 1272, Teobaldo came to Viterbo after his election to the pontificate, he assented to the suggestion of the Bishop and his physician in ordinary. While occupying this position, the latter wrote his "Thesaurus pauperum", in which he gives a remedy for the diseases of every part of the body. This book was widely used, but was in time variously interpolated. Peter's wide reputation for learning led to his selection as Archbishop of Braga by the cathedral chapter in spring, 1273. Shortly afterwards Gregory X appointed him Cardinal-Bishop of Tusculum, and as such he is referred to on 5 June, 1273. But he continued to govern temporarily the See of Braga until 23 May, 1275, when the pope appointed another archbishop. In June, 1275, Peter accompanied Gregory X to the General Council of Lyons, where he was consecrated bishop. Gregory X's two successors in the Holy See, Innocent V and Adrian V, ruled only a very short time. The latter died at Viterbo on 18 August, 1276, having been elected on 17 August, and Peter, renouncing office, was consecrated archbishop of Braga by the ears of the cardinals, he had spoken of an alteration in the decrees of Lyons concerning the papal conclave, and had suspended them temporarily. After the death of Adrian V, the conclave in Viterbo was protracted, in consequence of which disturbances broke out in the town, thus hastening the election, so that in the week following 13 September Petrus Juliani, Cardinal-Bishop of Tusculum, was chosen pope, and crowned as John XXI (really XX) the following Sunday (20 September). The new pope wished forthwith to arrange the rules for the conclave. In the Bull "Licet felicis recordationis" he suspended with the consent of the cardinals the decrees issued at Lyons, and declared his intention of issuing in the near future the new regulations. On the same day (20 September, 1276) he issued another Bull, directed against those who had taken part in the disturbances during the last council (see Cowclay).

The pope was now in a position to turn his attention to the political situation. Since 1263, when Urban V had bestowed the Kingdom of Sicily upon Charles of Anjou, the latter had tried little by little to strengthen himself in Rome states. Charles himself went to Viterbo to win over the new pope, but the latter did not assent to his plans. On 7 October, the king took the oath of fealty for Sicily, in which it was provided that Sicily should never be united with Tuscany or Lombardy, nor yet with the Roman Empire. The pope, however, did not reappoint him. 20 November, either did he make him Vicar of Tuscany or Lombardy, honours which Innocent IV had bestowed upon him. In November, John sent an ambassador with letters to Rudolf of Hapsburg, inviting him to send a plenipotentiary to the Curia to negotiate with the plenipotentiary sent by Charles of Anjou concerning the conclusion of peace. As soon as this should be accomplished, Rudolf was to set out for Rome to receive the imperial crown. Soon after, John began negotiations with Rudolf relative to Romagna, the ancient Exarchate of Ravenna, which he wished definitely restored to the Latin Church. He sent as legate Giovanni Visconti, Concerning the collection and employment of the tithes levied on all ecclesiastical benefices, which the Council of Lyons had ordered in preparation for a crusade, the pope issued various instructions for the different countries. The cross had been taken by Philip III of France and Alfonso of Aragon, still reigning in February, 1276, Philip solemnly declared that he would lead the army in person against the Saracens. But the two kings found themselves involved in a quarrel over the Kingdom of Navarre. The Pope laboured to avert the outbreak of hostilities by sending, in November, 1276, legates to both kings, and by remonstrating with the parties in earnest and urgent letters. Soon after this Philip had to disband the large army he had assembled, and a treaty was signed between the two monarchs. By the beginning of 1277 the two kings began again to make preparations for war, and again the pope was obliged to send his legates to mediate, wherein they were again successful.

John also endeavoured to secure from the King of Portugal an amelioration of the ecclesiastical conditions in that country, but his pontificate was too short to witness the realization of his purpose. He demanded from Edward I of England the arrears of tribute which that country had owed the Holy See since the reign of King John (1215). He also sought the release of Eleanor, Countess of Montfort, and her brother Amaury, whom King Edward held prisoners. Many letters were sent by the pope to the king and the English bishops relative to this matter. The envoys sent out by the Byzantine emperor, Michael Paleologus, to the Council of Lyons swore that the emperor had renounced the sede vacante, and set the see of Venice subject to the obedience of the Holy See. In this way the emperor sought to obtain the pope's protection against the Western princes, who threatened his dominion. An embassy from Constantinople had already been sent to the Curia in Innocent V's reign, and that pontiff had appointed an envoy to the Byzantine Court, but died before the latter left Italy. Pope John appointed other envoys, two bishops and two Dominicans, and furnished them with minute instructions, as well as with letters for the Emperor Michael, his son Andronicus, and the Greek clergy. In April, 1277, a synod was held at Lyon, and the new patriarch, John Becius, who was an earnest supporter of the union of the Churches. At this synod the emperor and his son embraced the Roman Catholic Faith, and ratified all the promises previously made in their name at the Council of Lyons. The bishops assembled at the synod acknowledged the papal primacy and the doctrine of the Roman Church, and the patriarch addressed a letter to the pope, in which all minor discrepancy in teaching was satisfactorily explained. The messenger, who had charge of this epistle as well as of the documents drawn up by the emperor, did not remain annullable for the East, ambassadors came to the pope from Aega, Khan of Tartary, who had also sent an embassy to the Council of Lyons. The Khan wished to enter into an alliance with the Crusaders and to give them his support; he also asked to have missionaries sent to him. The pope sent the ambassadors to Charles of Sicily, Peter Damilet, Philip of France, and Edward of England, but none of these sovereigns had any serious intention of undertaking a crusade. John himself appointed missionaries to go to Tartary, but died before they set out on their journey.

Although John showed especial favour towards the University of Paris, he took care to exclude all erroneous teaching from this famous seat of ecclesiastical learning. Some chroniclers maintain that this pope was an enemy of the monks and friars. However, among the documents sent from the papal chancery under John XXI, there are numerous letters in which the papal legates express the desire that the religious orders should possess property and be exempt from all taxes. On many occasions, also, he gave evidence of his great respect for the monastic orders. On what particular act of the pope's this adverse criticism is based, is unknown; however, in the most trustworthy accounts of his life, no foundation is found for the charge of oppression of the papal legates Gaetano Orsini, who later ascended the papal throne as Nicholas III, exercised a great influence on the govern-
ment of the Church. Amid the cares of the papacy John found time for his scientific studies, which were under control through the help of the Jesuits. To secure the necessary quiet for these studies, he had an apartment added to the papal palace at Viterbo, to which he could retire when he wished to work undisturbed. On 14 May, 1277, while the pope was alone in this apartment, it collapsed; John was buried under the ruins, and died on 20 May in consequence of the serious injuries he had received. Soon after the death of this scholarly pope, various rumours were circulated, based upon his great medical learning; he was even accused of dealing in the magic arts. A few monastic chroniclers, seeing in him an enemy, compared him to these baseless tales, and thus the undervalued stigma was cast upon the memory of John XXI.

Quatremére de Quincy, Les Registres de Grégoire X et de Jean XXI (Paris, 1892–9); Potthast, Regesta Rom. Pont. 1198–1314 seq.; Kohler, Vollständiges Nachricht von Papst Johann XXI (Göttingen, 1870); Strapper, Papst Johannes XXI in Kirchen- gesch. Studien, IV (Münster, 1890), 4; Died, Die Summe legis saec. des Patres Hespanos et Ihr Verhältnis zu Michael Piusius in Festschrift des deutschen Compo sino in Rom (Freiburg, 1907), 135–61; Oertel, Die päpstlichen Krönungsbräuche des 13 Jahrhunderts (Heiligenstadt, 1892); Neuburger und Pospel, Handbuch der Gesch. der Modernen, I (Jena, 1863), 692, doubts his authenticity of the sermon. For his work at Versailles, see the works of the eye, Liber de Oculo, see Pettinga, Die bekanntesten und wichtigsten Bekanntschaften der Mediziner, II (Amsterdam, 1897–98), 405–20, 570–90. The Liber de oculo was first edited, with a German version, by Berger (Münich, 1899).

J. P. KIRSCH.

John XXIII, Pope (Jacques d'Eusee), b. at Cahors in 1249; enthroned 5 September, 1316; d. at Avignon, 4 December, 1334. He received his early education in the Dominicans in his native town, and later studied theology and law at Montpellier and Paris. He then taught both canon and civil law at Toulouse and Cahors, came into close relations with Charles II of Naples, and was made Bishop of Lyonesse in 1300. In 1309 he was appointed chancellor of Charles II, and in 1310 was transferred to the See of Avignon. He delivered legal opinions favourable to the suppression of the Templars, but he also defended Boniface VIII and the Bull "Unam Sanctam." On 23 December, 1312, Clement V made him Cardinal-Bishop of Porto. After the death of Clement V (20 April, 1314) the Holy See was vacant for two years and three and a half months. The cardinals assembled in Carpentras for the election of a pope were divided into two violent factions, and could come to no agreement. The electoral college was composed of eight Italian cardinals, ten of France, four of Spain and Portugal, and three from other parts of France. After many weeks of unprofitable discussion as to where the conclave should be held, the electoral assembly was entirely dissolved. Ineffectual were the efforts of several princes to induce the cardinals to undertake an election; neither party would yield. After his consistory Philip V of France was finally able to assemble a concave of twenty-three cardinals in the Dominican monastery at Lyons on 26 June, 1316, and on 7 August, Jacques, Cardinal-Bishop of Porto, was chosen pope. After his coronation at Lyons on 5 September as John XXII, the pope set out for Avignon, where the cardinals joined him.

His vast correspondence shows that John XXII followed closely the political and religious movements in all countries, and sought on every possible occasion the advancement of ecclesiastical interests. Nor was he less insistent than his predecessors on the supreme influence of the papacy in political matters. For this reason he often involved himself in disputes which lasted throughout the greater portion of his pontificate. Great difficulties were also raised for the pope by the controversies among the Franciscans, which Clement V had tried in vain to settle. A number of Franciscans, the so-called "Spirituals", or "Fraticelli", adherents of the most rigorous views, refused to submit to that pope's decision, and after the deaths of Clement V and Gonzalvez, General of the Minorites, they rebelled, especially in the South of France and in Italy, declaring that the pope had no power to dispense from their rule, since this was nothing other than the Gospel. They then proceeded to drive the Conventuals from their houses, and take possession of the same, thereby causing scandal and much disorder. The newGeneral of the Franciscans, John, who in 1317 ordered the refractory friars to submit to their superiors, and caused the doctrines and opinions of the Spirituals to be investigated. On 23 January, 1318, many of their doctrines were declared erroneous. Those who refused to yield were treated as heretics; many were burned at the stake, and some escaped to Sicily.

These troubles among the Franciscans were increased by the quarrel about evangelical poverty which broke out among the Conventuals themselves. The general chapter of Perugia, through their general, Michael of Cesena, and other learned men of the order (including William Occam), defended the opinion of Berenger Talon, that Christ and His Apostles had no possessions either individually or in common. In 1322 Pope John declared this statement null and void, and in 1325 denounced as heretical the assertion that Christ and the Apostles had no possessions either individually or in common, and could not even temporarily dispose of what they had for personal use. Not only the Spirituals, but also the adherents of Michael of Cesena and William Occam, protested against this decree, whereupon in 1324 the pope issued a new Bull, confirming his former decision, setting aside all objections to it, and declaring those who opposed this decision heretics and enemies of the Church. Summoned to appear at Avignon, Michael of Cesena obeyed the summons, but refused to yield and, when threatened with imprisonment, sought safety in flight. Leaving Avignon on 25 May, 1328, and accompanied by William Occam and his last nóngers, he took on himself to Louis of Bavaria for protection.

Political conditions in Germany and Italy moved the pope to assert over the latter far-reaching political claims, and similarly with regard to the German Crown, because of the latter's union with the imperial office. On this score a violent quarrel broke out between the pope and King Louis of Bavaria. During the vacancy that followed the death of Clement V, there had arisen a disputed election for the throne of Germany, Louis of Bavaria having been crowned at Aschen, and Frederick of Austria at Bonn (23 Nov., 1314). The electors of the latter candidate, the former candidate, and the king, each claimed the imperial recognition of their choice, and also to seek for him imperial coronation. On the day of his coronation (6 Sept., 1315) John wrote to both Louis and Frederick and also to the other German princes, admonishing them to settle their disputes amicably. As there was a universal acknowledgment of German king, and the pope had not given preference to either candidate, neither could hope to exercise imperial authority. Nevertheless, in 1315 Louis appointed Jean de Belmont imperial vicar for Italy, and at the same time supported Galeazzo Visconti of Milan, then in open opposition to the pope. The latter maintained (13 March, 1317) that, by reason of the vacancy of the Roman Empire, all imperial jurisdiction rested with the pope, and, following the example of his predecessor Clement V, he appointed King Robert of Sicily imperial vicar for Italy (July, 1317). On 28 September, 1322, Louis of Bavaria informed the pope that he had overcome Louis of Hungary, and that John, upon which John wrote him a friendly letter.

Louis, however, took no further steps to effect a reconciliation with the pope. On the contrary, he supported in their opposition to the papal legates the excommunicated Visconti of Milan and the Italian Ghibellines, acted as legitimate emperor, and pro-
claimed, on 2 March, 1323, Berthold von Neifen imperial vicar for Italy. Thereupon John, following the precedent of Gregory VII and Innocent III, warned Louis of Bavaria that the examination and approval of the chosen German king with a view to the consequent bestowal of the imperial dignity be- longing thereto, would be refused, and that the legitimacy of his election had been settled; that he must recall all commands already issued, give no further aid to the enemies of the Church—especially the Visconti of Milan, condemned as heretics—and within three months present himself before the pope. Should Louis not submit to this admonition, he was threatened with excommunication. The subsequent behaviour of Louis was very equivocal. He sent an embassy to the pope, asking for and obtaining a delay of two months before appearing in the papal presence. At the same time he de- clared at Nuremberg on 16 November, 1323, that he did not recognize the pope's action or his claim to examine into the election of a German king; he also accused John of countenancing heretics, and proposed the calling of a general council to sit in judgment on him. During this respite, lengthened at his own request by the pope, who reserved his decision, and on 23 March, 1324, John pronounced on the king the sentence of excommunication. On the other hand the latter published at Sachsenhausen on 22 May, 1324, an appeal in which he accused the pope of enmity to the empire, of heresy and protection of heretics, and appealed from John's decision to a general council. An open breach henceforth existed, followed by disastrous results. Louis persecuted the few German cardinals, who recognized the papal Bull, whereas upon John on 11 July, 1324, declared all his rights to imperial recognition forfeited. The pope further ratified the treaty between Duke Leopold of Austria and Duke Frederick of Tyrol, and summoned Louis to the States of Ulm in 1325, whereupon John, not being able to help the latter to the title of German King, and then of Roman Emperor. However, as Leopold died on 28 Feb., 1326, and Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria became reconciled, the king's power in Ger- many became firmly established.

The quarrel between John XXII and Louis of Bavaria stirred up a vigorous literary feud concerning the relations of Church and State. Louis was supported by the Franciscan Spirituals, e.g., Ubertiio da Cazale, Michael of Cesena, William Occam, Bonagratia di Bergamo, and many others whose extreme ideas on the question of church poverty had been condemned by the pope; also by two theologians of the University of Paris, Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun (de Genduno), joint authors of the famous "Defensor Pacis", which was intended to prove that the only way to maintain peace is by the complete subordination of the ecclesiastical power to that of the State. Denying the primacy of the pope, the authors asserted that the emperor alone could authorize ecclesiastical to exercise criminal jurisdiction, that all temporal goods of the Church belonged to the emperor, etc. Other theologians—e.g., Henry von Kelheim, provincial of the Franciscans, Henry Hermann the king's privy secretary, Abbot Engelbert of Admont, Lupo de Bebenburg, afterwards Bishop of Bamberg, and William Occam, though not so extreme in their views as the authors of the "Defensor Pacis", willingly exalted the imperial above the papal power. It was unfortunate for the field and, in theological matters, in- experienced king that he fell into the hands of such ad- visers. The "Defensor Pacis" was anathematized by a papal Bull of 23 October, 1327, and some of its theses were condemned as heretical by the University of Paris. Many theologians in their writings de- ferred to the ecclesiastical authority and the primacy of the pope, and among them the Franciscan Albert, Sancto Elpidio, later Archbishop of Ravena, the Minorite, Alvarius Pelagius, the Augustinian Augustinian Triumphus of Ancona, and Conrad of Magen- berg. On their side, however, the defence was carried too far, some of them even extolling the pope as abso- lute ruler of the world.

When Louis of Bavaria saw his power firmly es- tablished in Germany, he set out early in 1327 for Italy, to continue the struggle against the rival house of Aragon. In the spring, he held a congress at Trent. In March he passed through Bergamo on his way to Milan. On 5 April John XXII declared forfeited all rights of Louis to the German Crown, also to all fiefs held from the Church and from former sovereigns, and finally to the Duchy of Bavaria. Hence he summoned Louis to appear before the Holy See within six months, and ac- cused him of heresy for defending a doctrine which the Head of the Church had repudiated, and for taking under his protection the heretics, Marullius and John of Jandun. Louis paid no attention to this notice, which indeed only aggravated his opposition to the pope. In Milan he received (30 May) the crown of Lombardy from the hands of two deposed bishops, and arbitrarily appointed several new bishops. The pope on his side appointed bishops to see falling vacant within the empire, and continued to fill the vacant sees. But the breach henceforth existed. In 1328 Louis set out for Rome, where the Guelphs had been overthrown with their senator, King Robert of Naples. On 17 January, 1328, the excommunicated German king received in Rome the imperial crown from Sciarra Colonna, who on 19 April, after a farcical proceeding, and under the name of Louis of Bavaria, proclaimed John XXII a heretic, usurer, and oppressor of the Church, and de- prived him of all his papal dignities. A straw image of the pope was publicly burned in Rome, and on 12 May the Franciscan Spiritual, Pietro Rainalducci of Corbaro, was proclaimed anti-pope by Louis, taking at once the title of Peter II, afterwards Peter the Great, the whole of Italy returned to the obedience of the legiti- mate pope. The latter meanwhile had renewed his sentence against Louis of Bavaria, and proclaimed in Italy a crusade against him (1328). At the same time he summoned the German princes to hold another election, and excommunicated Michael of Cesena, William Occam, and Bonagratia. The adherents of Louis in Lombardy soon dwindled away, and he re- turned to Germany in the beginning of 1330. Here, too, the people were weary of the long conflict, and wished for peace, so that Louis was compelled to take steps to mitigate the position of the pope when he arrived in May, 1330, he entered into negotiations with Avignon through the mediation of Archbishop Baldwin of Trier, King John of Bohemia, and Duke Otto of Austria. The pope demanded from Louis renunciat- ion of all claims on the imperial title. Louis on that occasion refused to entertain the idea, but was later (1333) willing to discuss the question of peace. The matter, however, was then postponed. Whether John XXII arbitrarily severed Italy from the empire has never been definitely settled, for the authenticity of the Bull "Ne praetereat" is not certain.

In the last years of John's pontificate there arose a domineering attack against the* through the pope, brought on by himself, and which his enemies made use of to discredit him. Before his elevation to
the Holy See, he had written a work on this question, in which he stated that the souls of the blessed departed do not see God until after the Last Judgment. After becoming pope, he advanced the same teaching in his sermons. The King of the Two Sicilies, however, with some opposition, many theologians, who adhered to the usual opinion that the blessed departed did see God before the Resurrection of the Body and the Last Judgment, even calling his view heretical. A great commotion was aroused in the University of Paris when he made this. In particular, the Dominican order tried to disseminate there the pope's view. Pope John wrote to King Philip IV on the matter (November, 1333), and emphasized the fact that, as long as the Holy See had not given a decision, the theologians enjoyed perfect freedom in this matter. In December, 1335, the theologians at Paris, after a consultation on the question, definitively in favour of the doctrine that the souls of the blessed departed saw God immediately after death or after their complete purification; at the same time they pointed out that the pope had given no decision on this question but only advanced his personal opinion, and now petitioned the pope to confirm their decisions. John appointed a commission at Avignon to study the writings of the Fathers, and to discuss further the disputed question. In a consistory held on 3 January, 1334, the pope explicitly declared that he had never meant to teach aught contrary to Holy Scripture or the rule of faith and in fact had not intended to recommend his opinion. After his death he withdrew his former opinion, and declared his belief that souls separated from their bodies enjoyed in heaven the Beatific Vision.

The Spirituals, always in close alliance with Louis of Bavaria, profited by these events to accuse the pope of heresy, being supported by Cardinal Napoleon Orani. In union with the latter, King Louis wrote to the cardinals, urging them to call a general council and condemn the pope. The incident, however, had no further consequences. With uniting energy, and in countless documents, John followed up all ecclesiastical or politico-ecclesiastical questions of his day, though no particular granteur is remarkable in his dealings. He gave salutary advice to ruling sovereigns, especially to the Kings of France and of Naples, settled the disputes of rulers, and tried to restore peace in England. He increased the number of sees in the West, especially in the new seels and colleges, founded a large library at Avignon, furthered the fine arts, and dispatched and generously maintained missionaries in the Far East. He caused the works of Petrus Olivi and Meister Eckhardt to be examined, and condemned the former, while he censured many passages in the latter's works. He published the Canons of the Latin Church in Avignon, and sanctioned the general collection of the "Corpus Juris Canonici", and was the author of numerous decreals ("Extravagantes Johannis XXII") in "Corp. Jur. Can."). He enlarged and partly re-organized the papal Curia, and was particularly active in the administration of ecclesiastical finances.

The papacy at the time of John XXII was precarious, owing to the disturbed condition of Italy, especially of the Papal States, consequent on the removal of the papacy from its historic seat at Rome. Moreover, since the end of the thirteenth century the College of Cardinals had enjoyed one half of the large income from tributary kingdoms, the sertii oni of the bishops, and some less important sources. Pope John, on the other hand, had need of large revenues, not only for the maintenance of his Court, but particularly for the wars in Italy. Since the thirteenth century the papal treasury had exacted from the minor benefices, when conferred directly by the pope, a small tax (see ANETTEN, APOTOLIC CAMERA). In 1319 John XXII reserved to himself all minor benefices falling vacant in the Western Church during the succeeding three years, and in this way collected from each of them the aforesaid annates, as often as they were conferred by the pope. Moreover, many foreign benefices were already canonically in the papal gift, and the annates from them were paid regularly into the papal treasury. John also made frequent use of the right known as jus spoleti, or right of spoils, which permitted him under certain circumstances to divert the estate of a deceased bishop into the papal treasury. He procured further relief by demanding special subsidies from various archbishops and their suffragans. The extensive reservation of ecclesiastical benefices was destined to exercise a prejudicial influence on ecclesiastical life. The centralized administration took on a highly bureaucratic character, and the purely legal standpoint was too constantly in evidence. The pope's financial measures, however, were highly successful at the time, though in the end they evoked no little resistance and dissatisfaction. In spite of the large expenditures of his pontificate, John left an estate of 500,000 gold florins—not five millions as stated by some chroniclers.

John XXII died on 4 December, 1334, in the eighty-fifth year of his age. He was a man of serious character, of austere and simple habits, broadly cultivated, very energetic and tenacious. But he held too persistently to canonico-legal traditions, and centralized overmuch the ecclesiastical administration. His financial measures, more rigorously applied by his successors, made the Catholic Church very strong, and the papacy very wealthy. The transfer of the papacy from Rome to Avignon was esteemed to have taken place in the interests of France, which impression was strengthened by the preponderance of French cardinals, and by the long-continued conflict with King Louis of Bavaria. In this way was aroused a widespread distrust of the papacy, which could not fail to result in consequences detrimental to the interior life of the Church.
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affairs of his kingdom. On 18 May King Ruprecht of Germany, the firm supporter of Gregory XII, died. The elections of Mainz and Cologne proved that they intended to choose Sigismund, King of Hungary, as King of Germany. As Sigismund had, even before he heard of Ruprecht’s death, entered into negotiations with the Pisan pope, John exerted himself all the more readily on his behalf, and on 21 July Sigismund, who had become reconciled with his brother Wenzel of Bohemia, was chosen King of Germany. Sigismund’s election was also recognized by Gregory XII. In April, 1411, John XXIII advanced with Louis of Anjou upon Rome, where they vigorously prosecuted the war against Ladislaus of Naples, and completely routed him at the battle of Roccasecca on 1 May, 1411, but made no further progress. Soon afterwards Louis of Anjou returned to France, thus enabling Ladislaus to rally his troops and strengthen his positions. Subsequently, John began negotiations with Ladislaus in spite of the excommunication of 11 August, 1411. Ladislaus thereupon abandoned the cause of Gregory, and acknowledged John as legitimate pope, in recognition of which the latter withdrew his excommunication, enfeoffed Ladislaus with the Kingdom of Naples, consented to his conquest of Sicily, appointed him gonzafalconnier, or standard-bearer, of the Roman Church, and gave him financial aid (16 October, 1412).

In conformity with a resolution passed at the Council of Pisa, John had summoned a new council to meet at Rome on 29 April, 1412, for the purpose of carrying out ecclesiastical reforms. He also appointed a number of new cardinals, among whom were many able men, such as Francesco Zabarella of Florence, Pierre d’Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, Guillaume Fillastre, dean of Reims, and Robert Hallam, Bishop of Salisbury. From the beginning of 1412 conferences and meetings of the clergy had been held throughout France in preparation for this council, among the representatives appointed by the king being Cardinal Pierre d’Ailly and Patriarch Cranaph, erstwhile cardinal in 1413. But, when the council was opened in April, there were so few participants that it had to be prorogued several times. When the sessions finally began, the only thing accomplished was the condemnation of the writings of Wyclif, the council being dissolved in March, 1413. John’s irremediable weakness in dealing with Ladislaus of Naples soon led to another attack by the latter upon papal territory. In May, 1413, he invaded the Roman province, and John was compelled to fly with his cardinals. He escaped to Florence, where he sought the protection of Sigismund, King of Hungary, who invited him to Northern Italy for the convocation of a general council to put an end to the unfortunate schism. John’s legates were authorized to come to an understanding with Sigismund on this matter, and Sigismund took advantage of the pope’s predicament to insist on the selection of Constance as the meeting-place of the council. On 30 October, 1413, Sigismund invited Popes Gregory XII and Benedict XIII and all Christendom to attend, and prevailed on John XXIII, with whom he had a meeting at Lod to attend the end of November, to issue the Convocation Bull (9 December, 1413) of the general council to be opened at Constance on 1 November, 1414.

By the sudden death of Ladislaus (6 August, 1414) John’s position in Italy was improved, and he could now return to Rome. But the cardinals urgently protested that his presence was needed at the Council of Constance; so that John hastened to press the matter of presiding in person, and direct there the treatment of all ecclesiastical matters. On 1 October, 1414, John set out for Constance with a large following and supplied with ample means, but with heavy heart and anxious forebodings. Timidity and suspicion had replaced the warlike spirit he had shown as cardinal.
On his way through the Tyrol he formed an alliance with Frederick of Austria, who was on terms of enmity with Sigismund. John and his nine cardinals made their entry into Constance on 28 October, 1414, and the breaking up of the confederacy, which could be promoted only by the abdication or the deposition of all three claimants of the papacy. John at first dominated the council, while he endeavoured to increase his adherents by presents, and, by the aid of spies, to learn the temper of the members. However, the hostility set up for Fieschi, who had been Duke of Burgundy, also his adherent. John’s flight, in consequence of the great difficulties it caused the council, only increased the hostility towards him, and, while he himself tried to negotiate further concerning his abdication, his supporters were obliged to submit to Sigismund. Formally declared the twentieth session (29 May, 1415), John made his submission and commenced himself to the mercy of the council. John was accused of the gravest offences in several inimical writings as well as in the formal charges of the council. Undeniably secular and ambitious, his moral life was not above reproach, and his unscrupulous methods in no wise accorded with the requirements of his high office. On the other hand, the heinous crimes of which his opponents in the council accused him were certainly greatly exaggerated. After his abdication he was again known as Baldassare Cossa, and was given into the hands of the Lord of Burgundy, who had always been his enemy. The latter kept him confined in different places (Rudolfszell, Gottlieben, Heidelberg, and Mannheim). At the forty-second session of the council, 28 Dec., 1417, after Martin V had been elected, the release of Cossa was decreed. It was not, however, till the following year that he recovered his liberty. He then wrote some bitter words against Martin V, eluding the oath and did homage to him as the Head of the Church. On 23 June, 1419, the new pope made him Cardinal-Bishop of Tusculum. But Cossa was completely crushed, and died a few months later at Florence, where he was buried in the baptistery beside the cathedral. Costo de’ Medici erected a magnificent tomb to his memory.

**John, Epistles of Saint, three canonical books of the New Testament written by the Apostle St. John.**

**First Epistle.**—I. Authenticity. — A. External evidence. — The very brevity of this letter (105 verses divided into five chapters) and the lateness of its composition might lead us to suspect no traces thereof in the Apostolic Fathers. Such traces there are, some of which are questionable. St. Papias (Eusebius, Hist. eccl., II, 36) says that in the time of John, who was with his brethren Philip and James in the land of Judaea, etc., sent a book written by John to Harnack, whose chronology we shall follow in this article) wrote to the Philippians: “For whosoever confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh is Antichrist.” — We are confident that Harnack, who is a great expert, has been mistaken about St. John’s letters, and what is more, that the Epistle of St. John (as we shall see in the next chapter) is the first Epistle of St. John. — Therefore, the Epistle of St. John is the first Epistle of St. John, and consequently, the Apostolic Fathers are not mistaken in saying that St. John wrote this letter. — We have the authority of St. Irenæus, who says: “The distinctively Johannine phrase, ‘come in the Flesh’, is also used in the First Epistle of St. John (v. 10; Funk, op. cit., I, 53), which was written about A.D. 130.” The First Epistle of St. John is the first Epistle of St. John, and consequently, the Apostolic Fathers are not mistaken in saying that St. John wrote this letter. — We have the authority of St. Irenæus, who says: “The distinctively Johannine phrase, ‘come in the Flesh’, is also used in the First Epistle of St. John (v. 10; Funk, op. cit., I, 53), which was written about A.D. 130.”

**II. Canon.** — The Epistle of St. John is the first Epistle of St. John, and consequently, the Apostolic Fathers are not mistaken in saying that St. John wrote this letter. — We have the authority of St. Irenæus, who says: “The distinctively Johannine phrase, ‘come in the Flesh’, is also used in the First Epistle of St. John (v. 10; Funk, op. cit., I, 53), which was written about A.D. 130.”

**III. Integrity.** — The only part of the letter concern-
ing the authenticity and canonicity whereof there is serious question is the famous passage of the three witnesses: "And there are three who give testimony (in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. And these three are one. And there are three that give testimony on earth): the spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three are one (1 John, 5:7)."

During the centuries, effort has been made to expunge from our Clementine Vulgate edition of canonical Scripture the words that are bracketed. Let us examine the facts of the case.

A. Greek MSS.—The disputed part is found in no uncial Greek MSS. and in only four rather recent minuscule, one of the fourteenth and three of the sixteenth century. No Greek epistolarum MS. contains the passage.

B. Versions.—No Syriac MS. of any family—Peshito, Phlœxian, or Harßian—has the three witnesses; and their presence in the printed Syriac Gospels is due to translation from the Vulgate. So too, the Coptic MSS.—both Sahidic and Bohairic—have no trace of the disputed part; nor have the Ethiopic MSS., which represent Greek influence through the medium of Coptic. The Armenian MSS., which favor the reading of the Vulgate, are admitted to represent a Latin influence which dates from the twelfth century or earlier. The Armenian Latin reading. Of the Itala or Old Latin MSS., only two have our present reading of the three witnesses: Codex Monacensis (q), of the sixth or seventh century; and the Speculum (m), an eighth or ninth-century MS. which gives many quotations from the New Testament. Even the Vulgate, in the majority of its earliest MSS., is without the passage in question. Witnesses to the canonicity are: the Bible of Theodulph (eighth century) in the National Library of Paris; Codex Caversinus (ninth century), the best representative of the Spanish type of text; Toletanus (12th century); and the majority of the Latin Vulgate after the twelfth century. There was some dispute as to the canonicity of the three witnesses as early as the sixth century; for the preface to the Catholic Epistles in Codex Fuldaensis (A. D. 541–546) complains about the omission of this passage from some of the Latin versions.

C. The Fathers.—(1) Greek Fathers, until the twelfth century, seem one and all to have had no knowledge of the three witnesses as canonical Scripture. At times they cite verses 8 and 9 and omit the disputed portions of verses 7 and 8. The Fourth Lateran (A. D. 1215), in its decree against Abbot John (I. 10), another ecclesiastic, 10th century, quotes the disputed passage with the remark "sicut in quibusdam codicibus inventur." Thereafter, we find the Greek Fathers making use of the text as canonical. (2) The Syriac Fathers never use the text. (3) The Armenian Fathers do not use it before the twelfth century. (4) The Latin Fathers make much earlier use of the text as canonical Scripture. St. Cyprian (third century) seems undoubtedly to have had it in mind, when he quotes John, x, 30, and adds: "Et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est.—Et hi tres unum sunt." (De Unitate Ecclesie, vii). Clear also is the witness of St. Fulgentius (sixth century): "Respon- sio contra Ariano" in P. L., LXV, 224, who refers to the above witness of St. Cyprian. In fact, outside of St. Augustine, the Fathers of the African Church are to be grouped with St. Cyprian in favor of the canonicity of the passage. The silence of the great and well-known (S. Augustin et patris, lib. 10, c. 11) witnesses of the text in the African Church are admitted facts that militate against the canonicity of the three witnesses. St. Jerome (fourth century) does not seem to know the text. After the sixth century, the disputed passage is more and more in use among the Latin Fathers; and, by the seventh century, it is commonly cited as canonical Scripture.

D. Ecclesiastical Documents.—Trent's is the first certain ecumenical decree, whereby the Church established the Canon of Scripture. We cannot say that the decree of Trent on the Canon necessarily included the three witnesses. For in the preliminary discussions that led up to the canonizing of "the entire books with all their parts, as these have been wont to be read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the old Latin Vulgate" and "that the Holy Ghost wotsoever to this special part; hence this special part is not canonized by Trent, unless it is certain that the text of the three witnesses has 'been wont to be read in the Catholic Church and is contained in the old Latin Vulgate'. Both conditions must be verified before the canonizing of the text is possible; and the testimony of the manuscripts is not a sufficient condition has as yet been verified with certainty; quite the contrary, textual criticism seems to indicate that the 'Comma Johanneum' was not at all times and everywhere wont to be read in the Catholic Church and is not contained in the original old Latin Vulgate. However, the Catholic theologian must take into account more than textual criticism; to him the authentic decisions of all Roman Congregations are guiding signs in the use of the Sacred Scripture, which the Church and only the Church has given to him as the Word of God. He cannot pass over the disciplinary decision of the Sacred Office in the case, whereby it is decreed that the authenticity of the 'Comma Johanneum' may not with safety (tudo) be denied or called into doubt. This disciplinary decision was approved by Leo XIII two days later. Though his approval was not in forma specifica, as was Pius X's approbation of the Decree "Lamentabili," all future discussion of the text in question must be carried on with due deference to this decree. (See "Revue Biblique," 1898, p. 149; and Pesch, "Praelaciones Dogmaticae," II, 250.)

IV. Author.—It was of chief moment to determine the author of this letter, i.e., whether it was written in the apostolic age, is Apostolic in its sources, and is trustworthy. Among those who admit the authenticity and canonicity of the letter, some hold that its sacred writer was not John the Apostle but John the Presbyter. We have traced the tradition of the Apostolic origin of the letter back to the time of St. Irenæus. Harnack and his followers admit that Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, assigns the authorship to St. John the Apostle; but have the hardihood to throw over all tradition, to accuse Irenæus of error in this matter, to cling to the doubtful witness of Papias, and to be utterly regardless of the patent fact that throughout three centuries and more Papia's name is missing in this John the Presbyter. The doubtful witness of Papias is saved for us by Eusebius ("Hist. eccl.," III, xxxix; Funk, "Patres Apostolici," I, p. 350): "And if any one came my way who had been a follower of the elders, I enquired the sayings of the elders, what John had said, or what had Andrew, or what had Peter said, or what Paul, or what Thomas or James, or what John (§ 17. 10) or Matthew or any one else of the disciples of the Lord, and what were Arianism and John the elder, the disciples of the Lord, saying?" (§ τις ὁ Ἀποστολος καὶ ὁ ἐπισκόπωρος ὁ Διονυσίως, οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητὴς λέγων). Harnack insists that Eusebius read his sources thoroughly; and, on the authority of Eusebius and of Papias, postulates the existence of a disciple of the Lord named John the Elder, who was distinct from John the Apostle; and to this fictitious John the Elder assigns all the Johannine writings (Geschichte der Altenkirchlichen Literatur, II, i, 657). With all Catholic authors, we consider that either Eusebius alone, or Papias and Eusebius, erred, and that Irenæus and the rest of the Fathers were right; in fact we lay the blame at the door of Eusebius. As Bardenhewer (Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Literatur, I, 540) says, Eusebius sets up a straw man. There never was a John the Elder; Funk (Patres Apostolici, I, 354), Dr. Salmon (Diction-
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ary of Christian Biography, III, 308), Hauserleiter (Thol. Litteraturblatt, 1896), Stilting, Guerike, and others.

Eusebius is here a special pleader. He opposes the millennium. Wrongly fancying that the Apocalypse favours the Chaldaei, he uses this by the Eusebius to rot the work of its Apostolic authority; the clumsiness of expression of Papias gives occasion to Eusebius in proof of the existence of two disciples of the Lord named John. To be sure, Papias mentions two Johns,—one among the Apostles, the other in a clause with Aristion. Both are called elders; and, as John is in his Gospel and First Epistle, may e.g. be Apostles, since he admits that Papias got information from those who had met the Apostles (substituting τοις ἀπόστολοι for τοις πρεσβύτεροι; see Hist. eccl., III, xxxix, 7). Hence it is that Papias, in joining John with Aristion, speaks of John the Elder and not of Aristion the Elder: Aristotle was not an elder or Apostle. The reason for joining the Aristion with John at all is that they were both witnesses of the present to Papias, whereas all the Apostles were witnesses of the past generation. Note that the second κοστή (dian) is used in regard to the group of witnesses of the past generation, since there is question of what they had said, whereas the present (λέγεις) is used in regard to the witnesses of the present generation, i.e. Aristion and John the Elder, since the question is what they are now saying. The Apostle John was alive in the time of Papias. He and he alone can be the elder of whom Papias speaks. How is it, then, that Papias mentions John twice? Hauserleiter conjectures that the phrase δι' ἑαυτοῦ is a gloss (Thol. Litteraturblatt, 1896). It is likelier that the repetition of the name of John is due to the clumsiness of expression of Papias. He does not mention all the Apostles, but only the two whom he undoubtfully means them all. His mention of John is quite natural, in view of the relation in which he stood to that Apostle. After mention of the group that were gone, he names the two from whom he now receives indirect information of the Lord’s teaching; these two are the disciples Aristion and John the Apostle.

V. Time and Place.—Irenaeus tells us the letter was written by St. John during his stay in Asia (Adv. Hær., III, 1). Nothing certain can be determined in this matter. The arguments are probable in favour of Ephesus and also for the last few years of the first century.

VI. Destination and Purpose.—The form is that of an ecumenical letter. Its destination is clearly the churches which St. John evangelized; he speaks to his "little children", "beloved", "brethren", and is affectionate and fatherly throughout the entire letter. The purpose is identical with the purpose of the Fourth Gospel,—that his children may believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and that believing may have life eternal in His name (I John, v, 13; John, xx, 31).

VII. Argument.—A logical analysis of the letter would be a mistake. The thought is built up not analytically but synthetically. After a brief introduction, St. John works up the thought that God is Light (i, 5); so, too, should we walk in the light (i, 7), keep from sin (i, 6-ii, 6), observe the new commandment of love (ii, 7), since he that loves is in the light and he that hates is in darkness (ii, 8-iii). Then follows the second leading Johannine thought that God is Love (iii—v, 12). Love means that we are sons of God (iii, 1-4): Divine sonship means that we are not in sin (iii, 4-13), that we love one another (iii, 13-44), that we believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God (iv, 5, 6); that God gave us this love (iv, 7-12), that God is true (iv, 7-12). The conclusion (v, 13-end) tells the reader that the purpose of the letter is to inculcate faith in Jesus Christ, since this faith is life eternal. In this conclusion as well as in other parts of the letter, the same salient and leading Johannine thoughts recur to defy analysis. John had two or three things to say; he said these two or three things over and over again in ever varying form.

SECOND EPISTLE.—These thirteen verses are directed against the named of Gnosticism which St. John strives to root up in his Gospel and First Epistle. Harnack and some others, who admit the canonicity of the Second and Third Epistles, assign them to the authorship of John the Elder; we have shown that this John the Elder never existed. The authenticity of this epistle is attested by very early Fathers, St. Polycarp ("Phil.", VII, i; Funk, "Patres Apostolici", I, 304) cites rather II John, 7, than I John, 4. St. Irenæus expressly quotes II John, 10, as the words of "John the Apostle of the Lord". The Muratorian Canon speaks of two Epistles of John. St. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the larger Epistle of John; and, as a consequence, knows at least two. Origen bears witness to the two shorter letters, which "both together do not contain a hundred lines" and are not admitted by all to be authentic. The canonicity of these two letters was long disputed. Eusebius puts them among the Apostolic canons. They are not found in the Peshitta. The Canon of the Western Church includes them after the fourth century; although only Trent's decree set the question of their canonicity beyond the dispute of such men as Cajetan. The Canon of the Eastern Church, outside of that of Antioch, includes them after the fourth century. The style and manner of the second letter are very like to those of the first. The destination of the letter has been much disputed. The opening words are variously interpreted,—"The ancient to the lady Elect, and her children" (δὲ πρεσβύτεροι εὐχερεὶς οἰκίας τοῦ τιμίου σωτῆρος ἀδελφοί). We have seen that the elder Electans means the Apostle. Who is the lady elect? Is she the Elect Kyria? The lady Eklektē Kyria? A lady named Eklektē Kyria? A lady elect, whose name is omitted? A Church? All these interpretations are defended. We consider, with St. Jerome, that the letter is addressed to a particular church, which St. John urges on to faith in Jesus Christ, to the avoidance of hereticons, to love. This interpretation best fits in with the ending to the letter,—"The children of thy sister Elect salute thee."

THIRD EPISTLE, fourteen verses addressed to Gaius, a private individual. This Gaius seems to have been an eclesiastic but a layman of some standing, is praised by John for his hospitality to visiting brethren (verses 2-9). The Apostle then goes on: I had written perhaps to the church; but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, doth not receive us (verse 9). This Diotrephes may have been the bishop of the Church. He is found fault with roundly, and Demetrius is set up for an example. This short letter, "twin sister", as St. Jerome called it, to the second of John's letters, is entirely a personal affair. No doctrine is discussed. The lesson of hospitality, especially of care for the preachers of the Gospel, is insisted on. The second of this letter as Apostolic is by St. Denis of Alexandria (third century). Eusebius refers to the letters called "the second and third of John, whether these chance to belong to the evangelist or to someone else with a name like his" ("Hist. eccl.", III, xxxv; Schwartz, II, 1, p. 250). The canonicity of the letter has already been treated. The greeting and ending of this letter are internal evidence of composition by the author of the previous Johannine letter. The simple and affectionate style, the firmness of the rebuke of Diotrephes are strictly Johannine. Nothing certain is known as to time and place of writing; but it is generally supposed that the two small letters by John end toward the end of his long life and in Ephesus.

Fathers: St. Clement of Alexandria, Adversaries in Epistolam I Johannis in P. G., XL, 733; St. Augustine, In

WALTER DRUM.

John, Gospel of St. — This subject will be considered under the following heads: (I) Contents and Scheme of the Gospel; (II) Distinctive Peculiarities; (III) Authorship; (IV) Circumstances of the Composition; (V) Critical Questions Concerning the Text; (VI) Historical Genuineness; (VII) Object and Importance.

I. CONTENTS AND SCHEME OF THE GOSPEL. — According to the traditional order, the Gospel of St. John occupies the last place among the four canonical Gospels. Although in many of the ancient copies this Gospel was, on account of the Apostolic dignity of the author, inserted immediately after or even before the Gospel of St. Matthew, the position it occupies to-day was from the beginning the most usual and the most approved.

As regards its contents, the Gospel of St. John is a narrative of the life of Jesus from His baptism to His Resurrection and His manifestation of Himself in the midst of His disciples. The chronicle falls naturally into four sections: — (1) the prologue (i, 1-18), containing what is in sense a brief epitome of the whole Gospel; in the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word; (2) the first part (i, 19-xxi, 50), which recounts the public life of Jesus from His baptism to the eve of His Passion; (3) the second part (xxii—xxvii), which relates the history of the Passion and Resurrection of the Saviour; (4) a short epilogue (xxvii, 23—25), referring to the great mass of the Saviour's words and works which are not recorded in the Gospel.

When we come to consider the arrangement of matter by the Evangelist, we find that it follows the historical order of events, as is evident from the above analysis. But the author displays in addition a special concern to determine exactly the time of the occurrence and the connexion of the various events fitted into this chronological framework. This is apparent at the very beginning of his narrative, when, as though in a diary, he chronicles the circumstances attendant on the beginning of the Saviour's public ministry, with four successive definite indications (i, 19, 35, 43; 23, 43; 35, 43). He lays special emphasis on the first miracles: "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee" (ii, 11), and "This is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee." (iv, 54).

Finally, he refers repeatedly throughout to the great religious and national festivals of the Jews for the purpose of indicating the exact historical sequence of the facts related (ii, 13; v, 1; vi, 4; vii, 2; x, 22; xii, 1, xiii, 1).

All the early and the majority of modern exeges are quite justified, therefore, in taking this strictly chronological arrangement of the events and Eucharistic of their commentaries. The divergent views of a few modern scholars are without objective support either in the text of the Gospel or in the history of its exegesis.

II. DISTINCTIVE PECULIARITIES. — The Fourth Gospel is written in Greek, and even a superficial study of it is sufficient to reveal many peculiarities, which give the narrative a distinctive character. Especially characteristic is the vocabulary and diction. His vocabulary is, it is true, less rich in peculiar expressions than that of Paul or of Luke: he uses in all about ninety words which are nowhere elsewhere found. Numerous are the expressions which are used more frequently by John than by the other sacred writers. Moreover, in comparison with the other books of the New Testament, the narrative of St. John contains a very considerable portion of those words and expressions which might be called the common vocabulary of the Four Evangelists.

What is even more distinctive than the vocabulary is the grammatical use of particles, pronouns, prepositions, verbs, etc., etc. In this respect it is also distinguished by many peculiarities of style—asyndeta, reduplications, repetitions, etc. On the whole, the Evangelist reveals a close intimacy with the Hellenistic speech of the first century of our era, which receives at his hands in certain expressions a Hebrew turn. His literary style is desertely lauded for its noble, natural, and not inartistic simplicity. He combines in harmonious fashion the rustic speech of the Synoptics with the urban phraseology of St. Paul (DEISSMANN, "Licht vom Osten," 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1909, p. 181).

What first attracts our attention in the subject-matter of the Gospel is the confinement of the narrative to the chronology of events which took place in Judea and Jerusalem. Of the Saviour's labours in Galilee John relates but a few events, without dwelling on details, and of these events only two—the multiplication of the loaves and fishes (vi, 1-13), and the sea-voyage (vi, 17—21)—are already related in the Synoptic Gospels.

A second limitation of material is seen in the selection of his subject-matter, for compared with the other Evangelists, John chronicles but few miracles and devotes his attention less to the miracles than to the discourses of Jesus. In most cases the events form, as it were, but a frame for the words, conversation, and teaching of the Saviour and His disputations with His adversaries. In fact it is the controversies with the Sanhedrists at Jerusalem which seem especially to claim the attention of the Evangelist. On such occasions John's interest, both in the narration of the circumstances and in the recording of the discourses and conversation of the Saviour, is a highly theological one. With justice, therefore, was John conceded, even in the earliest ages of Christianity, the honorary title of the "theologian" of the Evangelists. There are, in particular, certain great truths, to which he constantly refers in his Gospel and which may be regarded as his governing ideas; special mention should be made of such expressions as the Light of the World, the Truth, the Life, the Resurrection, etc. Not infrequently these or other phrases are found in pithy, enigmatic form. He lays especial emphasis on the course of the Saviour, and frequently recur, as a leit-motif, at intervals during the discourse (e.g. vi, 35, 48, 51, 58; x, 7, 9; xv, 1, 5; xvii, 1, 5; etc.).

In a far higher degree than in the Synoptics, the whole narrative of the Fourth Gospel centres round the Person of the Redeemer. From his very opening sentences John turns his gaze to the inmost recesses of eternity, to the Divine Word in the bosom of the Father. He never tires of portraying the dignity and glory of the Eternal Word Who vouchsafed to take up His abode among men, that, while receiving the revelation of Himself as the Word of God, mankind may partake in the fullness of His grace and truth. As evidence of the Divinity of the Saviour the author chronicles some of the great wonders by which Christ revealed His glory; but he is far more intent on leading us to a deeper understanding of Christ's Divinity and majesty by a consideration of His words, discourses, and teaching, and to impress upon our minds the far more glorious marvels of His Divine Love.

III. AUTHORSHIP. — If we except the heretics mentioned by Irenæus (Adv. haer., III, xi, 9) and Epiphanius (Haer., ii, 3), the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel was securely established by the end of the eighteenth century. Ewansö (1792) and Bretschneider (1820) were the first to run counter to tradition in the question of the authorship, and, since David Friedrich Strauss (1834—40) adopted Bre-
schneider's views and the members of the Tübingen School, in the wake of Ferdinand Christian Baur, denied the authenticity of this Gospel, the majority of the critics outside the Catholic Church have denied that the Fourth Gospel was an autograph. On the other hand, many of the main points of the Johannine problem: "Again and again have I attempted to solve the problem with various possible theories, but they led me into still greater difficulties, and even developed into contradictions." 11 Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., I, pt. ii, Leipzig, 1897, p. 678. 12 For a survey of the history of the criticism of the Fourth Gospel consult Jaegger, "Histoire des livres du N. T.," IV (Paris, 1908), pp. 23–51; also Sanday, "The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel" (Oxford, 1905); and Jackson, "The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent German Criticism" (Cambridge, 1906). 13 Thus the first problem of the Fourth Gospel is the question whether the problem of the source of the Fourth Gospel will enable the reader to form an independent judgment. 14 Direct Historical Proof.—If, as is demanded by the character of the historical question, we first consult the writings of the period of the earliest Gospel texts, we find that there is a universally admitted fact that, from the eighteenth century back to at least the third, the Apostle John was accepted without question as the author of the Fourth Gospel. In the examination of evidence, therefore, we may begin with the third century, and then proceed back to the time of the Apostles. The ancient manuscripts and translations of the Gospel constitute the first group of evidence. In the titles, tables of contents, signatures, which are usually added to the text of the separate Gospels, John is in every case and without the slightest indication of doubt named as the author of this Gospel. The earliest of the extant manuscripts, it is true, do not date back to the middle of the fourth century, but the perfect unanimity of all the codices proves to every critic that the prototypes of these manuscripts, at a much earlier date, must have contained the same indication of authorship. Since the use of Gospel quotations by which the Syrian, Coptic, and Old Latin extend back in their earliest forms to the second century. 15 The evidence given by the early ecclesiastical authors, whose reference to questions of authorship is not incidental, agrees with that of the above-mentioned sources. 264–5, it is true, sought for a different author for the Apocalypse, owing to the special difficulties which were being then urged by the Millenarians in Egypt; but he always took for granted as an undisputed fact that the Apostle John was the author of the Fourth Gospel. 2 Origen (d. 254). He knew from the tradition of the Church that John was the last of the Evangelists to compose his Gospel (Eusebius, Hist. ecc., VI, xxv, 6), and at least a great portion of his commentary on the Gospel of St. John, in which he everywhere makes clear his conviction of the Apostolic origin of the work, has come down to us. Origen's teacher, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215–6), relates as "the tradition of the old presbyters", that the Apostle John, the last of the Evangelists, "filled with the Holy Ghost, had written a spiritual Gospel" (Eusebius, op. cit., VI, xvi). 16 Of still greater importance is the testimony of St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (d. about 202), linked immediately with the Apostolic Age as he is, through his teacher Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John. 17 The native country of Irenaeus (Asia Minor) and the scene of his subsequent ministry (Gaul) render him a witness of the Faith in both the Eastern and the Western Church. He cites in his writings at least one hundred verses from the Fourth Gospel, often with the remark, "as John, the disciple of the Lord, he speaks of the composition of the Four Gospels, he says of the last: "Later John, the disciple of the Lord who rested on His breast, also wrote a Gospel, while he was residing at Ephesus in Asia." (Adv. Haer., III, i, n. 2). As here, so also in the other texts it is clear that "as John, the disciple of the Lord," he means none other than the Apostle John. (Concerning the importance of Irenaeus in the present question see Gutjahr, "Die Glaubwürdigkeit des irenäischen Zeugnisses über die Abfassung des 4. kanonischen Evangeliums," Grau, 1904.) 18 We find that the same conviction concerning the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is expressed at greater length in the Roman Church, about 170, by the writer of the Muratorian Fragment (lines 9–34). Bishop Theophilus of Antioch in Syria (before 181) also cites the beginning of the Fourth Gospel as the words of John (Ad Autolycum, 8). His reference is to the testimony of a Vatican manuscript (Codex Regius Sueciae seu Alexandrinus, 14), Bishop Papias of Hierapolis in Phrygia, an immediate disciple of the Apostle John, included in his great exegetical work an account of the composition of the Gospel by St. John, during his ministry as scribe by the Apostle (J. Wordsworth, Novum Testamentum latine, Oxford, 1889–98, I, p. 491). It is scarcely necessary to repeat that, in the passages referred to, Papias and the other ancient writers have in mind but one John, namely the Apostle and Evangelist, and not some other Presbyter John, to be distinguished from the Apostle. (See John the Evangelist, Saint.) 19 Indirect External Evidence.—In addition to the direct and express testimony, the first Christian centuries testify indirectly in various ways to the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel. Among this indirect evidence the most prominent place must be assigned to the numerous citations of texts from the Gospel, which demonstrate its existence and the recognition of its claim to form a portion of the canonical writings of the New Testament, as early as the beginning of the second century. St. Ignatius of Antioch, who died under Emperor Trajan (98–117), reveals in the quotations, allusions, and theological views found in his Epistles, an intimate acquaintance with the Fourth Gospel. In the writings of the majority of the other Apostolic Fathers, also, a like acquaintance with this Gospel can scarcely be disputed, especially in the case of Polycarp, the "Martyrium of Polycarp", the "Epistle to Diognetus", and the "Pastor" of Hermas (cf. the list of quotations and allusions in F. X. Funk's edition of the Apostolic Fathers). In speaking of St. Papias Eusebius says (Hist. ecle., III, xxxix, 17) that he heard from his work passages from the Fourth Gospel of St. John. But this Epistle necessarily presupposes the existence of the Gospel, of which it is in a way the introduction or companion work. Furthermore, St. Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., V, xxxii, 2) cites a sentence of the "presbyters" which contains a quotation from John, xiv, 2, and, according to the opinion of those entitled to speak as authorities, St. Papias must be placed in the front rank of the presbyters. Of the second-century apologists, St. Justin (d. about 165), in an especial manner, indicates by his doctrine of the Logos, and in many passages of his apologies the dependence of the Fourth Gospel, and the insistence in the chronological scheme of his "Diatessaron", follows the order of the Fourth Gospel, the prologue of which he employs as the introduction to his work. In his "Apology" also he cites a text from the Gospel
Like Tatian, who apostatized about 172 and joined the Gnostic sect of the Encratites, several other heretics of the second century also supply indirect testimony concerning the Fourth Gospel. Basilides appeals to John, i, 8, and ii, 4. Valentine seeks support for his theories of the sons in expressions taken from John; but purports to have composed, abut not commentary on the Fourth Gospel, while Ptolemy, another of his followers, gives an explanation of the prologue of the Evangelist. Marcion preserves a portion of the canonical text of the Gospel of St. John (xii, 4–15; xxxiv, 15, 19) in his own apocryphal gospel. The Montanists deduced their doctrine of the Parousia mainly from John xiv, 28. Similarly in his "True Discourse" (about 178) the pagan philosopher Celsus bases some of his statements on passages of the Fourth Gospel.

On the other hand, indirect testimony concerning this Gospel is also supplied by the oldest ecclesiastical liturgies and the monuments of early Christian art. As to the former, we find from the very beginning texts from the Fourth Gospel used in all parts of the Church, and not infrequently with special predilection. Again, to take one example, the raising of Lazarus depicted in the Catacombs forms, as it were, a monumental commentary on the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of St. John.

**The Testimony of the Gospel Itself.**—The Gospel itself also furnishes an entirely intelligible solution of the question of authorship.

(1) In the first place from the general character of the work we are enabled to draw some inferences regarding its author. To judge from the language, the author was a Palestinian Jew, who was well acquainted with the Hellenic Greek of the upper classes. He also displays an accurate knowledge of the geographical and social conditions of Palestine, even without having been from the heaenrens. He must have enjoyed personal intercourse with the Saviour and must even have belonged to the circle of his intimate friends. The very style of his chronicle shows the writer to have been an eyewitness of most of the events. Concerning the Apostles John and James the author makes a thoroughly characteristic reserve. He never mentions their names, although he gives those of most of the Apostles, and once only, and then quite incidentally, speaks of "the sons of Zebedee" (xxi, 2). On several occasions, when treating of incidents in which the Apostle John was concerned, he seems to introduce his own name without mentioning the name of the "disciple whom Jesus loved." (John, i, 40; xviii, 15, 16; cf. xii, 23–10). He speaks of John the precursor nine times without giving him the title of the "Baptist," as the other Evangelists invariably do to distinguish him from the Apostle. All these indications point clearly to the conclusion that the Apostle John must have been the author of the Fourth Gospel.

(2) Still clearer grounds for this view are to be found in the express testimony of the author. Having mentioned in his account of the Crucifixion that the disciple whom Jesus loved stood beneath the Cross beside the mother of Jesus (John, xix, 26 sqq.), he adds, after telling of the Death of Christ and the opening of His side, the solemn assurance: "And he that saw it hath given testimony; and his testimony is true. And he knoweth that he saith true: that you also may believe" (xix, 35). According to the admission of all, he was present at the Last Supper and said to John to tell it to Jesus. He was also present when Jesus was transfigured on the mount. His testimony is contained in the Gospel which for many consecutive years he has announced by word of mouth and which he now sets down in writing for the instruction of the faithful. He assures us, not merely that this testimony is true, but that he was a personal witness of its truth. In this manner he identifies himself with the disciple beloved of the Lord who alone could give such testimony from intimate knowledge.

Similarly, the author repeats this testimony at the end of his Gospel. After again referring to the disciple whom Jesus loved, he immediately adds the words: "This is that disciple who gaveth testimony of these things, and hath written these things; and we know that his testimony is true." (John, xx, 24). As the text stands, this witness is limited to the events just recorded but to the whole Gospel. It is more in accordance with the text and the general style of the Evangelist to regard these final words as the author's own composition; should we prefer, however, to regard this verse as the addition of the first reader and disciple of the Apostle, the text constitutes a remarkable evidence of the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel (cf. M. Lefèvre in "Revue Biblique", new series, V, 1906, pp. 89–91).

(3) Finally we can obtain evidence concerning the author from the Gospel itself, in a third way, by comparing his work with the three Epistles, which have retained their place among the Catholic Epistles as the writings of the Apostle John. We may here take for granted as a fact admitted by the majority of the critics, that these Epistles are the work of the same writer, and that the author was identical with the author of the Gospel. In fact the arguments based on the unity of style and language and form John's teaching, on the testimony of Christian antiquity, render any reasonable doubt of the common authorship impossible. At the beginning of the Second and Third Epistles the author styles himself simply: the presbyter—evidently the title of honour by which he was commonly known among the Christian community. On the other hand, in his First Epistle, he emphasizes repeatedly and with great earnestness the fact that he was an eyewitness of the facts concerning the life of Christ to which he (in his Gospel) had borne testimony among the Christians: That which was from the beginning, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life: for the life was manifested; and we have seen and do bear witness, and declare unto you the life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us: that which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you" (1 John, i, 1–3; cf. iv, 14). This "presbyter," who finds it sufficient to use such an honorary title without qualification as his proper name, and was likewise an eye- and ear-witness of the incidents of the Saviour's life, can be none other than the Presbyter John, the "disciple whom Jesus loved," other than John the Apostle (cf. John the Evangelist, Saint).

We can, therefore, maintain with the utmost certainty that John the Apostle, the favourite disciple of Jesus, was really the author of the Fourth Gospel.

**IV. Circumstances of the Composition.**—Passing over the intimate circumstances with which early legend has clothed the composition of the Fourth Gospel, we shall discuss briefly the time and place of composition, and the first readers of the Gospel.

As to the date of its composition we possess no certain historical information. According to some opinion, the Gospel is to be referred to the last decade of the first century, or to be still more precise, to 96 or one of the succeeding years. The grounds for this opinion are briefly as follows: (1) the Fourth Gospel was composed after the three Synoptics; (2) it was written after the death of Peter, since Peter, especially xvi, 18–19, speaks of the death of the Prince of the Apostles; (3) it was also written after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, for the Evangelist's references to the Jews (cf. particularly xi, 18; xvii, 1; xii, 41) seem to indicate that the end of the city and of the people as a nation has already come; (4) the text of the Gospel, especially ch. xvi, 23, appears to imply that John was already far advanced in years when he wrote the Gospel; (5) those who denied the Divinity
Christ, the very point to which St. John devotes special attention throughout his Gospel, began to disseminate their heresy about the end of the first century; (6) finally, we have direct evidence concerning the date of composition. The so-called "Monarchian Prologue" to the Gospel is the first writing about the year 200 or a little later, says concerning the date of the appearance of the Gospel: "He [sc. the Apostle John] wrote this Gospel in the Province of Asia, after he had composed the Apocalypse on the Island of Patmos" (J. Wordsworth, "Novum Testamentum latine", I, Oxford, 10, in the 88th). The banishment of John to Patmos occurred in the last year of Domitian's reign (i. e. about 95). A few months before his death (18 Sept., 96), the emperor had discontinued the persecution of the Christians and recalled the exiles (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xx, nn. 5-7). This evidence would therefore refer the composition of the Gospel to A. D. 96 or one of the years immediately following.

The place of composition was, according to the above-mentioned prologue, the province of Asia. Still more precise is the statement of St. Irenaeus, who tells us that the Apostle John wrote his Gospel "in Asia" (Adv. her., III, i, 2). All the other early references are in agreement with these statements.

The first readers of the Gospel were the Christians of the second and third generations in Asia Minor. There was no need of initiating them into the elements of faith; the Gospels, certainly, must have aimed rather at confirming against the attacks of its opponents the Faith handed down by their parents.

V. CRITICAL QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TEXT.—As regards the text of the Gospel, the critics take special exception to three passages, v. 36, 4; vii, 53-58, xi, 22.

(1) The fifth chapter tells of the cure of the paralytic at the pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem. According to the Vulgate the text of the second part of verse three and verse four runs as follows: "... waiting for the moving of the water. And an angel of the Lord descended at certain times into the pond; and the water was moved. And he that went down first into the pond after the motion of the water, was made whole, of whatsoever infirmity he lay under." But these words are wanting in the three oldest manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus (B), Codex Sinaiticus (\w), and Codex Bezae (D), in the original text of the palimpsest of St. Ephraemi (second half of the fourth century), in the translation of Cureton, as well as in the Coptic and Sahidic translations, in some manuscripts, in three manuscripts of the Itala, in four of the Vulgate, and in some Armenian manuscripts. Other copies append to the words a critical sign which indicates a doubt as to their authenticity. The passage is therefore regarded by the majority of modern critics, including the Catholic exegetes, Schegg, Schans, Belser, etc., as a later addition by Papias or some other disciple of the Apostle.

Other exegesis, e. g. Corluy, Cornely, Knabenuaer, and Murillo, defend the authenticity of the passage, urging an argument from the Schriften des N. T. (Baur, 1895, p. 521). Too much importance should not be attached to variations of vocabulary, which may be found on comparing this passage with the rest of the Gospel, since the correct reading of the text is in many places doubtful, and any such differences of language may be easily harmonised with the strongly individual style of the Evangelist.

It is thus possible, even from the purely critical standpoint, to adduce strong evidence in favour of the canonicity and inspired character of this pericope, which by decision of the Council of Trent, forms a part of Holy Writ. (1)

(3) Concerning the last chapter of the Gospel a few remarks will suffice. The last two verses of the twentieth chapter indicate clearly indeed that the Evangelist intended to terminate his work here:

tioned, in his tractate on the Gospel of St. John, omits the passage.

The context of the narrative seems necessarily to presuppose the presence of the words. The subsequent answer of the sick man (v. 7), "Sir, I have no man, when the water goes down into the pond. For whilst I am coming, another goeth down before me", could scarcely be intelligible without verse 4, and the Evangelist is not accustomed to omit such necessary information from his text. Thus both sides have good grounds for their opinions, and the final decision on the authentication of the text from the standpoint of the textual critic, seems possible.

(2) The second passage (vii, 53-58, 11) contains the story of the adulteress. The external critical evidence seems in this case to give still clearer decision against the authenticity of this passage. It is wanting in the four earliest manuscripts (B, A, C, and \w) and many others, while in many copies it is admitted only with the critical mark, indicative of doubtful authenticity. Nor is it found in the Syriac translation of Cureton, in the Sinaiticus, the Gothic translation, in most codices of the Peshito, or of the Coptic and Armenian translations, or in the Ecumenical Text. None of the Greek Fathers have treated the incident in their commentaries, and, among Latin writers, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Hilary appear to have no knowledge of this pericope.

Notwithstanding the weight of the external evidence of these important authorities, it is possible to deduce still more important testimony in favour of the authenticity of the passage. As for the manuscripts, we know on the authority of St. Jerome that the incident "was contained in many Greek and Latin codices" (Contra Pelagium, II, xvii), a testimony supported to-day by the Codex Bezae of Canterbury (D) and many others. The authenticity of the passage is also favoured by the Vulgate, by the Ethiopian, Arabic, and Slavonic translations, and by many manuscripts of the Itala and of the Armenian and Syrian text. Of the commentators of the Greek Fathers, the books of Origen dealing with this portion of the Gospel are no longer extant; only a portion of the commentary of St. Cyril of Alexandria has reached us, while the homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Fourth Gospel must be considered a treatment of selected passages rather than of the whole text. Among the Latin Fathers, St. Ambrose and Augustine included the pericope in their text, and seek an explanation of its omission from other manuscripts in the fact that the incident might easily give rise to offence (cf. especially Augustine, "De coniugis adulteris", II, vii).

It is thus much easier to explain the omission of the incident from many copies than the addition of such a passage in so many ancient versions in all parts of the Church. It is furthermore admitted by the critics that the style and mode of presentation have not the slightest trace of apocryphal origin, but reveal throughout the hand of a true master (von Soden, Die Schriften des N. T., I, Berlin, 1925, p. 523). Too much importance should not be attached to variations of vocabulary, which may be found on comparing this passage with the rest of the Gospel, since the correct reading of the text is in many places doubtful, and any such differences of language may be easily harmonised with the strongly individual style of the Evangelist.

(1) Concerning the last chapter of the Gospel a few remarks will suffice. The last two verses of the twentieth chapter indicate clearly indeed that the Evangelist intended to terminate his work here:
"Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, you may have life in his name" (xx, 30 sq.). But the sole conclusion that can be deduced from this is that the twenty-first chapter was afterwards added and regarded as an appendix to the Gospel. Evidence has yet to be produced to show that it was not the Evangelist, but another, who wrote this appendix. The opinion is at present fairly general, even among critics, that the vocabulary, style, and the mode of presentation as a whole, together with the subject, belong to the latter period. The first expository chapters of the Gospel are thought to be the last written by the Evangelist. The history of this chapter and the preceding portions of the Fourth Gospel (cf. Jülicher, "Einleitung", 5th ed., Tübingen, 1906, pp. 387-91; also Hilgenfeld, Har- knack, etc.).

VI. HISTORICAL GENUINENESS.—Objections Raised against the Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel.—The historical genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is at the present time almost universally denied outside the Catholic Church. Since David Friedrich Strauss and Ferdinand Christian Baur this denial has been postulated in advance in most of the critical inquiries into the sources of the Gospels. The influence of this prevailing tendency, Alfred Loisy has also reached the point where he openly denies the historicity of the Fourth Gospel; in his opinion the author desired, not to write a history, but to clothe in symbolic garb his religious ideas and theological speculations.

The writings of Loisy and their rationalistic prototypes, especially those of the German critics, have influenced many later exegetes, who while wishing to maintain the Catholic standpoint in general, concede only a very limited measure of historical genuineness to the Fourth Gospel. The most probable solution of this class of objections are included those who acknowledge as historical the main outlines of the Evangelist’s narrative, but see in many individual portions only symbolic embellishments. Others hold with H. J. Holtzmann that we must recognize in the Gospel a mixture of the subjective, theological speculations of the author and the objective, personal recollections of his intercourse with Christ, without any possibility of our distinguishing by sure criteria these different elements. That such a hypothesis precludes any further question as to the historical genuineness of the Johannine narrative, is evidently candidly admitted by the representatives of these views.

On examining the grounds for this denial or limitation of the historical genuineness of John we find that they are drawn by the critics almost exclusively from the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptic narrative. On comparison three points of contact are discovered: (1) with respect to the events which are related; (2) in regard to the mode of presentation; and (3) in the doctrine which is contained in the narrative.

(1) As regards the events related, the great contrast between Jesus and the Synoptists in the choice and arrangement of materials is especially accentuated. The latter show us the Saviour almost exclusively in Galilee, labouring among the common people: John, on the other hand, devotes himself chiefly to chronicling Christ’s work in Judea, and His conflict with the Sanhedrists at Jerusalem. An easy solution of this first point was found in the hypothesis that attending the composition of the Fourth Gospel John may—in fact must—have assumed that the Synoptic narrative was known to his readers at the end of the first century. The interest and spiritual needs of these readers demanded primarily that he should narrate in a manner that lead to a deeper knowledge of the Person and Divinity of the Saviour, against which the first heresies of Cerinthus, the Ebionites, and the Nicolaites were being already disseminated in Christian communities. But it was chiefly in His discussions with the Scribes and Pharisees at Jerusalem that Christ had spoken of His Person and Divinity. In his Gospel, therefore, John made it his primary purpose to set down the sublime teachings of Our Saviour, to safeguard the faith of the Christians against the attacks of the heretics.

When we come to consider the individual events in the narrative, three points in particular are brought forward: (a) the duration of Christ’s public ministry extends in the Fourth Gospel over at least two years, probably indeed over three years, and some months. However, the Synoptic account of the public life of Jesus can by no means be confined within the narrow space of one year, as some modern critics contend. The three earliest Evangelists also suppose the space of at least two years and some months. (b) The purity of the Temple is referred by John to the beginning of the Saviour’s ministry, while the Synoptists narrate it at the close. But it is by no means proven that this purification occurred but once. The critics bring forward not a single objective reason why we should not hold that the incident, under the circumstances, was repeated. Even if, as those of the Fourth Gospel, had its historical place at the beginning and at the end of the public life of Jesus. (c) Notwithstanding all the objections brought forward, John is in agreement with the Synoptists as to the date of the Last Supper. It occurred on Thursday, the thirteenth day of Nisan, and the crucifixion took place on Friday, the fourteenth. The fact that, according to John, Christ held the Supper with His Apostles on Thursday, while, according to the Synoptists, the Jews ate the passchal lamb on Friday, is not irreconcilable with the above statement. The most probable solution of this difficulty is the widespread custom, according to which, when the fifteenth of Nisan fell on the Sabbath, as it did in the year of the Crucifixion, the passchal lamb was killed in the evening hours of the thirteenth of Nisan and the passchal feast celebrated on this or the following evening, to avoid all infringement of the strict sabbatic rest.

(2) As regards the mode of presentation, it is especially insisted that the great sublimity of the Fourth Gospel is difficult to reconcile with the homely simplicity of the Synoptics. This objection, however, entirely disregards the great differences in the circumstances under which the Gospels were compiled. For the Christians of the third generation in Asia, living in the midst of flourishing schools, the Fourth Evangelist was forced to adopt an entirely different style from that employed by his predecessors in writing for the newly-converted Jews and pagans of the earlier period.

Another difficulty raised is the fact that the peculiar Johannine style is found not only in the narrative portions of the Gospel, but also in the discourses of Jesus and in the words of the Baptist and other personages. But we must remember that all the discourses and colloquies had to be translated from Aramaic into Greek, and in this process received from the author their distinctive unity of style. Besides, in the Gospel, the intention is by no means to give a verbatim report of every sentence and expression of a discourse, a sermon, or a dispute. The leading ideas alone are retained, and are expressed in a sense, and, in this manner also, they come to reflect the style of the Evangelist. Finally, the disciple surely received from his Master many of the distinctive metaphors and expressions which imprint on the Gospel its peculiar character.

(3) The fact that in such a manner original content lies only in the external forms and does not extend to the truths themselves. A satisfactory explanation of the dog
Divine Majesty of His Being. In this manner John wished to secure the faithful against the temptations of the false learning by means of which the heretics might prejudice the purity of their faith. Towards the narrative of the earlier Evangelists John's attitude was that of one who sought to fill out the story of the life and work of the Saviour, while endeavouring to secure certain incidents from misinterpretation. His Gospel thus forms a glorious conclusion of the joyous message of the Eternal Word. For all time it remains for the Church the most sublime testimony of her faith in the Son of God, the radiant lamp of truth in her doctrine, the never-ceasing source of loving zeal in her devotion to her Master, Who loves her even to the end.

Commentaries on the Gospel of St. John. — In early Christian times: the Romilita of St. John Chrysostom and the Tractates of St. Augustine; the extant portions of the commentaries of Origen and St. Cyril of Alexandria; the expositions of Themannus and Euthymius, who generally follow Chrissostom, and the exegetical works of St. Basil, who follows Augustina. In the Middle Ages: the interpretations of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, of Blessed Albertus Magnus, Rupert of Deutz, and St. Bonaventure of Savior. Works in Latin: those of Cajetan; Tolstoy; Madalmonat; General: Patrice (Rome, 1580); Longinus (Rome, 1580); Klopoo (2d ed., Vienna, 1880); Knabenshue (2d ed., Paris, 1906). In English: Macdill (2d ed., Dublin, 1902); MacRitch (Dublin, 1902); London, 1908); Plummer (London, 1881); Whelphale (Glasgow, 1898). In German: Kerler (Munich, 1890); Hanseneenberg (2 vols., Munich, 1878-80); Laderer (Jena, 1900); Belscher (Freiburg, 1905); Keil (Leipzig, 1881); Holtmann (Giessen, 1898); Hoffmann (4th ed., Tubingen, 1900); Zahn (Leipsic, 1896). In French: Fillon (Paris, 1857); Calmer (Paris, 1894); Godet (4th ed., Neuchatel, 1888). Spanish: Murillo (Madrid, 1892); Cambray (Madrid, 1894). English: Worsley, The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics (Edinburg, 1909). LEOFOLD FORNCE.

John and Paul, Saints, martyred at Rome on 26 June. The year of their martyrdom is uncertain: according to their Acts, it occurred under Julian the Apostate (361-3). In the second half of the fourth century, Byssantius, the Roman senator, and Pammachius, his son, fashioned their house on the Caelian Hill into a Christian basilica. In the fifth century the presbyters tituli Byzantii (priests of the church of Byssantii) are mentioned in an inscription and among the benefactions of the Founding Father of the church was also called the titulus Pammachii after Byssantius's son, the pious friend of St. Jerome. In the ancient apartments on the ground-floor of the house of Byssantius, which were still retained under the basilica, the tomb of two Roman martyrs, John and Paul, was the object of veneration as early as the fifth century. The Sacramentarium Leornianum already indicates in the preface to the feast of the saints, that they rested within the city walls ("Sacr. Leon.", ed. Feltoe, Cambridge, 1896, 34), while, in one of the early itineraries to the tombs of the Roman martyrs, their grave is assigned to the church on the Caelian (De Rossi, "Roma Antiqua", II, 138, 175). The titulus Byzantii or Pammachii was consequently known at a very early date by the names of the two martyrs (titulus SS. Ioannis et Pauli). That the two saints are martyrs of the Roman Church, is historically certain; as to when they found a resting-place in the house of Pammachius under the basilica, we only know that it certainly occurred in the fourth century. The year and circumstances of their martyrdom are likewise unknown. According to their Acts, which are of a purely legendary character and which, like the martyrdoms of Constantina, daughter of Constantine the Great, and became acquainted with a certain Gallicans, who built a church in
Ostia. At the command of Julian the Apostle, they were beheaded secretly by Terentianus in their house on the Celian, where their church was subsequently erected, and where they themselves were buried. The gnomons on the ground-floor of the so-called house of Pammachius were rediscovered under the Basilica of SS. Giovanni e Paolo in Rome. They are decorated with important and interesting frescoes, while the original tomb (confessio) of the saints John and Paul is covered with paintings of which the remains act as the theme and subject of the tomb form one of the most important early Christian memorials in Rome. Since the erection of the basilica, the two saints have been greatly venerated, and their names have been inserted in the Canon of the Mass. Their feast is kept on 26 June.


J. P. KIRSCH.

John Andrea. See Andrea, Giovanni d'.

John Baptist de la Salle, SAINT, founder of the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, educational reformer and Father of modern pedagogy, was born at Reims, 30 April, 1651, and died at Saint-Just, Yon, Rouen, on Good Friday, 7 April, 1719. The family of de la Salle traces its origin to Johan Salla, who, in the early part of the ninth century, was Command-in-chief of the Royal forces of Alfonso the Chaste. It was not, however, until about 1350 that the first branch of this family, from which our saint is descended, removed to France and settled in Champagne. John Baptist was the eldest child of Louis de la Salle and Nicolle de Moët de Brouillet. His parents were very solicitous in the care they bestowed upon their child, especially in regard to his moral and intellectual development. After due preparation, he was sent to the Collège des Bons Enfants, where he pursued the higher studies, and, on 10 July, 1669, he took the degree of Master of Arts. Canon Pierre Doutz, chancellor of the University of Reims, was the presiding officer at the academic sessions, and in the discharge of his duties he professed his desire to study the character of his young cousin, de la Salle, with the result that he determined on resigning his canonry in his favour. Louis de la Salle, however, cherished the hope that John Baptist would select the profession of law, and thereby maintain the family tradition. The last wish was fulfilled when he was called to serve the Church, and accordingly he received the tonsure 11 March, 1662, and was solemnly installed as a canon of the metropolitan See of Reims, 7 Jan., 1667.

When de la Salle had completed his classical, literary, and philosophical course and had read the Schoolmen, he was sent to Paris to enter the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice on 18 October, 1670. While residing here he attended the lectures in theology at the Sorbonne. There, under the direction of Louis Tronson, he made such rapid progress in virtue, that M. Lecomte (general of the Congregation of Saint-Sulpice) renders this testimony of him: "De la Salle was a constant observer of the rule. His conversation was always pleasing and above reproach. He seems never to have given offence to any one, nor to have incurred any one's censure. While at the seminary, I would myself go to Mass as well as by the vigour of his intellectual progress and the ability with which he handled theological subjects. Nine months after his arrival in Paris, his mother died, 19 July, 1671, and on 9 April, 1672, his father died. This circumstance obliged him to leave Saint-Sulpice, 19 April, 1672. He was now twenty-one, the head of the family, and as such had the responsibility of educating his brothers and sisters. His whole attention was devoted to his domestic affairs, and he provided for his parents discreet, businesslike administration. Canon Blain says that he underwent at this time many mental struggles. Distrusting his own lights, de la Salle had recourse to prayer and the guidance of discreet advisers, among them, Nicolas Roland, canon and theologian of Reims, a man of great spiritual discernment. After four years, he was ordained deacon at Paris, 21 March, 1676, by François Batailler, Bishop of Bethlehem. On this occasion de la Salle sought to obtain the permission of Maurice Le Tellier, Archbishop of Reims, to resign his canonry and prepare for parish work. Nicolas Roland urged him to take this step, alleging that a rich canonry was little in harmony with youthful zeal and activity. His archbishop, however, refused his request. With humble submission, de la Salle accepted the decision and returned to Reims to pursue his studies and to make final preparations for his ordination to the presbyterate. After four years of spiritual discernment, de la Salle was appointed by the Bishop of Reims, on Holy Saturday, 9 April, 1678. The young priest was a model of piety, and his biographers say that persons went to assist at his Mass to be edified, and to share his piety. After Mass there were many who sought his counsel and put themselves under his spiritual guidance. De la Salle never omitted Holy Mass, save when prevented by sickness. In June, 1680, he submitted to his final examination and took his doctorate in theology. At this period of his life de la Salle evinced a docility of spirit, a self-diffidence, that bespoke the character of the man and saint. In physical appearance he was of commanding presence, somewhat above the medium height, and well-proportioned. He had large, penetrating blue eyes and a broad forehead. His portraits present a picture of sweetness and dignity, beaming with intelligence andbreathing an air of modesty and refined grace. A matter of profoundest concern with de la Salle was the education of young men. He took up the study of his functions with a determination to embrace a calling, which large lustrous eyes give an air of commanding intelligence.

During the few years that intervened between his ordination to the priesthood and the establishing of his institute, de la Salle was occupied in carrying out the educational aims of his order. After his death, when dying, had confided to him the newly established Congregation of the Sisters of the Child Jesus. "Your zeal will bring it to prosperity", said Nicolas Roland to him. "You will complete the work which I have begun. In all this, Father Berré will be your model and guide." Thus was de la Salle imperceptibly drawn towards his life-work. "The idea of it never occurred to me", de la Salle wrote in a memoir. "If I had ever thought that what I did out of pure charity for the poor school teachers would make it incumbent upon me to live with them, I would have given it up at once." This sentiment he again expressed towards the close of his life in these emphatic words: "If God had revealed to me the good that could be accomplished by this institute, and had likewise made known to me the trials and sufferings which would accompany it, my courage would have failed." At this period de la Salle was still occupied with his functions as canon. He was, however, aroused to the higher calling by a message from Madame Mallefer, in March, 1679, requesting him to aid Adrien Néel in opening a free school at Reims. But hardly had he succeeded in establishing the school of St-Maurice.
when he quietly withdrew from the work, as if it were in his mission. Shortly afterwards the opening of another free school in St.-Jacques parish lured him again from his seclusion, but he soon retired again.

Although instrumental in opening these elementary free schools at Reims, de la Salle seemed to allow Adrien Nyel to share all the honours resulting therefrom and to take the lead in the rules of discipline. He went at once to visit the real progress of both schools. He was unconsciously attracted to the work. Daily he visited the teachers to encourage them or suggest practical methods to attain definite results. But when he found that the teachers became discouraged, owing to the lack of proper guidance after school hours, he undertook to house them, that he might be able to direct them and give them practical lessons in the useful employment of time, and to prevent weariness and disgust. Not only did he aid them in class and after class, but he made good any deficit in the cost of living. He even admitted them to his own table and later on sheltered them under his roof. Thus was he drawn closer and closer to them, forming an intimate fellowship with the teachers of the poor. "It was, indeed," says Mgr Guitbert, "his love that induced de la Salle to devote himself to the young teachers of Reims. They were like abandoned sheep without a shepherd. He assumed the responsibility of uniting them." As yet de la Salle had no definite plans for the future, even as late as 24 June, 1682, when he transferred his little community to the vicinity of rue Neuve. He simply kept himself in readiness to follow the guidance of Providence. He resigned his canonical in July, 1683, and he distributed his fortune to the poor in the winter of 1684, thus giving convincing proofs that he would not hesitate to make any sacrifices necessary to complete the good work he had begun. Père Barré counselled de la Salle to give up whatever might divert his attention from procuring God's glory. In reply to the earnest remonstrances of his friends and kinsfolk, he meekly answered: "I must do the work of God, and if the worst should come to pass, we shall have to beg alms." Reliance upon Providence was henceforth to be the foundation of the Christian Schools.

Up to this period (1684) the institute had lacked the characteristics of a permanent organization. From 1684 to 1717, the struggle for existence was most critical. In 1692 the institute was so weakened by deaths and defections that de la Salle could hardly find two Brothers who were willing to bind themselves by vow to maintain the free schools. The death of Henri L'Heureux in December, 1690, materially affected the welfare of the Christian Schools. De la Salle, intending this gifted young Brother to be the future superior of the congregation, entertained the hope of having him ordained priest, and with this view he sent him to Paris to pursue his theological studies at the Sorbonne. After a brilliant course, Brother Henri L'Heureux was ready for ordination, but before this event took place the young candidate fell sick and died. The loss of this Brother was a blow to the founder. After passing the whole night in prayer, he rose up, not only comforted and strengthened, but also enlightened as to the character of his future institute. He then determined that there should be no priests among the members of his institute. Although there were priests and lay brothers in nearly all existing religious orders, de la Salle was convinced that the time had come for a change in this matter in the new congregation. Brother Lucard, the Annalist of the institute, thus sums up the matter: "Since the death of Henri L'Heureux, de la Salle was firmly convinced that his institute was to be founded on simplicity and humility. No Brother could, without compromising his congregation, allow himself to be diverted from his functions as a teacher, by devoting himself to special studies, the saying of the Divine Office, or the fulfilment of other duties obligatory on the sacred ministry." Therefore, no Brother can aspire to the priesthood nor perform any priestly function, and no ecclesiastic can become a member of the institute. This is the new rule that de la Salle added, and it is embodied in the Constitution of the institute.

From 1702 the founder began to endure a long period of trial, aggravated by persecution on the part of certain ecclesiastical authorities. In November, 1702, he was deposed by Cardinal de Massa, and supplanted for a time by the Rev. M. Bricot. In 1703 one of his most trusted disciples, Nicolas Vuyart, treacherously deserted him. For the next ten years the founder was engaged in a series of struggles for the preservation of his institute, in the course of which his name was attacked, and justice denied him before the civil tribunals. After fifty-five years of hard labour, his work seemed to be almost on the verge of ruin. His confidence in God was so firm and unshaken that he was never really discouraged. In 1717 he convoked a chapter for the purpose of solidifying the work and for the election of a superior general. His aim was to have a Brother elected during his lifetime and thus perfect the government of the institute in accordance with the rule he had formulated. The choice of the assembled Brothers fell upon Brother Barthélemy, a man whom all esteemed for his learning and virtue. The institute was now an accomplished fact. And from the first interview with Adrien Nyel, in 1679, de la Salle belonged wholly to the Brothers, sharing with them the burden of labour and observing the common rule. He never left them to engage in other works.

De la Salle was too prudent and too well inspired by God, not to give his institute a positive character in its twofold object: the Christian education of youth and the cultivation of that spirit of faith, piety, mortification, and obedience which should characterize its members. His gift of gaining souls to God, and of leading them to make great sacrifices, was supplemented by the splendid executive ability that enabled him to found an institute and to preserve and...
direct its gradual development. A study of the extraordinary religious, social, and educational conditions, at the time the institute was founded by de la Salle, will show the peculiar character of the difficulties he had to encounter and overcome. Jansenism had gained the ascendency in France and spread pernicious doctrines; it fostered internal dissensions and promoted Gallicanism, to the great detriment of the Faith and of loyalty to the Holy See. In the social order, a spirit of exaggerated independence was abroad, alienating authority or thrusting it aside. When such conditions for education prevailed in the upper classes, one may well ask, what must have been the condition of the masses? The incessant foreign and internal wars, with their consequent evils, told with disastrous effect upon the people. Exorbitant demands on the part of army officials, the violence of the soldiery, the rapine of supervisors, the wholesale plunder of crops, followed by famine and ruin, left whole provinces of France under the weight of terrible sufferings and untold misery. The peasants frequently had no bread, and when they had it the circumstances were such as to deprive them of any hope for the future. The standard of living had deteriorated, and the gloom of intestine turmoil had been momentarily brightened by the splendid victories abroad, the sad effect of the glory of the reign of Louis XIV made the mourning in cottages only the more bitter owing to the loss of the loved ones on foreign battlefields. Evidently, the circumstances were such that these dire circumstances were threatened with ruin, as were the social and economic conditions; for false doctrines were spread and took hold among the people, destroying their faith and stultifying their consciences. Schools there were, but they were poorly attended and shamefully neglected. The children and the people generally were ignorant, and vice, according to contemporary authorities, was rampant among all classes. De la Salle carefully studied these conditions and, moved to compassion for the poor, resolved to improve their social and moral status. The founder grasped the situation and proposed as a remedy, popular free schools thoroughly graded and supplied with zealous teachers, who would implant in the hearts of the children the germs of those virtues that would tend towards the regeneration of both the pupils and the parents. He saw that a religious congregation composed of men enlightened and married for the salvation of souls, could alone stem the tide of irredeemable material ignorance. He clearly perceived that, in the peculiar conditions which surround any institute at the period of its origin, the work proposed to be done should embody in its ends the special requirements of the age in which it originates. He also foresees that, while the guiding spirit of such an institute must even remain fundamentally the same, its scope, as a permanent organization working for the welfare of humanity, should have the character of a social force answering to the needs and conditions of any age and country. Various educational reforms which de la Salle introduced prove that he anticipated many of the measures that have been adopted. The courses of study for elementary free schools, technical schools, and colleges are evidences of his broad culture and wide grasp of educational problems. Hence, if the needs of a certain locality called for special branches, or if the times and conditions demanded certain advanced studies, de la Salle was not slow in responding nor in giving these subjects a place commensurate in importance with their educational value. De la Salle, furthermore, displayed his genius in giving his institute a distinctive character, that of a teaching body, consecrated to the work of popular education. Thus, he gave it the pedagogy which included the essential principles adopted by later workers in the field of educational reforms, notably by Pestalozzi, Fröbel, Herbart, and others. In making the vernacular the basis of all instruction, de la Salle appealed to the intelligence of the child, prepared the way for the study of national literature, and opened up to the grown man those avenues of real knowledge and delight that had hitherto been closed against the eager multitude. With true scientific insight, he perceived that the Latin texts set the standard of teaching in France and that the Latin texts taught the art of reading. For this change he gave the following reasons: (1) The teaching of the art of reading, in primary and elementary schools, through the vernacular, is of greater and wider utility than by Latin texts. (2) The vernacular is more easily taught to children who already possess some knowledge of it, than the Latin of which they are wholly ignorant. (3) It requires considerably less time to learn the art of reading through the vernacular, than through a foreign tongue. (4) The boys and girls attending the primary and elementary schools, can spend only a few years under instruction. Now, if they are taught reading from a Latin text, they generally leave school without being able to read the vernacular, and with only an imperfect knowledge of how to read the Latin. Hence, they will soon forget the little they have learned, and, perhaps, even how to read the Latin. (5) It is an efficacious means of acquiring knowledge. With due care in the selection of books, children who can read in the vernacular could spread the Christian doctrine in the family circle, and, on evenings, read some useful or instructive books to the assembled household; whereas, if they knew only the Latin, understanding it, they would be deprived of many valuable benefits resulting from the intelligent reading of a good book. (6) It is impossible for children in primary and elementary schools to master the reading of Latin texts, because they are not acquainted with its subject-matter. It is, therefore, the part of wisdom to train children thoroughly to the intelligent reading of works written in the vernacular. Thus, having mastered the art of reading in the vernacular, a few months would suffice to make them read the Latin fluently, whereas, if the traditional method were followed, it would require at least several years [Annales de l’Institut, I (1883), pp. 140, 141]. This fact proves that de la Salle was a profound thinker, a genius in the work of popular education. He embraced all classes, all conditions of society. By making the free schools popular, he grasped the growing needs of society in his own day and for all times. No phase of the educational problem escaped his attention, and in the vernacular, giving his new school the same text-books, and requiring them to follow the same lesson under one and the same teacher. This method has best stood the test of time and experience, and is that which the Brothers of the Christian Schools employ in all grades of instruction even at the present day. Inside wisdom - the “Simultaneous Method” is not the exclusive property of any one man. Others besides de la Salle discerned its value, and even partially applied its essential principles, long before the founder of the Christian Schools made it live in his institute. It had no place in the university system of the Middle Ages. The plan adopted in those times was that which prevailed to a great extent in the universities of our own day, namely, listening to lectures, taking notes thereon, and holding disputations upon the subject-matter. The Jesuits organized each class in subdivisions; each division being headed by an advanced pupil, the author of the subject. These pupils then read, recited their lessons at stated times, while the teacher corrected exercises or heard the lessons of particular pupils. The whole class afterwards received explanations from the teacher. St. Peter Fourier (185-
1640) saw in Christian education the remedy for many of the disorders existing among the poor and labouring class. He was far-seeing, and anticipated more than one of our modern educational improvements. Indeed, he was one of the first to apply some of the principles of the "Simultaneous Method". In his constitution he prescribed that, as far as it can possibly be carried out, all the pupils of the same mistress shall have each the same book, in order to learn and read therein the same lesson; so that, whilst one is reading her in an audible and intelligible voice before the mistress, all the others, hearing her and following this lesson in their books at the same time, may learn it sooner, more readily, and more perfectly. Herein the principle of the "Simultaneous Method" is, for the first time, clearly stated. Yet, when he enters into the details of practice, he seems to lose sight of the principle which he lays down. In the very next paragraph of the constitution, it is provided that the mistress shall call up two pupils at a time, and place them one at each side of her desk. The more advanced pupil shall read her lesson; the other shall listen to her, shall correct all the faults she may make, in the use of words, in pronunciation, or in the observance of pauses. This is the individual method. For the smaller pupils he recommends that four or six at a time come to her desk, and to make use of some graded cards, containing letters and syllables. (Sommaire des Constitutions des Religieuses de la Congregation de Notre-Dame, 1649, 3rd part.)

Comenius (or Amos Komensky, 1592–1674), in his "Didactica Magna", requires the teacher to instruct his pupils "sed et omnes simul, "all together at one and the same time" (edit. 1647, cap. xix, Probl. I, Col. 102, 103). Mgr. de Nesmond (1629–1715) divided the class into four or five groups, each having the same book, "in order that all the children of the same age receive with the same lesson, and when one begins to read, the others are to read in a low voice at the same time" (Méthode pour instruire en peu de temps les Enfants, p. 59). About 1674, Charles Démia, of Lyons, adopted the method of Mgr. de Nesmond. Like him, he gave the same reading book to each group, requiring that each one follow, holding his finger or a marker on the words that are being read. The immediate precursor of St. John Baptist de la Salle was a theologian, the anonymous author of "Avis touchant les Petites Ecoles" (Bibl. Nat., 40, R. 556). In this little work, which Leopold Delisle placed prior to 1660, the author complains of the condition of the primary schools and proposes a method by which a large number of pupils might be taught, by one teacher, one book, and one voice. The school, he tells us, should be so regulated that one and the same book, one and the same teacher, one and the same lesson, and all the same, serve for all, so that each pupil would thereby possess his teacher wholly and entirely, and occupy all his care, all his time, and all his attention, as if he were the only pupil (pp. 13 and 19). It is reasonable to presume that de la Salle frequented the schools taught by the Congregation of Notre-Dame which were founded at Reims about 1634. He must have observed the method of teaching employed in that congregation. We can have no doubt that he was equally well acquainted with the defects which rendered such methods useless. In 1682 de la Salle had organized the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and had given them the "Simultaneous Method". Brother Azarius says: "What St. Peter Fourier touched, what Komensky and Mgr. de Nesmond and Charles Démia had g limmers of, what the anonymous author of the 'Avis' thought to realize, had become a fact." De la Salle applied the Simultaneous Method not only to reading, as was done by his predecessors, but also to catechism, writing, spelling, and arithmetic in the elementary classes, and then to all the specialties taught in the colleges which he founded. He is, therefore, the genius who introduced and perfected the Simultaneous Method in all its practical details. De la Salle definitely points out the "Simultaneous Method" as the one which he wished his disciples to follow. It is no longer the one teacher governing a whole school; it is two or three, or more, according to the number of pupils, each taking those of the same capacity and teaching them together. His instructions on these heads are exact. "The Brothers", he says, "are to give special attention to three things in class: (1) During the lessons, to correct every word that the pupil who is reading pronounces badly; (2) To make all who read at the same lesson, to follow therein; (3) To have silence strictly observed in the school" (Common Rules). The pupils follow in the same lesson, they observe strict silence, the teacher in correcting one, is correcting all. The essence of the "Simultaneous Method". De la Salle generalizes the principle for all lessons, thus: "In all the lessons from alphabet-cards, syllables, and other books, whether French or Latin, and even during arithmetic, while one reads, all the others of the same lesson shall follow; that is, they shall read to themselves from their books without making noises with their lips, what the one reading pronounces aloud from the book" (Conduite des ecoles chrétiennes, Avignon, 1724).

With truth has Matthew Arnold said, in speaking of this handbook of Method: "Later works on the same subject have little improved the precepts, while they entirely lack the unction." In the management of Christian schools, de la Salle states concisely the following practical rules for teaching methodically: "1. The teacher determines the relative intelligence of every pupil in his class. 2. He adapts his language and explanations to the capacity of his class, and is careful never to neglect the duller pupils. 3. He makes sure that the pupils know the meaning of the "orders" they employ. 4. He advances from the simple to the complex, from the easy to the difficult. 5. He makes it a special point to insist greatly on the elementary part of each subject; not to advance until the pupils are well grounded on what goes before. . . . 9. To state but few principles at a time, but to explain them well. . . . 10. To speak much to the eyes of the pupils, making use of the blackboard. . . . 11. To prepare every lesson carefully. 12. To place no faulty models or standards before the pupils; always to speak to them in a sensible manner, expressing one's self in correct language, good English, and with clearness and precision. 13. To banish hasty definitions and well-founded divisions. . . . 18. To assert nothing without being positively certain.
of its truth, especially as regards facts, definitions, or principles. 19. To make frequent use of the system of question and answer" (Chap. V, art. ii, pp. 31-33).

It is true that de la Salle, in establishing his institute, had in mind principally the primary and elementary school, which was the real raison d'être for the Brothers. He was an educator, not a churchman. He was the organizer of the public instruction of his time, and no master of pedagogical science will deny him that distinction. But, if the primary and elementary school was the principal master-work of de la Salle, there was yet another field of labour which likewise belonged to his creative genius. In the eighteenth century, he was confronted with singularly perplexing conditions. The rising generation was weary of past glories, disgusted with the present, and was ambitious to achieve renown in hitherto unexplored fields of activity. As education was gradually extending to the masses, with the light of instruction came new ideas, new occupations, new ventures, and a breaking away from the old civilisation, with the desire to wrestle with the problems born of the new conditions. Even those who were trained in traditional methods became aware of a mighty change in social conditions. They found there was an euramerican educational system in the actual educational system. With their sons, they experienced the world-spirit breathing upon the moribund civilization of Louis XIV. The political horizon had changed, society became more degenerate, the intellectual world was awakened and cast off the yoke of traditionalism, assuming a bearing towards greater freedom in the realm of thought and research. De la Salle had been struck with the serious hiatus in the instruction reserved for the wealthy children, who were destined for the liberal professions. So, while organizing the primary and elementary school, he also created, in 1705, a special establishment for the education of the sons of the clergy in the actual educational system. This new creation was the boarding college at Saint-Yon, wherein he inaugurated the system of modern secondary instruction. Saint-Yon became the type of all such colleges, and that of Yusses, Paris, became the modern exemplar of similar institutions in France and elsewhere. M. Drury, in his report upon technical education, states that France is indebted to de la Salle for the practical installation and popularization of that form of instruction.

Hence, from the origin of the institute, there was a condition of programmes to the needs created by the social transformations which were taking place. This flexibility, which contrasted with the fixedness of the university programmes, excited surprise and no little opposition among the representatives of academic authority in those days. The instruction given in the colleges founded by de la Salle and his successors was peculiarly adapted to the needs of a very interesting class of young men. The educational reforms thus planned and carried out by him gave unmistakable evidence that Providence had raised him up to be the lawgiver of primary and elementary education, as well as the creator of a new system of intellectual training, combining the precision of the traditional method with the wider scope of the new one. It was but natural that de la Salle, who had assimilated the best that the seventeenth century could give, and who had become cognizant of the insufficiency of the old system to meet the requirements of the new conditions, should create schools which were then, and have been since, the admiration of educators. The boarding colleges founded by de la Salle for the modern secondary instruction are, therefore, a distinct creation. The date of the Saint-Yon college, in 1705. He launched a technical school to develop the mechanical skill of the students, and also a special garden for botany. There were Sunday schools prior to the seventeenth century. But the Christian Academy, founded by de la Salle for adults in the parish of Saint-Sulpice, in 1699, was of a different character, the first of its kind in the history of education. The programme of this academy, or Sunday school, included not only the ordinary branches taught in the other Sunday schools, but it added geometry, architecture, and drawing. In 1702 a seminarium was opened for the novitiates of the teaching orders. But there were no normal schools for lay teachers. De la Salle had been frequently asked by clergy to send a Brother to take charge of their school. This request was refused, for he had established the rule that not less than two Brothers teach at one school. At the opening of the seminarium to open a seminary for teachers, an institution in which young men would be trained in the principles and practices of the new method of teaching. The normal school was opened at Reims in 1684. Indeed, thirteen years before Francke organized his teachers' college at Halle, and fifty years before Hecker founded the Prussian normal college at Stettin, de la Salle had given a programme which is even to-day deemed excellent. In the same year he established for youth who were destined to enter the brotherhood, a Christian academy, or preparatory novitiate, in which they were taught the humanities, literature, and the principles of scientific pedagogy.

De la Salle is entitled to be ranked among the advanced educators of the eighteenth century and among the greatest thinkers and educational reformers of all time. His system embraces the best in the modern educational philosophy. It is characterized by its higher educational progress which is the distinctive mark of modern times, and bequeathed to his own disciples, and to educators in general, a system of teaching which is adaptable to the wants of school-going youth in every country. But it was especially as a priest that John Baptist de la Salle loved his vocation as an educator. Like St. Ignatius Loyola, he taught letters that he might have the right to teach Christian doctrine. In claiming this privilege de la Salle was actuated by the highest and purest motives. There was nothing narrow in his educational plans. He was too wise not to realize the necessity that the truest and best children of the Church should be among the most skilled in human affairs. His view was from the summit, therefore, broad and comprehensive. Intellectual training was supplemented by a complete course of Christian virtues. Man had a desire, and education should inculcate this truth by cultivating and developing the theological virtues in the souls of the children.

This thought seemed to be uppermost in the mind and to haunt the soul of de la Salle when he drew up those excellent programmes for his schools, colleges, and technical institutions. His pedagogical principle was that nothing human should be foreign to the students, and the teaching of science and letters appeared to him to take nothing from the teacher in his ministry as an apostle. In September, 1713, Clement XI issued the Bull "Unigenitus", condemning the errors of the Jesuits, and designating them as the creators of "Reflections". M. de Montmartin, Bishop of Grenoble, promulgated the Bull in a circular letter, in February, 1714. De la Salle was then making a retreat at Parmenie. When he left this place, he entered the arena to defend the Church against Jansenism. He assembled the Brothers of Grenoble and explained the meaning of the Bull, in order to safeguard the purity of their faith. Not satisfied with this manifestation of loyalty, he published several articles in defence of the true doctrine. This irritated the Jansenists, but their opposition only served to give greater lustre to the purity of his faith. He was a fearless and uncompromising champion, and he seemed to forget his habitual calm and reserve when there was question of the integrity and purity of the Faith. To show his inviolable attachment to the Church and to the Bor-
John Baptist de Rossi (De Rubeis), Saint, b. at Voltaggio in the Diocese of Genoa, 22 February, 1608; d. at Rome, 23 May, 1764; feast on 23 May. His parents, Charles de Rossi and Frances Anfozzi, were not rich in earthly goods, but had solid piety and the esteem of their fellow-citizens. Of their four children
John excelled in gentleness and piety. At the age of ten he was taken to Genoa by friends for his education. There he received news of the death of his father. After three years he was called to Rome by a relative, Lorenzo de Rossi, who was canon at St. Mary in Cosmedin. In this church he studied Roman law under the direction of the Jesuits, and soon became a model by his talents, application to study, and virtue. As a member of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin and of the Ristretto of the Twelve Apostles established at the college, he led the members in the meetings and pious exercises, in visits to the sick in the hospitals and in other works of mercy, and merited even then the name of apostle. At the age of sixteen he entered the clerical state. Owing to indiscipline in practice of mortification he contracted spells of epilepsy, notwithstanding which he made his course of scholastic philosophy and theology, in the college of the Dominicans, and, with dispensation, was ordained priest on 8 March, 1721. Having reached the desired goal, he bound himself by vow to accept no ecclesiastical benefice unless commanded by obedience. He fulfilled the duties of the sacred ministry by devoting himself to the labourers, herds, and teamsters of the surrounding country, preaching the sermons early in the morning, or late in the evening, at the old Forum Romanum (Campo Vaccino), and by visiting, instructing, and assisting the poor at the hospital of St. Galla. In 1731 he established near St. Galla another hospital as a home of refuge for the unfortunate who wander the world. ("Rom. Brev."") tr. Bute, Summer, 573.) In 1735 he became titular canon at St. Mary in Cosmedin, and, on the death of Lorenzo two years later, obediently forced him to accept the canonry. The house belonging to it, however, he would not use, but employed the rent for good purposes.

For a number of years John was afraid, on account of his poverty, to enter the confraternity, and it was his custom to send to other priests the sinners whom he had brought to repentance by his instructions and sermons. In 1738 a dangerous sickness befall him, and to regain his health he went to Civita Castellana, a day's journey from Rome. The bishop of the place induced him to hear confessions, and after reviewing his moral theology he received the unusual faculty of hearing confessions in any of the churches of Rome.

He showed extraordinary zeal in the exercise of this privilege, and spent many hours every day in hearing the confessions of the illiterate and the poor whom he sought in the hospitals and in their homes. He performed with ease and at times in churches and chapels, convents, hospitals, barracks, and prison cells, so that he became the apostle of the abandoned, a second Philip Neri, a hunter of souls. In 1763, worn out by such labours and continued ill-health, his strength began to ebb away, and after several attacks of paralysis he died at his retreats in Trinità de' Pellegrini. He was buried in that church under a marble slab at the altar of the Blessed Virgin. God honoured his servant by miracles, and only seventeen years after his death the process of his beatification was begun, but the troubled state of Europe during the succeeding years prevented progress in the cause until it was resumed by Pius IX, who on 13 May, 1860, solemnly pronounced his beatification. As new signs still distinguished him, Leo XIII, on 8 December, 1881, enrolled him among the saints.

John Berchmans, Saint, b. at Diest in Brabant, 13 March, 1595; d. at Rome, 13 August, 1621. His parents watched with the greatest solicitude over the formation of his character. He was naturally kind, gentle, and affectionate towards them, a favourite with his playmates, brave and open, attractive in manner, and with a bright, joyful disposition. Yet he was also, by natural disposition, impetuous and fickle. Still, when John was but seven years of age, M. Emmerick, his parish priest, already remarked with pleasure that the Lord would make him a blessing to the child. Many are the details that reveal him to us as he was in the days that preceded his entrance into the Society of Jesus. He was but nine years old when his mother was stricken with a long and serious illness. John would pass several hours each day by her bedside and convey to him such spiritual words as only a religious mind could produce. When he was twelve years of age, he was made a confrere of his religious; and as an indication of the very serious words. Later, when he lived with some other boys at M. Emmerick's house, he would undertake more than his share of the domestic work, selecting by preference the more difficult occupations. If he was loved by his comrades, he repaid their affection by his kindness, without, however, deviating from the dictates of his conscience. It was noticed even that he availed himself discreetly of his influence over them to correct their negligence and to restrain their frivolous conversations. Eager to learn, and naturally endowed with a bright intellect and a retentive memory, he endeavoured to use all of these gifts by devoting to study whatever time he could legitimately take from his ordinary recreation.

What, however, distinguished him most from his companions was his piety. When he was hardly seven years old, he was accustomed to rise early and serve two or three Masses with the greatest fervour. He attended religious instructions and listened to Sunday sermons with the deepest recollection, and made pilgrimages to the sanctuary of Montaigu, a few miles from Diest, reciting the rosary as he went, or absorbed in meditation. As soon as he entered the Jesuit college at Mechlin, he was enrolled in the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, and made a resolution to pray for the conversion of all heretics with the deepest recollection, and made pilgrimages to the sanctuary of Montaigu, a few miles from Diest, reciting the rosary as he went, or absorbed in meditation. As soon as he entered the Jesuit college at Mechlin, he was enrolled in the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, and made a resolution to pray for the conversion of all heretics. He would, moreover, ask the director of the sodality every month to prescribe for him some special acts of devotion to Mary. On Fridays, at nightfall, he would go out barefooted and make the Stations of the Cross in the town. Such fervent, filial piety won him the grace of a religious vocation. Towards the end of his rhetoric course, he felt a distinct call to the Society of Jesus. His family was decidedly opposed to this, but his calm determination overcame all obstacles, and on 24 September, 1616, he was received into the novitiate at Mechlin. After two years passed in Mechlin he made his simple vows, and was sent to Antwerp to begin the study of philosophy. Remaining there only a few weeks, he set out for Rome, where he was to continue the same study. After journeying three hundred leagues on foot, carrying a wallet on his back, he arrived at the Roman College on 31 December, 1618. According to the usual course, he studied for two years and passed on to the third year class in philosophy in the year 1621. One day early in August of that same year he was selected by the prefect of studies to take part in a philosophical disputation at the Greek College, at that time under the charge of the Dominicans. He opened the discussion with great perspicacity and brilliancy, but in retreating to his own college, he was seized with a violent fever of which he died, on 13 August, at the age of twenty-two years and five months.

During the second part of his life, John offered the type of the saint who performs ordinary actions with extraordinary perfection. In his piety, obedience, and admirable charity he had no more religious, but he surpassed them all by his intense love for the rules of his order. The constitutions of the Society of Jesus lead those who observe them exactly to the highest degree of sanctity, as has been declared by Pope Julius III and his successors. The attitude of that ideal was what John proposed to himself. "If I do not become a saint when I am young", he used to
say, "I shall never become one." That is why he displayed such wisdom in conforming his will to that of his superiors and to the rules. He would have preferred death to the violation of the least of the rules of his way of life. With the exception of "I shall never become one," he would have paid the greatest attention to the least inspiration of God." He observed this fidelity in the performance of all his duties till the last day of his life, as is attested by Fathers Bauters, Cepari, Cecotti, Massucci, and Piccolomini, his spiritual director. With this he did not content himself; he desired to be seen and to invoke his intercession. The same year, Philip, Duke of Aerschot, had a petition presented to Pope Gregory XV for the taking of information with a view to his beatification. John Berchmans was declared Blessed in 1655, and was canonized in 1688. His statues represent him with hands clasped, holding his crucifix, his book of rules, and his rosary.

Cepari, Vita di Giovanni Berchmans, Fiammingo, religione della Compagnia di Gesù (Rome, 1627); Prioux, La vie de Jean Berchmans de la Compagnie de Jésus (Nancy, 1760); Acta beatificationis venerabili servorum Dei, Joannis Berchmans (Rome, 1742); De Croes, Un enfant de Marie ou le véritable Jean Berchmans (Brussels, 1882); D. J. L. Vandenheyden, J. Berchmans (Brussels, 1885); Vandervorst, Vies du B. Jean Berchmans (Louvain, 1896); Goldzie, Le Life of John Berchmans (London, 1873).

H. Demain.

John Buckley, Venerable (dias John Jones; alias John Griffith; in religion, Godfrey Maurice), priest and martyr, born at Clwyd Fawr, Carnarvonshire, Wales, date of birth unknown; died at Southwark, England, 12 July, 1598. There is much confusion between the above and Robert (or Herbert; in religion, Sigebert) Buckley, the monk of Westminster who was the sole competing link between the pre-Reformation and post-Reformation English Benedictines. This accounts for any apparent discrepancy in John’s history. Thus it is said that he was a native of Shropshire, also that he was imprisoned in the Marshalsea, 1582-4, both of which statements are incorrect. He was of a good Welsh family, which had remained faithful to the Church. As a youth, he entered the Franciscan convent at Greenwich; at its dissolution in 1559 he went to the Continent, and was professed at Pontoise, France. After many years he journeyed to Rome, where he stayed at the Ar Ranieri convent. For thirty years he was a Conventual, he joined the Roman province, the Franciscan observance in 1591, as he had become imbued with the ideals of the Strict Observance. He then begged to be allowed to go upon the English mission, which his superiors permitted, and he also received a special blessing and commendation from Clement VIII. He reached London about the end of 1592, and stayed temporarily at the house which Father John Gerard had provided for missionary priests; he then laboured in different parts of the country, and his brother Franciscans in England elected him their provincial.

In 1596 the priest-catcher Topcliffe was informed by a spy that Buckley had visited two Catholics and had said Mass in their house, but it was afterwards shown that these people were in prison when the alleged offence took place. However, Father Buckley was promptly arrested and severely tortured. He never recanted, and the Topcliffe took him to his own house and practised unspeakable barbarities upon him, all of which he endured with a surprising fortitude. He was then imprisoned for nearly two years, and on 3 July, 1598, was tried on the charge of “going over the seas in the first year of Her Majesty’s reign [1558] and then being made a priest by authority from Rome and returning to England contrary to statute” (27 Eliz. c. 2). He was convicted of high treason and sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered.

As by this time the people had grown tired of these butcheries, the execution was arranged for an early hour in the morning. The place was St. Thomas’s Watering, in what is now the Old Kent Road, at the site of the junction of the old Roman road to London with the main line of Watling Street. Such ancient landmarks had been immemorially used as places of execution, Tyburn itself being merely the point where Watling Street crossed the Roman road to Silchester. In spite of the early hour, a large crowd had gathered to see the execution. One of the guards, under the guise of crowding for several days to see and to invoke his intercession. The same year, Philip, Duke of Aerschot, had a petition presented to Pope Gregory XV for the taking of information with a view to his beatification. John Berchmans was declared Blessed in 1655, and was canonized in 1688. His statues represent him with hands clasped, holding his crucifix, his book of rules, and his rosary.
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H. Demain.
John Capistran, Saint, b. at Capistrano, in the Diocese of Sulmona, Italy, 1385; d. 23 Oct., 1456. His father had come to Naples in the train of Louis of Anjou, hence is supposed to have been of French blood, though some say he was of German stock. His father dying early, John owed his education to his mother. She had him at first instructed at home, and then sent him to study law at Perugia, where he achieved great success under the eminent legist, Pietro de Ubaldis. In 1412 he was appointed governor of Perugia by Ladislaus, King of Naples, who then held that city of the Holy See. As governor he set himself against civic corruption and bribery. War broke out in 1416 between Perugia and the Malatesta. John was sent as ambassador to negotiate peace to the Malatesta, who however cast him into prison. It was during this imprisonment that he began to think more seriously about his soul. He decided eventually to give up the world and become a Franciscan friar, owing to a dream he had in which he saw St. Francis and was warned by the saint to enter the Franciscan Order. John had married a wealthy lady of Perugia immediately before the war broke out, but as the marriage was not Consummated he obtained a dispensation to enter religion, which he did 4 October, 1416.

After he had taken his vows he came under the influence of St. Bernardine of Siena, who taught him theology; he had as his fellow-student St. James of the Marches. He accompanied St. Bernardine on his preaching tours in order to study his methods, and in 1420, whilst in deacon’s orders, was himself permitted to preach. But his apostolic life began in 1425, after he had received the priesthood. From this time until his death he laboured ceaselessly for the salvation of souls. He traversed the whole of Italy; and so great were the crowds who came to listen to him that he often had to preach in the public squares. At the time of his preaching all business stopped. At Brescia on one occasion he preached to a crowd of one hundred and twenty-six thousand people, who had come from all the neighbouring provinces. On another occasion during a mission, over two thousand sick people were brought to him that he might sign them with the sign of the Cross, so great was his fame as a healer of the sick. Like St. Bernardine of Siena he greatly propagated devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus, and, together with that saint, was accused of heresy because of it. John was sent to the Inquisition. While he was thus carrying on his apostolic work, he was actively engaged in assisting St. Bernardine in the reform of the Franciscan Order. In 1429 John, together with other Observant friars, was cited to Rome on the charge of heresy, and he was chosen by his companions to defend their cause; the friars were acquitted by the commission of cardinals.

After this, Pope Martin V conceived the idea of uniting the Conventual Friars Minor and the Observants, and he offered the post of bishop to John. The Franciscans was convoked at Assisi in 1430. A union was effected, but it did not last long. The following year the Observants held a chapter at Bologna, at which John was the moving spirit. According to Gonzaga, John was about this time appointed commissary general of the Observants, but his name does not appear among the commissaries and vicars in Holzapfel’s list ("Manuale Hist. Ord. FF. Min.", 624–5) before 1443. But it was owing to him that St. Bernardine was appointed vicar-general in 1438. Shortly after this, whilst visiting France he met St. Colette, the reformation of the Second Franciscan Order, or Poor Clares, with whose efforts he entirely sympathized. He was frequently employed on embassies by the Holy See. In 1439 he was sent as legate to Milan and Burgundy, to oppose the claims of the antipope Felix V; in 1446 he was on a mission to the King of France; in 1451 he went at the request of the emperor as Apostolic nuncio to Austria. During the period of his nunciature John visited all parts of the empire, preaching and combating the heresy of the Hussites; he also visited Poland at the request of Casimir IV. In 1454 he was summoned to the Diet at Frankfort, in support of his convictions concerning a crusade against the Turks for the relief of Hungary: and here, too, he was the leading spirit. When the crusade was actually in operation John accompanied the famous Hunyady throughout the campaign: he was present at the battle of Beiligrad, and led the left wing of the Christian army against the Turks. He was beatiied in 1694, and canonized in 1724. He wrote many books, chiefly against the heresies of his day.

Three lives written by the saint’s companions, Nicholas of Fano, Christopher of Varese, and Jacob of Under, are given by the Bollandists, Acta SS., X, October; Wadding, Anales, IX–XII; Guérard, St. Jean de Capistrano et son temps (Bourgoin, 1865); Jacob, Johannes von Capistrano (Vienna, 1903); Allen, Three Catholic Reformers (London, 1872); Pagan, History of the Popes, II (London, 1891): Lass, Lives of the Saints and Blasied of the Third Orders of St. Francis, III (Taunton, 1895).

John Cassian. See Cassian, John.

John Chrysostom (Xpoue·roapos, "golden-mouthed", so called on account of his eloquence), Saint, b. at Antioch, c. 347; d. at Comana in Pontus, 14 September, 407. John—whose surname "Chrysostom" occurs for the first time in the life of St. Nemesius the Vigilius (cf. P. L., LX, 217) in the year 553—is generally considered the most prominent doctor of the Greek Church and the greatest preacher ever heard in a Christian pulpit. His natural gifts, as well as exterior circumstances, helped him to become what he was.

I. Life. (1) Boyhood. At the time of Chrysostom’s birth, Antioch was the second city of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. During the whole of the fourth century religious struggles had troubled the empire and had found their echo at Antioch. Pagans, Manicheans, Gnostics, Arians, Apollinarians, Jews, made their proselytism; and at Antioch the orthodox were constantly agitated by the schism between the bishops Meletius and Paulinus. Thus Chrysostom’s youth fell in troubled times. His father, Secundus, was an officer of high rank in the Syrian army. On his death soon after the birth of John, Anthus, his wife, only twenty years of age, took the sole charge of two children. His death was early. Fortunately she was a woman of intelligence and character. She not only instructed her son in piety, but also sent him to the best schools of Antioch, though with regard to morals and religion many objections could be urged against them. Besides the lectures of An-
dragius, a philosopher not otherwise known, Chrysostom followed also those of Libanius, at once the most famous orator of that period and the most tenacious adherent of the declining paganism of Rome. As we may see from the later writings of Chrysostom, he attained then considerable Greek scholarship and classical culture, which he by no means disowned in his later days. His alleged hostility to classical learning is in reality but a misunderstanding of certain passages in which he defends the philosophia of Christianity against the myths of the heathen gods, of which the chief defenders in his time were the representatives and teachers of the sophia Parva (see A. Neugebauer in "Byzantin. Zeitschrift", XIII, 70–113; Idem, "Chrysostomus und Libanius" in Xeroorogia, I, Rome, 1908, 81–142).

(2) Chrysostom as Lector and Monk.—It was a very decisive turning-point in the life of Chrysostom when he met one day (about 367) the bishop Meletius. The earnest, mild, and winning character of this man captivated Chrysostom in such a measure that he soon began to withdraw from classical and profane studies and to devote himself to an ascetic and religious life. He studied Holy Scripture and frequented the sermons of Meletius. About three years later he received Holy Baptism and was ordained lector. But the young clergy, seized by the desire of a more perfect life, soon afterwards entered one of the ascetic societies near Antioch, which was under the spiritual direction of Carterius and especially of the famous Diodorus, later Bishop of Tarasus (see Palladius, "Dialogues", v; Sosomnus, "Hist. eccles.", VIII, 2). Prayer, manual labour, and the study of Holy Scripture were his chief occupations, and we may safely suppose that his first literary works date from this time, for nearly all his earlier writings deal with ascetic and monastic subjects (cf. below Chrysostom's writings: 1) "Opuscula"). Four years later, Chrysostom resolved to live as an anchorite in one of the caves near Antioch. He remained there two years, but then, as his health was quite ruined by indiscriminate watchings and fastings in frost and cold, he prudently returned to Antioch to regain his health, and resumed his office as lector in the church.

(3) Chrysostom as Deacon and Priest at Antioch.—As the sources of the life of Chrysostom give an incomplete chronology, we can but approximately determine the dates for this Antiochene period. Very probably in the beginning of 381 Meletius made him deacon, just before his own departure to Constantinople, where he died as president of the Second Ecumenical Council. The successor of Meletius was Flavian (concerning whose succession see F. Cavalleria, "Le Schemi d'Antioche", Paris, 1905). Ties of sympathy and friendship connected Chrysostom with his new bishop. As deacon he had to assist at the liturgical functions, to look after the sick and poor, and was probably charged also in some degree with teaching the catechumens. At the same time he continued his literary work, and we may suppose that he composed his most famous book, "On the Priesthood", towards the end of this period (c. 386; see Socrates, "Hist. eccl.", VI, 3), or at the latest in the beginning of his priesthood (c. 387, as Nairn with good reasons puts it, in his edition of "De Sacerd.", xii–xv). There may be some doubt if it was occasioned by a real historical fact, viz., that Chrysostom and his friend Basil were requested to accept bishoprics (c. 372). All the earliest Greek biographers seem not to have taken it in that sense, and it seems more likely that it was occasioned by Flavian, and from that year dates his real importance in ecclesiastical history. His chief task during the next twelve years was that of preaching, which he had to exercise either instead of or with Bishop Flavian. But no doubt the larger part of the popular religious instruction and education devolved upon him. The earliest notable occasion which showed his power of speaking and his great authority was the Lent of 387, when he delivered his sermons "On the Statues" (P. G., XLVIII, 15 sqq.). The people of Antioch, excited by the levy of new taxes, had thrown down the statues of Emperor Theodosius. In the panic and fear of punishment which followed, Chrysostom delivered a series of twenty or twenty-one (the nineteenth is probably not authentic) sermons, full of vigour, consolatory, exhortative, tranquilizing, until Flavian, the bishop, brought back from Constantinople the emperor's pardon. But the usual preaching of Chrysostom consisted in consecutive explanations of Holy Scripture. To that custom, unhappily no longer in use, we owe his famous and magnificent commentaries, which offer us such an inexhaustible treasure of dogmatic, moral, and historical knowledge of the transition from the fourth to the fifth century. These years, 386–98, were the period of the greatest theological productivity of Chrysostom, a period which alone would have assured him for ever a place among the first Doctors of the Church. A sign of this may be seen in the fact that in the year 392 St. Jerome already accorded to the preacher of Antioch a place among his Viri ilustres ("De Viris ille.", 129, in P. L., XXIII, 754), referring expressly to the great and successful activity of Chrysostom as a theological writer. From this same fact we may infer that during this time his fame had spread far beyond the limits of Antioch, and that he was well known in the Byzantine Empire, especially in the capital.

(4) St. Chrysostom as Bishop of Constantinople.—In the ordinary course of things Chrysostom might have become the successor of Flavian at Antioch. But on 27 September, 397, Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, died. There was a general rivalry in the capital, openly or in secret, for the vacant see. After some months it was known, to the great disappointment of the competitors, that Emperor Arcadius, at the suggestion of his minister Eutropius, had sent to the Prefect of Antioch to call John Chrysostom out of the
town without the knowledge of the people, and to send him straight to Constantinople. In this sudden way Chrysostom was hurried to the capital, and ordained Bishop of Constantinople on 26 February, 398, in the presence of a great assembly of bishops, by Theophilius, Patriarch of Alexandria, who had been obliged to renounce the idea of securing the appointment of Isidore, a candidate for Chrysostom as great as it was unexpected. His new position was not an easy one, placed as he was in the midst of an upstart metropolis, half Western, half Oriental, in the immediate neighbourhood of a court in which luxury and intrigue always played the most prominent parts, and at the head of a clergy composed of the intellectuals of the Hellenistic age (though not canonically, at least practically) at the head of the whole Byzantine episcopate. The first act of the new bishop was to bring about a reconciliation between Flavian and Rome. Constantinople itself soon began to feel the impulse of a new ecclesiastical life.

The necessity for reform was undeniable. Chrysostom began “weeping the stairs from the top” (Palladius, op. cit., V). He called his aeconomus, and ordered him to reduce the expenses of the episcopal household; he put an end to the frequent banquets, and to the strictly private life of people and formerly tutors of the clergy as a priest and monk. With regard to the clergy, Chrysostom had at first to forbid them to keep in their houses syneclastic, i.e. women housekeepers who had vowed virginity. He also proceeded against others who, by avarice or luxury, had given scandal. He had even to exclude from the ranks of the clergy two deacons, the one for murder and the other for adultery. Of the monks, too, who were very numerous even at that time at Constantinople, some had preferred to roam about aimlessly and without discipline. Chrysostom confined them to their monasteries. Finally, he took care of the ecclesiastical widows. Some of them were living in a worldly manner: he obliged them either to marry again, or to observe the rules of decorum demanded by their state. After the clergy, Chrysostom turned his attention to his flock. As he had done at Antioch, so at Constantinople and with more reason, he frequently preached against excessive luxury, and especially against the ridiculous finery in the matter of dress affected by women whose age should have put them beyond such vanities. Some of them, the widows Marra, Castricia, Eugraphia, known for such preposterous tastes, belonged to the court circle. It seemed to some people that the classes of the rich were previously been accustomed to such language. Doubtless some felt the rebuke to be intended for themselves, and the offence given was the greater in proportion as the rebuke was the more deserved. On the other hand, the people showed themselves delighted with the sermons of their new bishop, and frequently applauded him in the church (Socrates, “Hist. eccl.” VI). They never forgot his care for the poor and miserable, and that in his first year he had built a great hospital with the money he had saved in his household. But Chrysostom had also very intimate friends among the rich and noble classes. The most famous of these was Olympias, widow and deaconess, a relation of Emperor Theodosius, while in the Court itself there was Brison, first usher of Eudoxia, who assisted Chrysostom in instructing his choirs, and always maintained a true friendship for him. The empress herself was at first matters, but after the death of her husband. She followed the religious processions, attended his sermons, and presented silver candlesticks for the use of the churches (Socrates, op. cit., VI, 8; Sozomenus, op. cit., VIII, 8).

Unfortunately, the feelings of amity did not last. At first Eutropius, the former slave, now minister and consul, abused his influence. He deprived some wealthy persons of their property, and prosecuted others whom he suspected of being adherents of his. More than once Chrysostom went himself to the minister (see “Oratio ad Eutropium” in P. G., Chrys. Op., III, 392) to remonstrate with him, and to warn him of the results of his own acts, but without success. Then the above-named ladies, who immediately surrounded the empress, probably did not hide their resentment against the strict bishop. Finally, the empress herself committed an injustice in depriving a widow of her vineyard (Marcus Diaec., “Vita Porphyrii”, V, no. 37, in P. G., LXV, 1229). Chrysostom interceded for the latter. But Eudoxia showed herself offended. Henceforth there was a certain coolness between the two, even if not formally as a palace, which, growing little by little, led to a catastrophe. It is impossible to ascertian exactly at what period this alienation first began; very probably it dated from the beginning of the year 401. But before this state of things became known to the public there happened events of the highest political importance, and Chrysostom, without seeking it, was implicated in them. These were the fall of Eutropius and the revolt of Gainas.

In January, 399, Eutropius, for a reason not exactly known, fell into disgrace. Knowing the feelings of the people towards Chrysostom, he hurried to oust him from the church. As he had himself attempted to abolish the immunity of the ecclesiastical asylums not long before, the people seemed little disposed to spare him. But Chrysostom interfered, delivering his famous sermon on Eutropius, and the fallen minister was saved for the moment. As, however, he tried to escape during the night, he was seized, exiled, and some time later put to death. Immediately another more exciting and more dangerous event followed. Gainas, one of the imperial generals, had been sent out to subdue Thrace, who had revolted. In the summer of 399 Galerius united openly with the Trebizonites in Asia Minor, and restore peace, Arcadius had to submit to the most humiliating conditions. Gainas was named commander-in-chief of the imperial army, and even had Aurelian and Saturninus, two men of the highest rank at Constantinople, delivered over to him. It seems that Chrysostom accepted the mission, and that, owing to his intervention, Aurelian and Saturninus were spared by Gainas, and even set at liberty. Soon afterwards, Gainas, who was an Arian Goth, demanded one of the Catholic churches at Constantinople for himself and his soldiers. Again Chrysostom interfered, and made so energetic an opposition that Gainas, who was by this time made so energetic an opposition that Gainas, who was by this time
come to Ephesus, where he appointed a new archbishop, and with the consent of the assembled bishops deposed six bishops for simony. After having passed the same sentence on Bishop Gerontius of Nicomedia, he returned to Constantinople.

Meanwhile disagreeable things had happened there. Bishop Severian, to whom Chrysostom seems to have entertained a persistent and unbridled enmity, had entered into open enmity with Serapion, the archdeacon and aconimus of the cathedral and the episcopal palace. Whatever the real reason may have been, Chrysostom found the case so serious that he invited Severian to return to his own see. It was the first and last celebration of the festival of Aelia Dora, whose confidence Serapion possessed, that he was allowed to come back from Chalcedon, whither he had retired. The reconciliation which followed was, at least on the part of Severian, not a sincere one, and the public scandal had excited much ill-feeling. The effects soon became visible. When in the spring of 402 Bishop Porphyrius of Gaza (see Marcus Diacon., "Vita Porphyrii", V, ed. Nuth, Bonn, 1897, pp. 11–19) went to the Court at Constantinople to obtain a favour for his diocese, Chrysostom answered that he could do nothing for him, since he was himself in disgrace. No doubt the Emperor theodosius was not really dangerous, unless they could find some prominent and unscrupulous leader. Such a person presented himself sooner than might have been expected. It was the well-known Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria. He appeared under rather curious circumstances, which in no way overshadowed the final result. Theophilus, towards the end of the year 402, was summoned by the emperor to Constantinople to apologize before a synod, over which Chrysostom should preside, for several charges, which were brought against him by certain Egyptian monks, especially by the so-called four "tall brothers". This appeal was accompanied by a formal movement against them, and had them persecuted as Originsites (Palladius, "Dialogus", xvi; Socrates, op. cit., VI, 7; Sozomenus, op. cit., VIII, 12).

However, Theophilus was not easily frightened. He had always agents and friends at Constantinople, and knew the state of things and the feelings at the court. He now resolved to take advantage of them. He wrote at once to St. Epiphanius at Cyprus, requesting him to go to Constantinople and prevail upon Chrysostom to condemn the Originsites. Epiphanius went. But when he found that Theophilus was menace not only to his own diocese, but to his own capital, dying on his return in 403. At this time Chrysostom delivered a sermon against the vain luxury of women. It was reported to the empress as though she had been personally alluded to. In this way the ground was prepared. Theophilus at last appeared at Constantinople in June, 403, not alone, as he had been commanded, but with twenty-nine of his suffragan bishops, and, as Palladius (ch. viii) tells us, with a good deal of money and all sorts of gifts. He took his lodgings in one of the imperial palaces, and held conferences with all the adversaries of Chrysostom. Then he met with his suffragans and seven other bishops to a villa near Constantinople, called ευ έπισκοπη (see Ubaldi, "La Synodo ad Quercum", Turin, 1902). A long list of the most ridiculous accusations was drawn up against Chrysostom (see Photius, "Bibliotheca", 59, in P. G., CIII, 105–113), who, surrounded by forty-two bishops and bishops of Constantinople, was summoned to appear before the synod of Constantinople, held under the orders of the emperor, was now summoned to present himself and apologize. Chrysostom naturally refused to recognise the legality of a synod in which his open enemies were judges. After the third summons Chrysostom, with the consent of the emperor, was declared to be deposed. In order to avoid useless bloodshed, he surrendered himself on the third day to the soldiers who awaited him. But the threats of the excited people, and a sudden accident in the imperial palace, frightened the empress (Palladius, "Dialogus", ix). She feared some punishment from heaven for Chrysostom's exile, and ordered his recall. After some hesitation Chrysostom re-entered the capital amid the great rejoicings of the people. There was a scene of unbridled exultation. Some even killed themselves by flying from Constantinople. Chrysostom's return was in itself a defeat for Eudoxia. When her alarms had gone, her rancour revived. Two months afterwards a silver statue of the emperor was unvelied in the square just before the cathedral. The sermon which attended the ceremony was so boisterous that the offices in the church were disturbed. Chrysostom complained of this to the prefect of the city, who reported to Eudoxia that the bishop had complained against her statue. This was enough to excite the empress beyond all bounds. She summoned the patriarch and the other bishops to come back and to depose Chrysostom again. The prudent patriarch, however, did not wish to run the same risk a second time. He only wrote to Constantinople that Chrysostom should be condemned for having re-entered his see in opposition to the past. The sentence was held in the year 341 (an Arius synod). The other bishops had neither the authority nor the courage to give a formal judgment. All they could do was to urge the emperor to sign a new decree of exile. A double attempt on Chrysostom's life failed. On Easter Eve, 404, when all the catechumens were to receive baptism, the adversaries of the bishop, with imperial soldiers, invaded the baptistery and dispersed the whole congregation. At last Arcadius signed the decree, and on 24 June, 404, the soldiers conducted Chrysostom a second time into exile.

5) Exile and Death.—They had scarcely left Constantinople when a huge conflagration destroyed the cathedral, the senate-house, and other buildings. The followers of the exiled bishop were accused of the crime and prosecuted. In haste Arcadius, an old man, was appointed successor of Chrysostom, but was soon succeeded by the cunning Atticus. Whoever refused to enter into communion with them, was punished by confiscation of property and exile. Chrysostom himself was conducted to Cucusus, a secluded and rugged place on the east frontier of Armenia, continuously exposed to the invasions of the Sassarians. In the following year he had even to fly some time to the castle of Ars, to protect himself from the barbarians. Meanwhile he always maintained a correspondence with his friends and never gave up the hope of return. When the circumstances of his deposition were known in the West, the pope and the Italian bishops declared themselves in his favour. Emperor Honorius and Pope Innocent I endeavoured to summon a new synod, but their legates were imprisoned and then sent home. The pope broke off all communion with the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch (where an enemy of Chrysostom had succeeded Flavian), and Constantinople, until (after the death of Chrysostom) they consented to admit him again into the diptychs of the Church. Finally all hopes for the exiled bishop had vanished. Apparently he was living too long for his adversaries. In the summer, 407, the order was given to carry him to Pithysus, a place at the extreme boundary of the empire, near the Caucasus. One of the two soldiers who had to lead him caused him not only public contempt but made him force to make long marches, was exposed to the rays of the sun, to the rains and the cold of the nights. His body, already weakened by several severe illnesses, finally broke down. On 14 Sept. the party were at Comana in Pontus. In the morning Chrysostom had asked to rest there on account of his state of health. In vain; he was forced to continue his march.
Very soon he felt so weak that they had to return to Comana. Some hours later Chrysostom died. His last words were: Ἀληθὲς ἦς τὸς ἱερὸν ἰππὸν ἥφασεν (Glory be to God for all things) (Palladius, xi, 38). He was buried at Comana. On 27 January, 438, his body was translated to Constantinople with great pomp, and entombed in the church of the Apostles where Eudoxia had been buried in the year 404. See Socrates, VII, 45; Constantin Porphyrogenitus, "Cerimoniola Aulae Byza.ii", II, 92, in P. G., CXII, 1204 B.

II. THE WRITINGS OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.—Chrysostom has deserves a placed in ecclesiastical history, not simply as Bishop of Constantinople, but chiefly as a Doctor of the Church. Of none of the Greek Fathers do we possess such a complete series of works. We may divide them into three portions, the "opuscula," the "homilies," and the "letters." (1) The chief "opuscula" all date from the earlier days of his literary activity. The following deal with monastical subjects: "Comparatio Regia cum Monacho" ("Opera"), I, 387-93, in P. G., XLVII-XLIII, "Adhortatio ad Theodorum (Mopsuestensem?) lapsum" (ibid., 277-319), "Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticæ" (ibid., 319-87). Those dealing with ascetical generalities in general are the treatise "De Comportatione" in two books (ibid., 393-423), "Adhortationes ad Stigmatisculos" in books I and II (ibid., 435-521), "Adhortationes ad introductas" (ibid., 495-532), "De Virginitate" (ibid., 533-93), "De Sacroedothio" (ibid., 623-93). (2) Among the "homilies" we have to distinguish commentaries on books of Holy Scripture, groups of homilies (sermons) on special subjects, and a great number of single homilies. (a) The chief "commentaries" on the Old Testament are the sixty-seven homilies "On Genesis" (with eight sermons on Genesis, which are probably a first recension) (IV, 21 sqq., and ibid., 407 sqq.); fifty-nine homilies "On the Psalms" (4-12, 43-49, 108-117, 119-150) (V, 39-498), concerning which see C. E. Fritzsche, which lightly avoided "De inferni conspectus" (ibid., 287-92), on "John Chrysostomus su den Psalmen" in Ἱστορικομετα., fasc. I (Rome, 1900), 235-42, a commentary on the first chapters of "Isaiah" (VI, 11 sqq.). The fragments on Job (XIII, 503-65) are sporadic (see Haidacher, "Chrysostomens Fragmenta in Job," I, 217 sqq.) and sporadic (ibid., 575-740), on the Synopses of the Old and the New Testament (ibid., 313 sqq.), is doubtful. The chief commentaries on the New Testament are first the ninety homilies on "St. Matthew" (with the year 3901-3904) and the "homilies on John" (c. 389; VIII, 23 sqq.—probably from a later editor), fifty-five homilies on the "Acts" (as preserved by the stenographer, IX, 13 sqq.), and homilies "On all the Epistles of St. Paul" (IX, 391 sqq.). The best and most important commentaries are those on the Psalms, on St. Matthew, and on the Epistle to the Romans (written c. 370). The thirty-four homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews were only published after Chrysostom's death, and the commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians also very probably comes to us from the hand of a second editor. (b) Among the "homilies forming connected groups," we may especially mention the five homilies "On Anna" (IV, 631-76), three "On David" (ibid., 675-708), six "On Oza" (VI, 97-142), eight "Against the Jews" (II, 843-942), twelve "De Incomprehensi bili Dei natura" (ibid., 701-812), and the seven famous homilies "On St. Paul" (III, 473-514). (c) A great many more homilies havedeal with the lives of sacred objects, with certain feasts or saints. (3) The "Letters" of Chrysostom (about 238 in number: III, 547 sqq.) were all written during his exile. Of special value for their contents and intimate nature are the seventeen letters to the deaconess Olympia. Among the numerous "Apologiae" we may mention the liturgy attributed to Chrysostom, which, perhaps modified, but did not compose the ancient text. The most famous apology is the "Letter to Cæsarius" (III, 755-769). It contains a passage on the holy Eucharist which seems to favour the theory of "impanatio," and the disputes about it have continued for more than two centuries. The most important spurious work in Latin is the "Opus imperfectum," written by an Anian in the first half of the fifth century (see Th. Paas, "Das Opus imperfectum in Matteanum," Ta bingen, 1907).

III. CHRYSOSTOM'S THEOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE.—(1) Chrysostom as Orator.—The success of Chrysostom's preaching is chiefly due to his great natural facility of speech, which was extraordinarily even to Greeks, to the abundance of his homilies, and to the popular way of presenting and illustrating them, and, last but not least, the whole-hearted earnestness and conviction with which he delivered the message which he felt had been given to him. Speculative explanations did not attract his mind, nor would they have suited the tastes of his hearers. He ordinarily preferred moral subjects, and very seldom in his sermons followed any regular plan, nor did he care to avoid digressions when any opportunity suggested them. In this way he is by no means a model for our modern thematic preaching, which, however we may "Adm. Part. St. John Chrysostomus in the race of apostolic officials, Chrysostom's exegesis is often quite clear and easy. But the frequent outbursts of applause among his congregation may have told Chrysostom that he was on the right path.

(2) As an exegete Chrysostom is of the highest importance, for he is the chief and almost the only successful representative of the exegetical principles of the School of Antioch. Didorus of Tarsus had initiated him into the grammatico-historical method of that school, which was in strong opposition to the eccentric, allegorical, and mystical interpretation of Origen and the Alexandrian School. But Chrysostom's writings freely avoided his master's deep penetration into the text of the Old Testament, and only went to the extreme to which, later on, his friend Theodorus of Mopsuestia, the teacher of Nestorius, carried them. He did not even exclude all allegorical or mystical explanations, but confined them to the cases in which the inspired author himself suggests this meaning.

(3) Chrysostom's authority on the issues of the Church of the East has already been said, Chrysostom's was not a speculative mind, nor was he involved in his lifetime in great dogmatic controversies. Nevertheless it would be a mistake to underrate the great theological treasures hidden in his writings. From the very first he was considered an authority, and his expositions are a witness to the Faith. Even at the Council of Ephesus (431) both parties, St. Cyril and the Antiochians, already invoked him on behalf of their opinions, and at the Seventh Ecumenical Council, when a passage of Chrysostom had been read in favour of the veneration of images, Bishop Peter of Nicomedia cried out: "If John Chrysostom were speaking in that way of the images, who would dare to speak against them?" which shows clearly the progress his authority had made up to that date.

Strangely enough, in the Latin Church, Chrysostom was still earlier invoked as an authority on matters of faith. The first writer who quoted him was Pelagius, when he wrote his lost book "De Naturæ" against St. Augustine (c. 415). The Bishop of Hippo himself very soon afterward (421) claimed Chrysostom for the Catholic teaching in his controversy with Julian of Eclanum, who had opposed him a passage of Chrysostom with the argument "It is only preserved only in Latin" as being against original sin (see Chrys. Baur, "L'entrée littéraire de St. Jean Chrys. dans le monde latin" in the "Revue d'histoire ecclési.", VIII, 1907, 249-65). Again, at the time of the Reformation there arose long and acrid discussions as to whether Chrysostom was a Protestant or a Catholic, and these polemics have never wholly ceased.
It is true that Chrysostom has some very strange passages on our Blessed Lady (see Newman, "Certain difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching", London, 1875, pp. 130 sqq.), that he seems to ignore private confession to a priest, that there is no clear and consistent teaching of the supremacy of the pope. But it must be remembered that all the respective passages contain nothing positive against the actual Catholic doctrine. On the other side Chrysostom explicitly acknowledges as a rule of faith tradition (XI, 480), as laid down by the authoritative teaching of the Church (I, 5). This Church, he says, is but one, by the unity of her doctrine (V, 224; XI, 554); she is spread over the whole world, she is the one Bride of Christ (III, 229, 403; V, 62; VIII, 170). As to Christology, Chrysostom holds clearly that Christ is God and man in one person, but he never uses the deeper concepts of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity or of the Person of the Holy Spirit this union. Of great importance is his doctrine regarding the Eucharist. There cannot be the slightest doubt that he teaches the Real Presence, and his expressions on the change wrought by the words of the priest are equivalent to the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Eucharisticiehre des hl. Joh. Chrysostom.[74 sqq.]


John Climacus, Saint, also known and Scholas- tus, and The Simarit, b. doubtless in Syria, about 525; d. on Mount Sinai, 30 March, probably in 606, according to the accredited opinion—others say 605. Although his education and learning fitted him to live in an intellectual environment, he chose, while still young, to abandon the world for a life of solitude. He was region of Mount Sinai, where he could surround himself by the holiness of the monks who inhabited it; he betook himself thither and trained himself to the practice of the Christian virtues under the direction of a monk named Martyrius. After the death of Martyrius John, wishing to practise greater mortifications, withdrew to a hermitage on Mount Sinai. In this isolation he lived for some twenty years, constantly studying the lives of the saints and thus becoming one of the most learned doctors of the Church.

In 600, when he was about seventy-five years of age, the monks of Sinai persuaded him to put himself at their head. He acquired himself of his functions as abbot with the greatest wisdom, and his reputation spread so far that the pope (St. Gregory the Great) wrote to recommend himself to his prayers, and sent him a sum of money for the hospital of Sinai, in which the pilgrims were wont to lodge. Four years later he resigned his charge and returned to his hermitage to prepare for death. St. John Climacus has left us two important works: the "Scala [Kairos] Paradisum", from which his surname comes, composed at the request of John, Ab- bess of Raititza, a monastery of the Kievites, on the shores of the Red Sea; and the "Liber ad Pastore". The "Scala", which obtained an immense popularity and has made him an authorship, is addressed to anchorites and cenobites, and treats of the means by which the highest degree of religious perfection may be attained. Divided into thirty parts, or "steps", in memory of the thirty years of the hidden life of Christ, the Divine model of the religious, it presents a picture of all the virtues and contains a great many parables and historical touches, drawn principally from the monastic life, and exhibiting the practical application of the precepts. At the same time, as the work is mostly written in a concise, sententious form, with the aid of aphorisms, and as the reasonings are not sufficiently closely connected, it is at times somewhat obscure. This explains its having been the subject of various commentaries, even in very early times. The most ancient of the manuscripts containing the "Scala" is found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and was probably brought from Florence by Catharine de' Medici. In some of these manuscripts the work bears the title of "Spiritual Tables" (Tavole spirituali). It was translated into Latin by Ambrogio the Camaldolese (Ambrosius Camaldulensis) (Venice, 1531 and 1569; Cologne, 1583, 1593, with a commentary by Denis the Carthusian; and 1601, 5vo). The Greek of the "Scala", with the scholia of Elias, Archbishop of Crete, and also the text of the "Liber ad Pas-
John Colommini, Blessed, founder of the Congregation of Jesus; b. at Siena, Upper Italy, about 1300; d. on the way to Acquapendente, 31 July, 1367. There was nothing in his early life to indicate the presence in his character of any unusual seeds of holiness. Belonging to an old patrician family, he devoted himself, like many others, to the study of his classics in Italy, to commerce, which swelled his already substantial fortune, and rose to a position of great prominence and influence among his fellow-citizens, who on several occasions elected him gonfalonier. Fortunate in his marriage, of which two children—Peter and Agnese—were the fruit, his private life was marred by his aversion, his ambition, and his proneness to anger. One day, while still suffering under a sense of mortification after one of his passionate outbursts occasioned by a petty domestic disappointment, he chanced to take up a biography of St. Mary of Egypt, whose later life had been as conspicuously shadowy as her earlier one had been for sin. The perusal of this narrative brought a new light into his life; henceforth ambition and anger gave way to an almost incredible humility and meekness. The great transformation of his life extended to his business affairs, and excited in the purely mercenary-minded a ridicule easy to understand. Heceased, however, of railery, he did not rest content with selling cheaper than any other merchant, but persisted in paying more for his purchases than the sum demanded. With the consent of his wife he soon abandoned his former patrician associates, visited hospitals, tended the sick, and made large donations to the poor. Then, casting aside his former station, he assumed the garments of the most indigent, and, having fallen ill and believing himself treated with too much delicacy at home, deserted his luxurious house for the ordinary ward of a poor hospital. His relations urged him to return, and finally elicited his consent on the condition that henceforth he would be given only the coarser forms of nourishment. Nursed back to health, he insisted on making his house the refuge of the needy and the suffering, washing their feet with his own hands, dispensing to them bodily and spiritual comfort, leaving nothing undone that the spirit of charity could suggest. Among the wonders recorded to have taken place in this abode of Christian mercy was the miraculous disappearance of a leper, leaving the room permeated with an indescribable fragrance.

It required eight years to render his wife reconciled to the extraordinary philanthropy of her husband. His son having meanwhile died, and his daughter too, the Sienese with the approval of his wife, on whom he first settled a life-annuity, divided his fortune into three parts: the first went to endow a hospital, the second and third to two cloisters. Together with his old friend Francisco Mini, who had been associated with him in all his charitable works, he founded a life of apostolic poverty, begged for his daily bread, and esteemed it a favour to be allowed to wait on the sick poor, while in public and in their dwellings he stimulated the people to pence. He was soon joined by those of the Piccolomini and by members of other patrician families, who likewise distributed all their goods among the poor. Alarmed at these occurrences, many of the Siene now raised an outcry, complaining that Colommini and his followers were the most promising young men of the city to "folly", and succeeded in obtaining their banishment. Accompanied by twenty-five companions, Colommini left his native city without a protest and visited in succession Arezzo, Città di Castello, Fiesa and many other Tuscan cities, making numerous conversions, reconciling sullen friends, and effecting the inward renewal of much property owned by his order. An epidemic which broke out at Siena shortly after his departure, was generally regarded as a heavenly chastisement for his banishment, and there was a universal clamour for his recall. Regardless alike of derision and insult, he resumed on his return his former charitable occupations, in his humility rejoicing to perform the most menial services at house, where he had once been an honoured guest.

On the return of Urban V from Avignon to Rome (1367), Colommini and his followers hastened to meet him, and begged him to sanction the foundation of a new institute. A commission was appointed, presided over by Cardinal William Sudre, Bishop of Marseilles, having attested their freedom from every taint of the error of the Fraticelli, whose views some evil-intentioned people had accused them of holding, the pope gave his consent to the foundation of their congregation. The name Jesuati (Jesuates) had already been given them by the populace of Viterbo because of their constant use of the ejaculation "Praise be to Jesus Christ." From the very beginning they had a special veneration for St. Jerome, and, to this fact and to the apostolic life they led, they were indebted for their long and honorific name Hieronymi (Apostolic Clerics of St. Jerome). Urban appointed as their habit a white soutain, a white four-cornered hood hanging round the neck and falling in folds over the shoulders, and a mantle of a dun colour; the soutain was encircled by a leathern girdle, and sandals were worn on the feet. Their occupations were the care of the sick, particularly the plague-stricken, the burial of the dead, prayer, and strict mortification (including daily scourging). Their statutes were at first based on the Rule of St. Benedict, modified to suit the aims of the congregation, but the Rule of St. Augustine was later adopted. They decided a week after the establishment of their institute, having appointed Mini his successor. After many miracles had occurred at his tomb, Gregory XIII inserted Colommini’s name in the Roman Martyrology, fixing 31 July for the celebration of his feast, which is of obligation at Siena. Under Mini and his successor, Blessed Jerome Dasciau, the Jesuits spread rapidly over Italy, and in 1606 the Holy See allowed the reception of priests into the congregation. Abuses, however, crept in subsequently, and the congregation was suppressed by Clement IX in 1668 as of little advantage to the interests of the Church. The Jesuatiess or Sisters of the Visitation of Mary, founded about 1367 at the suggestion of Colommini by his cousin Blessed Catharine Colommini of Siena (d. 20 October, 1387), spoke as little as possible, fasted very strictly, and chastised their bodies twice daily. They also spread very rapidly, and survived in Italy until 1750.


Thomas Kennedy.
JOHN CORNELIUS AND COMPAANIONS, VENERABLES.— John Cornelius (called also Mobun) was born of Irish parents at Bodmin, in Cornwall, on the estate of Sir John Arundel, of Lanherne, in 1557; martyred at Dover, 4 July, 1594. Sir John Arundel took an interest in England and laboured there for nearly ten years. He practised mortification, was devoted to meditation, and showed much zeal in the ministry. While acting as chaplain to Lady Arundel, he was arrested on 24 April, 1594, at Chideock Castle, by the sheriff of Dorsetshire. He was met on the way by Thomas Bosgrave, a relative of the Arundell family, who offered him his own hat, as he had been dragged out bareheaded. Thereupon Bosgrave was arrested. Two servants of the castle, John (or Terence) Carey and Patrick Salmon, natives of Dublin, shared the same fate. When they reached the sheriff's house a number of people were in drinking to the Catholic religion, but were so well answered that the sheriff stopped the disputation. The missionary was sent to London and brought before the Lord Treasurer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and others, who, by words and by torture, tried in vain to obtain the retraction of the proclamation. He was finally brought back to Dorchester and with his three companions condemned to death, 2 July, 1594. He was accused of high treason, because he was a priest and had returned to England; the others were charged with felony, for having rendered assistance to one who professed to be a priest; but all were assured that their lives would be spared if they embraced Protestantism. While in prison John Cornelius was admitted to membership in the Society of Jesus. On the way to execution none of the confessors showed signs of fear. The first to ascend the scaffold was John Carey; he kissed the rope, explaining, "O precious collar," made a solemn profession of faith and died a valiant death. Before his execution Patrick Salmon, a man much admired for his virtues, exhorted the spectators to embrace the faith, for which he and his companions were giving their lives. Then followed Thomas Bosgrave, a man of education, who delivered a stirring address on the truth of his belief. The last to suffer was John Cornelius, who kissed the gallows with the words of St. Andrew, "O Cross, long desired," etc. On the ladder he tried to speak to the multitude, but was prevented. After praying for his executioners and for the welfare of the queen, John Cornelius was executed. The body was taken down and quartered, his head was nailed to the gibbet, but soon removed. The bodies were buried by the Catholics.


FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

John Damascene, Saint, b. at Damascus, about 378; d. some time between 754 and 757. The only extant life of the saint is that by John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, which dates from the tenth century (P. G., XCIV, 429-90). This life is the single source from which all have drawn the materials of his biographical notices. It is extremely unsatisfactory from the standpoint of historical criticism. An exception is the last section, a prolix, pedantic, and a turgid style are its chief characteristics. Mansur was probably the name of John's father. What little is known of him indicates that he was a stercing Christian whose infidel environment made no impression on his religious fervour. Apparently his adhesion to Christian truth constituted no offence in the eyes of his Saracen countrymen, for he seems to have enjoyed their esteem in an eminent degree, and discharged the duties of chief financial officer for the caliph, Abdul Malik. Of his early life nothing is known, except that he was the names of but two of his children, John and his half-brother Cosmas. When the future apologist had reached the age of twenty-three his father cast about for a Christian tutor capable of giving his sons the best education the age afforded. In this he was singularly fortunate. Standing one day in the market-place he discovered among the captives taken in a recent raid on the shores of Italy a Sicilian monk named Cosmas. Investigation proved him to be a man of deep and broad erudition. Through the influence of the caliph, Mansur secured the captive's liberty and appointed him tutor to his sons. Under the tutelage of Cosmas, John made such rapid progress that, in the enthusiastic language of his biographer, he soon equalled Diophantus in algebra and Euclid in geometry. Equal progress was made in music, astronomy, and theology.

On the death of his father, John Damascene was made protosynkellos and archbishop of Jerusalem. It was during his incumbency of this office that the Church in the East began to be agitated by the first mutterings of the Iconoclast heresy. In 726, despite the protests of Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, Leo the Isaurian issued his first edict against the veneration of images. From his first meeting with the caliph, John Damascene immediately entered the lists against him, in defence of this ancient usage of the Christians. Not only did he himself oppose the Byzantine monarch, but he also stirred the people to resistance. In 730 the Isaurian issued a second edict, in which he not only forbade the veneration of images, but even inhibited their exhibition in public places. To this royal decree the Damascene replied with even greater vigour than before, and by the adoption of a simpler style brought the Christian side of the controversy within the grasp of the common people. A third letter emphasized what he had already said and warned the emperor to beware of the consequences of his unlawful action. Naturally, these powerful apologies aroused the anger of the Byzantine emperor. Unable to reach the writer with physical force, he sought to encompass his destruction by strategy. Having secured an autograph of the letters by John Damascene, he forged a letter, exactly similar in chirography, purporting to have been written by John to the Isaurian, and offering to betray into his hands the city of Damascus. This letter he sent to the caliph. Notwithstanding his councilor's earnest avowal of innocence, the latter accepted it as genuine and ordered that the hand that wrote it be severed at the wrist. The sentence was executed, but, according to his biographer, through the intervention of the Blessed Virgin, the amputated hand was miraculously restored.

The caliph, now convinced of John's innocence, would have reinstated him in his former office, but the Damascene had heard a call to a higher life, and with his foster-brother entered the monastery of St. Sabas, some eighteen miles south-east of Jerusalem. After the usual probation, John V, Patriarch of Jerusalem, conferred on him the "title of the priesthood." In 754 the pseudo-Syncellus of Constantinople, convened at the command of Constantine Copronymus, the successor of Leo, confirmed the principles of the Iconoclasts and anathematized by name those who had conspicuously opposed them. But the largest measure of the council's spleen was reserved for John Damascene. He was accused of "abhorring Christ and the Sarcens", a "traitorous worshipper of images", a "wronger of Jesus Christ", a "teacher of impiety", and a "bad interpreter of the Scriptures." At the emperor's command his name was written "Mansur"
John of Damascus was the last of the Greek Fathers. His genius was not for original theological development, but for compilation of an encyclopedic character. In fact, the state of full development to which theological thought had been brought by the great Greek writers and the councils left him little else than the work of an encyclopedist; and this work he performed in such a manner as to merit the succeeding ages. Some consider him the precursor of the Scholastics, whilst others regard him as the first Scholastic, and his "De fide orthodoxa" as the first work of Scholasticism. The Arabsians, too, owe not a little of the fame of their philosophy to his inspiration. The most important and best known of all his works is that to which the author himself gave the name of "Fountain of Wisdom" (Εὑρηκα γνώσεως). This work has always been held in the highest esteem in both the Catholic and Greek Churches. Its merit is not that of originality, for the author asserts, at the end of the second chapter of the "Dialectic", that it is done for the purpose to set forth his own views, but rather to collate and epitomize in a single work the opinions of the great ecclesiastical writers who have gone before him. A special interest attaches to it for the reason that it is the first attempt at a *summa theologica* that has come down to us.

The "Fountain of Wisdom" is divided into three parts, namely, "Philosophical Chapters" (Κεφάλαια φιλοσοφικά), "Concerning Heresy" (Εξώθηκα ἁδερσώ), and "An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith" (Εὔκολο ψηφιδωτό τῆς θρησκείας πίστεως). The title of the first book is somewhat too comprehensive for its contents and consequently is more commonly called "Dialectic". With the exception of the fifteen chapters that deal exclusively with logic, it has mostly to do with the ontology of Aristotle. It is largely a summary of the Categories of Aristotle with Porphyry's "On Categories" (Κατηγοριών). This summary has been John of Damascus's purpose to give his readers only such philosophical knowledge as was necessary for understanding the subsequent parts of the "Fountain of Wisdom". For more than one reason the "Dialectic" is a work of unusual interest. In the first place, it is a record of the terminology used by the Greek Fathers, not only against the heretics, but also in the exposition of the Faith for the benefit of the Christians. It is interesting, too, for the reason that it is a partial exposition of the "Orpanon", and the application of its methods to Catholic theology a century before the first Arabic translation of Aristotle made its appearance. The second part, "Concerning Heresy", is little more than a copy of a similar work by Epiphanius, brought up to date by John of Damascus. The author indeed expressly disclaims originality except in the chapters devoted to Islamism, Iconoclasm, and Apostasy. To the list of eighty heresies that constitute the "Panarion" (πανάριον) of Epiphanius, he added twenty heresies that had sprung up since his time. In treating of Islamism he vigorously assails the immoral practices of Mohammed and the corrupt teachings inserted in the Koran to legalize them. With the exception of the latter, he brings the work to a close with a fervent profession of Faith. John's authorship of this book has been challenged, for the reason that the writer, in treating of Arianism, speaks of Arius, who died four centuries before the time of the Damascene, as still living and working spiritual ruin among the people. The solution of the difficulty is to be found in the fact that John of Damascus did not epitomize the contents of the "Panarion", but copied it verbatim. Hence the passage referred to is in the exact words of Epiphanius himself and with the same Chrysobullon (golden stream) by his friends on account of his oratorical gifts. In the pontificate of Leo XIII he was enrolled among the doctors of the Church. His feast is celebrated on 27 March.

"Concerning the Orthodox Faith", the third book of the "Fountain of Wisdom", is the most important of John Damascene's writings and one of the most notable works of Christian antiquity. Its authority has always been great among the theologians of the East and West. Here, again, the author modestly disavows any claim to originality—any purpose to essay a new exposition of doctrinal truth. He assigns himself the less pretentious task of collecting in a single work the opinions of the ancient writers scattered through many volumes, and of systematizing them in a logical order. He gives the smallest credit to John of Damascus that he was able to give to the Church in the eighth century its first summary of connected theological opinions. At the command of Eugenius III it was rendered into Latin by Burgundio of Fisa, in 1150, shortly before Peter Lombard's "Book of Sentences" appeared. This translation was used by Peter Lombard and St. Thomas Aquinas, as well as by other theologians, till the Humanists rejected it for a more elegant one. The author follows the same order as does Theodoret of Cyrus in his "Epitome of Christian Doctrine". But, while he presents the general plan of Theodoret, he does not make use of his method. He quotes, not only from the pages of Holy Writ, but also from the writings of the Fathers. As a result, his work is an inexhaustible thesaurus of tradition which became the standard for the great Scholastics who followed. In particular, he draws generously from Gregory of Nazianzus, whose works he seems to have absorbed, from Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Athanasius, John Chrysostom, and Epiphanius. The work is divided into four books. This division, however, is an arbitrary one neither contemplated by the author nor justifiable by the Greek text. It is really the work of a Latin translator seeking to accommodate it to the style of the four books of Lombard's "Sentences".

The first book of "The Orthodox Faith" treats of the essence and existence of God, the Divine nature, the Son of God (the Trinitarian). In summary form, he cites the concurrence of opinion among those enlightened by Revelation and those who have only the light of reason to guide them. To the same end he employs the argument drawn from the mutability of created things and that from design. Treating, in the second book, of the sacred order of the Church, he attempts to embody the views of his times, without, however, committing himself to any of them. In the same treatise he discloses a comprehensive knowledge of the astronomy of his day. Here, also, place is given to the consideration of the nature of angels and demons, the terrestrial paradise, the properties of human nature, the foreknowledge of God, and predestination. Treating of man (ἐξωστρεφώ), he gives what has been aptly called a "psychology in nuce". Contrary to the teachings of Plotinus, the master of Orphery, he identifies mind and soul. In the third book the personality and two-fold nature of Christ are discussed with great ability. This leads up to the consideration of the Monophysite heresy. In this connexion he deals with Peter the Fuller's addition to the "Trisagion", and combats Anastasius's interpretation of this ancient hymn. The latter, who was Abbot of the monastery of St. Euthymius at Palmyra, spent his time in discussing the Divinity and Person of the Trinity. In his letter "Concerning the Trisagion" John Damascene contends that the hymn applies not to the Son alone, but to each Person of the Blessed Trinity. This book also contains a spirited defence of the Blessed Virgin's claim to the title of Theotokos ("Our Lady"). Nestorius is vigorously dealt with for trying to substitute the title of "Mother
of Christ” for “Mother of God.” The Scriptures are discussed in the fourth book. In assigning twenty-two books to the Old Testament Canon he is treating of the Hebrew, and not the Christian, Canon, as he finds it in a work of Epiphanius, “De ponderibus et mensuris.” His treatment in this book of the Real Presence is especially satisfactory. The nineteenth chapter contains a powerful plea for the veneration of images.

The treatise, “Against the Jacobites,” was written at the request of Peter, Metropolitan of Damascus, who imposed on him the task of reconciling to the Faith the Jacobite bishop. It is a strong polemic against the Monothelites, as the Jacobites were called. He also wrote against the Manicheans and Monothelites. The “Booklet Concerning Right Judgment” is little more than a profession of Faith, confirmed by arguments setting forth the mysteries of the Faith, especially the Trinity and the Incarnation. Though John of Damascus wrote voluminously on the Scriptures, as in the case of so much of his writing, his work bears little of the stamp of originality. His “Select Passages” (Loci Selecti), as he himself admits, are taken largely from the homilies of St. John Chrysostom and appended as commentaries to the homilies of St. Cyril. The commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians is taken from Cyril of Alexandria. The “Sacred Parallels” (Sacra parallela) is a kind of topical concordance, treating principally of God, man, virtues, and vices.

Under the general title of “Homilies” he wrote fourteen discourses. The sermon on the Transfiguration, which Lequien asserts was delivered in the church on Mt. Thabor, is of more than usual excellence. It is characterized by dramatic eloquence, vivid description, and a wealth of imagery. In it he discourses on the twofold nature of Christ, quotes the classic text of Scripture in testimony of the primacy of Peter, and witnesses the Catholic doctrine of sacramental Penance. In his sermon on Holy Saturday he descants on the Easter duty and on the Real Presence. The Annunciation is the text of a sermon, now extant only in a Latin version of an Arabic text, in which he attributes various present blessings to the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. The second of his three sermons on the Assumption is especially notable for its detailed account of the translation of the body of the Blessed Virgin into heaven, an account, he allows, that is based on the most reliable and ancient tradition. Both Liddledale and Neale regard John of Damascus as the prince of Greek hymnologists. His hymns are contained in the “Carmina” of the Lequien edition. The “canons” on the Nativity, Epiphany, and Pentecost are written in ichthyic trimeters. Three of his hymns have become widely known and admired in their English version—“Those eternal bowers,” “Come, ye faithful raise the strain,” and “Tis the Day of Resurrection.” The most famous of the “canons” is that on Easter. It is a song of triumph and thanksgiving, the “Te Deum of the Greek Church.” It is a tradition of the Venetians, lately controverted, that John Damascene composed the “Octoechos,” which contains the liturgical hymns used by the Greek Church in its Sunday services. Gerbet, in his “History of Sacred Music,” credits him with doing for the East what Gregory the Great accomplished for the West. In the thirteenth chapter he was imprisoned on a charge of heresy by the king, he was expelled from the country. In 1888 he was sent to Europe as deputy to the triennial Congregation of Procurators. Resisting urgent attempts to keep him in Portugal, and refusing the Archbishopric of Crangano, he returned in 1891 to the See of Cambrai. He was, in 1892, appointed Titular Bishop of Wieliczki, and in 1896, Bishop of Cambrai. He was translated to the See of Cambrai in 1899. In 1918 he received the title of cardinal-priest of S. Maria Maggiore. In 1920 he was created a cardinal by Pope Benedict XV. He was appointed to the See of Cambrai in 1921.

The “Apology of Aristides” shows what amounts to sixteen printed pages of it was taken directly from Aristides. The panegyric on St. Barbara, while accepted as genuine by Lequien, is rejected by many others. The treatise entitled “Concerning those who have died in the Faith” is rejected as spurious by Suarez, Bellarmine, and Lequien, not on account of errors, but of its doctrinal discrepancies of a character as well. The first Greek edition of any of the works of John Damascene was the of the “Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith” brought out at Verona (1531) under the auspices of John Matthew Gibertius, Bishop of Verona. Another Greek edition of the same work was made at Morea in 1546 by John Epessinus. It was also printed in a Latin edition at Paris (1507), by James Faber. Henry Gravius, O.P., published a Latin edition at Cologne (1546) which contained the following works: "Dialectic," "Elementary and Dogmatic Instruction," "Concerning the two Wills and Operations," and "Concerning Heresy." A Greek-Latin edition with an introduction by Mark Hopper made its appearance at Basle (1548). A similar edition, but much more complete was published at the same place in 1575. Another Latin edition, constituting a partial collection of the author's works was brought out at Paris in 1589 (1577). The only complete edition of the Damascene's works is that by Michael Lequien, O.P., published at Paris (1717) and Venice (1748). To the reprint of this edition, P. G., XCIV-XCVI (Paris, 1864), Migne has added a supplement of works attributed by some to the authorship of John Damascene.

GRUNDLIEFER, Joannes Damascenus (Utrecht, 1878); LANG, Joannes von Damaskus (Gotha, 1879); LEDUREM, De exposizione fidei orthodoxae (Utrecht, 1892); LUPPINO, St. John of Damascus (London, 1882); LEQUIEN, Sanctorum patrum et oficiae Damascensis opera opera magna, vol. I, II, 1875, 1878; DE LETTO, Storia della Chiesa di Christo (Paris, 1890); HOLL, Die Sacra Paralelae des Johannes Damascenus in Texte und Untersuchungen, XVI, n. (Leipzig, 1890); EHRHARD, Zu den Sacra Paralelaen und dem Plutarchiadium des Martinus in Byzant. Zeitschr. (1901); ERMON, Saint Jean Damascene in La Pensée chrétienne (Paris, 1904); PESCHE, Jean Damascène sa vie et ses écrits (Strasbourg, 1883); NODE, Studien über die dem Johannes von Damaskus zugeschriebenen Paroikien (Halle, 1892); KIMS, Barlaam und Josaphat in Abhandlungen der k. bayer Akad. d. Wissenschaften, 1 Klasse, XX (Munich, 1893), sect. 1; ALLIES, Treatises on Holy Images, and Treatises on the Assumption, a new and complete ed. (London, 1891); DENHWEER, Patrologie, tr. SHARMAN (St. Louis, 1908), 582-80; RENOUX, De Dialecticae Sanctorum Joannis Damascen (Paris, 1883).

JOHN B. O'CONNOR.

John Davys, Blessed. See Thomas Johnson, Blessed.

John de Britto, Blessed, martyr, b. in Lisbon, 1 March, 1647, and was brought up at court, martyred in India 1 Feb., 1653. Entering the Society of Jesus at fifteen, he obtained as his mission-field Madura in Southern India. In September, 1673, he reached Goa. Before taking up his work he spent thirty days in the Exercises of St. Ignatius at Ambalacare near Crangonore. De Britto apparently entered the Kshatriyas, a noble caste. His dress was yellow cotton; he abstained from every kind of animal food. On going out early in 1674, he traversed the Ghauts on foot and reached Colei in the Caufvery Delta, where he perfected himself in the language. He journeyed northward at least as far as Madras and Vellore, but the Caufvery Delta, Tanjore, Madura, and Marava, between Madura and the sea, were his chief field. In 1684, he was imprisoned on a charge of heresy by the king, he was expelled from the country. In 1888 he was sent to Europe as deputy to the triennial Congregation of Procurators. Resisting urgent attempts to keep him in Portugal, and refusing the Archbishopric of Crangano, he returned in 1891 to the See of Cambrai. He was, in 1892, appointed Titular Bishop of Wieliczki, and in 1896, Bishop of Cambrai. He was translated to the See of Cambrai in 1899. In 1918 he received the title of cardinal-priest of S. Maria Maggiore. In 1920 he was created a cardinal by Pope Benedict XV. He was appointed to the See of Cambrai in 1921.

Among the several works that are dubiously attributed to John Damascene the most important is the anonymous Gospel of Madras, which throughout the Middle Ages it enjoyed the widest popularity in all languages. It is not regarded as authentic by Lequien, and the discovery of a Syriac version of the
eral persecution. De Britto and others were taken and carried to the capital, Ramnad, the Brahmins clamoured for his death. However, he was freed at Calais led to Orleans, some thirty miles northward along the coast, where his head was struck off, 11 Feb. 1693. He had wrought many conversions during his life, established many stations, and was famous for his miracles before and after death. He was beatified by Pius IX, 21 Aug. 1867, and canonized by Pius XII, 1950.

De COIMBRA. Breve Relação do ilustre martirio de V. P. de Britto (1895); MALDONADO, Ilustre Cartar men R. P. Jornada de Britto e Sociedade Jhs. (Arxivo, 1897); PEREIRA DE BRITTO, Historia de Nascimento, Vida e Martírio do P. João de Britto da Companhia de Jesus (1702; published 1722; republished Lisbon, 1807); MISSA DE O.M. DE MODER, Après des discours épitaphiques (Paris, 1847); Lettres épitaphiques et curieuses; Life de V. P. de Britto in (journeys Series) (London, 1851); Excerto Historie du P. Britto (Paris, 1853); CABEZA, Atlas Geográfico Societatis Jesu (Paris, 1900).

H. WOODS.

John Dominic. See DOMINICI, GIOVANNI, BLESSED.

John Duns Scotus. See DUNS SCOTUS, JOHN.

John Eynon, BLESSED. See HUGH FARINGDON, BLESSED.

John Felton, BLESSED, martyr, date and place of birth unknown; was executed in St. Paul’s Churchyard, London, 8 August, 1570, for having, about eleven o’clock at night on the previous 24 May, affixed a copy of the Bull of St. Pius V excommunicating the queen to the gates of the Bishop of London’s palace near St. Paul’s. His daughter, Frances Salisbury, says that this exploit actually took place between two and three on the morning of the next day, on which that year the feast of Corpus Christi happened to fall. The MS. which preserves her narrative contains a blank where the age of her father should be recorded, but she gives us other particulars fully. He was a wealthy gentleman of Norfolk extraction, and lived at Bermondsey Abbey near Southwark. He had married a lady who had been maid of honour to Queen Mary and playmate of Queen Elizabeth, and who was the widow of an auditor of the former queen. He himself “was a man of stature little and of complexion black”. Of the copies of the Bull which he received at Calais he had given one to William Mellowes of Lincoln’s Inn, a special friend of his. This copy was discovered on 25 May, and Mellowes on the rack confessed to having received it from him. On 26 May he was arrested and taken to the Tower, where he was thrice racked, though on the first confession and glorified in his deed. He was executed on 4 August and executed four days later. He was cut down alive, and his daughter says that he uttered the holy name of Jesus once or twice when the hangman had his heart in his hand.


JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

John Fisher, BLESSED, cardinal, Bishop of Rochester, and martyr; born at Beverley, Yorkshire, England, 1459 (? 1460); d. 22 June, 1535. John was the third son of Robert Fisher, merchant of Beverley, and Agnes his wife. His early education was probably received in the school attached to the collegiate church in his native town, whence in 1484 he removed to Michaelhouse, Cambridge. He took the degree of B.A. in 1487, proceeded M.A. in 1491, in which year also he was elected a fellow of his college. In 1496 the first master was inadequate of his position and was dismissed. In 1497, John was appointed Master of Michaelhouse, about which date he became chaplain and confessor to Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, mother of King Henry VII. In 1501 he received the degree of D.D., and was elected Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. Under Fisher’s guidance the Lady Margaret founded St. John’s and Christ’s colleges, and also the two “Lady Margaret” professorships of divinity at Oxford and Cambridge respectively, Fisher himself being the first occupant of the Cambridge chair.

By Bull dated 14 October, 1504, Fisher was advanced to the Bishopric of Rochester, and in the same year was elected Chancellor of Cambridge University, to which post he was re-elected annually for ten years and then appointed for life. At this date also he is said to have acted as tutor to Prince Henry, afterwards Henry VIII. As a preacher his reputation was so great that in 1509, when King Henry was on his way to the Lady Margaret, Fisher was appointed to preach the funeral oration on both occasions; these sermons are still extant. In 1512 Fisher was nominated as one of the English representatives at the Fifth Council of the Lateran, then sitting, but his journey to Rome was postponed, and finally abandoned. Besides his share in the Lady Margaret’s foundations, Fisher gave further proof of his genuine zeal for learning by inducing Erasmus to visit Cambridge. The latter indeed (Epist., vi, 2) attributes it to Fisher’s protection that the study of Greek was allowed to proceed at Cambridge without fear of active molestation that it encountered at Oxford. He has also been named, though without any real proof, as the true author of the royal treatise against Luther entitled “Assertio septem sacramentorum”, published in 1521, which won the title Fidei Defensor for Henry VIII. Before this date Fisher had denounced various abuses in the Church, urging the need of disciplinary reforms, and in this year he preached at St. Paul’s Cross on the occasion when Luther’s books were publicly burned.

When the question of Henry’s divorce from Queen Catherine arose, Fisher became the queen’s chief supporter and most trusted counsel. Shortly after his appearance on the queen’s behalf in the legates’ court, where he startled his hearers by the directness of his language and most of all by declaring that, like St. John the Baptist, he was ready to die on behalf of the indissolubility of marriage. This statement was reported to Henry, raged by it that he himself composed a long Latin address to the legates in answer to the bishop’s speech. Fisher’s copy of this still exists, with his MS. annotations in the margin which show how little he feared the royal anger. The removal of the cause to Rome brought him himself to personal sharing in its end, but the king now forgave him for what he had done. In November, 1529, the “Long Parliament” of Henry’s reign began its series of encroachments on the Church. Fisher, as a member of the upper house, at once warned Parliament that such acts could only end in the utter destruction of the Church in England. On this the Commons, through their speaker, complained to the king that the bishop had disparaged Parliament. Dr. Gardiner (Lollardy and the Reformation, I, 442) says of this incident “it can hardly be a matter of doubt that this strange remonstrance was prompted by the king himself, and partly for personal use of his own.”

The opportunity was not lost. Henry summoned Fisher before him, demanding an explanation. This being given, Henry declared himself satisfied, leaving it to the Commons to declare that the explanation was inadequate of substantiating his infamous sovereign, instead of Fisher’s enemy. A year later (1530) the continued encroachments on the Church moved the Bishops of Rochester, Bath, and Ely to appeal to the Apostolic see. This gave the king his opportunity. An edict forbidding such appeals was immediately issued, and the three bishops were arrested. Their imprisonment, however, cas
have lasted a few months only, for in February, 1531, Convocation met, and Fisher was present. This was the occasion when the clergy were forced, at a cost of £100,000, to purchase the king’s pardon for having recognized Cardinal Wolsey’s authority as legate of the pope; and at the same time to acknowledge two Popes, and to add to the land, to which phrase, however, the addition “so far as God’s law permits” was made, through Fisher’s efforts.

A few days later, several of the bishop’s servants were taken ill after eating some porridge served to them at breakfast, and two died. The popular opinion at the time regarded this as an attempt on the bishop’s life, although he himself charged not to have eaten any of the poisoned food. To dissimulate suspicion, the king not only expressed strong indignation at the crime, but caused a special Act of Parliament to be passed, whereby poisoning was to be accounted high treason, and the person guilty of it boiled to death. This sentence was actually carried out on the culprit, but it did not prevent what seems to have been a second attempt on Fisher’s life soon afterwards.

The bishop moved rapidly. In May, 1532, Sir Thomas More resigned the chancellorship, and in June, Fisher preached publicly against the divorce. In August, Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, died, and Cranmer was at once nominated to the pope as his successor. In January, 1533, Henry secretly went through the form of marriage with Anne Boleyn; Cranmer’s consecration took place in March of the same year, and, a week later, Fisher was arrested. It seems fairly clear that the purpose of this arrest was to prevent his opposing the sentence of divorce which Cranmer pronounced in May, or the consecration of Anne Boleyn which followed on 1 June. Fisher was set at liberty again within a fortnight of the latter event, no charge being made against him. In the autumn of this year (1533), various arrests were made in connexion with the so-called revelations of the Holy Maid of Kent (see Barron, Elizabeth), but as Fisher was taken seriously ill in December, proceedings against him were postponed for a time. In March, 1534, however, a special bill of attainder against the Bishop of Rochester and others for complicity in the matter of the Nun of Kent was introduced and passed. This Fisher was condemned to forfeit his goods and lands, and to be imprisioned during the king’s pleasure. Subsequently a pardon was granted to him on payment of a fine of £300.

In the same session of Parliament was passed the Act of Succession, by which all who should be called upon to do so were compelled to take an oath of succession, acknowledging the issue of Henry and Anne as legitimate heirs to the throne, under pain of being guilty of misprision of treason. Fisher refused the oath and was sent to the Tower of London, 26 April, 1534. Several efforts were made to induce him to submit, but without effect, and in November he was sentenced to death. The time attemted of imprisonment of treason, his goods being forfeited as from 1 March preceding, and the See of Rochester being declared vacant as from 2 June following. A long letter exists, written from the Tower by the bishop to Thomas Cromwell, which records the severity of his confinement and the sufferings he endured.

In May, 1535, the new pope, Paul III, created Fisher Cardinal Priest of St. Vitalis, his motive being apparently to induce Henry by this mark of esteem to treat the bishop less severely. The effect was precisely the reverse. Henry forbade the cardinal’s hat to be worn in church, and declared, declaring that he would send the head to Rome for it instead. In June a special commission for Fisher’s trial was issued, and on 17 June he was arraigned in Westminster Hall on a charge of treason, in that he had denied the king to be supreme head of the Church. Since he had been deprived of his bishopric by the Act of Attainder, he was treated as a commoner, and tried by jury. He was declared guilty, and condemned to be hanged, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn, but the mode of execution was changed, and he was beheaded at the bottom of Allhallows, Barking. Then it was removed a fortnight later and laid beside that of Sir Thomas More in the church of St. Peter ad Vincula by the Tower. His head was stuck upon a pole on London Bridge, but its dusty and life-like appearance excited so much attention that, after a fortnight, it was thrown into the Thames, its place being taken by that of Sir Thomas More, whose martyrdom occurred on 6 July next following.

Several portraits of Fisher exist, the best being that by Holbein in the royal collection; and a few secondary reliefs are extant. In the Decree of 29 December, 1536, when fifty-four of the English martyrs were stated to have been by Leo XIII, the then Pope of all the former deposed Blessed John Fisher. A list of Fisher’s writings will be found in Gilly, "Biblical Dictionary of the English Catholics" (London, a. d.), II, 262-270. There are twenty-six works in all, printed and MS., mostly ascetical or controversial treatises, several of which have been reprinted many times. The original editions are very rare and valuable. The principal are: "Treatise concerning . . . the seven penitential Psalms" (London, 1508); "Sermon . . . again ye penercious doctrin of Martin Luther" (London, 1521); "Defensio Henrici VIII" (Cologne, 1525); "De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Beatae Mariae Verusus Johanne Oecolampadum" (Cologne, 1527); "De Causa Matrimonii . . . Henrid VIII cum Catharina Aragonensi" (Alcalá de Henares, 1530); "The Ways to Perfect Religion" (London, 1535); "A Spiritual Consolation written . . . to his sister Elizabeth." (London, 1735).


G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

John Forest, Blessed, b. in 1471, presumably at Oxford, where his surname was then not unknown; suffered 22 May, 1538. At the age of twenty he received the habit of St. Francis at Greenwich, in the church of the Friars Minor of the Regular Observance, and was ordained for brevity’s sake “subsecrario.” Nine years later we find him at Oxford, studying theology. He is commonly styled “Doctor” though, beyond the steps which he took to qualify as bachelor of divinity, no positive proof of his further progress has been found. Afterwards he became one of Queen Catherine’s chaplains, and was appointed her confessor. In 1525 he appears to have been provincial, which seems certain from the fact that he threatened with excommunication the brethren who opposed Cardinal Wolsey’s legatine powers. Already in 1531 the Observants had incurred the king’s displeasure by their determined opposition to the divorce; and no wonder that Fisher’s step in this matter was not without object of wrath. In November, 1532, we find the holy man discoursing at Paul’s Cross on the decay of the realm and the pulling down of churches. At the beginning of February,
1533, an attempt at reconciliation was made between him and Henry; but a couple of months later he left the neighbourhood of London, where he was no longer safe. He was probably already in Newgate prison in 1534, when Father Peto preached his famous sermon before the king at Greenwich. In his confinement Father Forest corresponded with the queen and Edward, the king's brother, urging the release of Henry, which began with the text: "Neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was".

On 8 April, 1538, the holy friar was taken to Lambeth, where, before Cranmer, he was required to make an act of abjuration. They, however, refused to do—, and it was then decided that the sentence of death should be carried out. On 22 May following he was taken to Smithfield to be burned. The statue of "Darvell Gatheren" that had been brought from the church of Llandaff in Wales, was thrown on the pile of firewood; and, according to popular belief, was fulfilled an old prophecy, that this holy image would set a forest on fire. The holy man's martyrdom lasted two hours, at the end of which the executioners threw him, together with the gibbet on which he hung, into the fire. Father Forest, together with fifty other English martyrs, was declared a "Blessed" by Pope Leo XIII, on 9 December, 1886, and his feast is kept by the Friars Minor on 22 May. Some years ago rumour was current that the relics of the martyr had been taken to Spain, and were preserved in a residence of the Friars Minor somewhere in the north of that country. In 1904 the writer of this article made inquiries, to which the Provincial of Cantabria replied that the fathers there were not aware of the existence of the holy relics in any part of Spain, and that they thought the rumour was unfounded. It seems therefore most probable that the mortal remains of Father Forest still lie hidden at Smithfield, near the corner of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, opposite the gate of the ancient priory.


FATHER THADDIUS.

John Francis Regis, Saint, b. 31 January, 1597, in the village of Fontcouverte (department of Aude); d. 29 Dec. 1640, a noble French merchant, had been recently ennobled in recognition of the prominent part he had taken in the Wars of the League; his mother, Marguerite de Cugunhan, belonged by birth to the landed nobility of that part of Languedoc. They watched with Christian solicitude over the early education of their son, whose sole fear was lest he should displease his parents or his tutors. The slightest harsh word rendered him inconsolable, and quite paralyzed his youthful faculties. When he reached the age of fourteen, he was sent to continue his studies in the Jesuit college at Béziers. His condescendency and hatred of practices of devotion, while his good humor, frankness, and eagerness to oblige everybody soon won for him the good-will of his comrades. But Francis did not love the world, and even during the vacations lived in retirement, occupied in study and prayer. On one occasion he allowed himself the diversions of the chase. At the end of his five years' study of the humanities, grace and his ascetic inclinations led him to embrace the religious life under the standard of St. Ignatius Loyola. He entered the Jesuit novitiate of Toulouse on 8 December, 1616, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Here he was distinguished by extreme fervency, and his zeal often forwarded flagged, neither at Cahors, where he studied rhetoric for a year (Oct., 1618–Oct., 1619), nor during the six years in which he taught grammar at the colleges of Bilлом (1619–22), of Puy-en-Velay (1625–27), and of Auch (1627–28), nor during the three years in which he studied philosophy in the scholasticate at Tournon (Oct., 1622–Oct., 1625). During this time, although he was filling the laborious office of regent, he made his first attempts as a preacher. On feast-days he loved to visit the town and its little neighbourge, and there give an informal instruction, which never failed—as attested by those who heard him—to produce a profound impression on those present.

As he burned with the desire to devote himself entirely to the salvation of his neighbour, he aspired with all his heart to the priesthood. In this spirit he began in October, 1628, his theological studies. The four years he was supposed to devote to them seemed to him so very long that he finally begged his superiors to shorten the term. This request was granted, and in consequence Francis said his first Mass on Trinity Sunday, 15 June, 1631; but on the other hand, in conformity with the statutes of his order, which require the full course of study, he was not admitted to the solemn profession of the four vows. The plague was at that time raging in Toulouse. The new priest was untouched to witness the terrible and the fruit of his apostolate. In the beginning of 1632, after having reconciled family differences at Fontcouverte, his birthplace, and having resumed for some weeks a class in grammar at Pamiers, he was definitively set to work by his superiors at the hard labour of the missions. This became the work of the last ten years of his life. It is impossible to enumerate the cities and localities which were the scene of his zeal. On this subject the reader must consult his modern biographer, Father de Curley, who has succeeded best in reconstructing the itinerary of the holy man. We need only mention that from May of 1632 until he was seventy, his head-quarters were at the Jesuit college of Montpellier, and here he laboured for the conversion of the Huguenots, visiting the hospitals, assisting the needy, withdrawing from the services of the women, and preaching Catholic doctrine with tireless zeal to children and the poor. Later (1633–40) he evangelized more than fifty districts in le Vivarais, le Forez, and le Velay. He displayed everywhere the same spirit, the same intrepidity, which were rewarded by the most striking conversions. "Everybody," wrote the rector of Montpellier to the general of the Jesuits, "has seen Father Regis in his parishes." "He will never be forgotten of the Missions" (Daubenton, "La vie du B. Jean-François Regis", ed. 1716, p. 73). But not everyone appreciated the transports of his zeal. He was reproached in certain quarters with being impetuous and meddlesome, with troubling the peace of families by an indiscreet charity, with preaching not evangelical sermons, but satires and invectives which converted no one. Some priests, who felt their own manner of life rebuked, determined to ruin him, and therefore denounced him to the Bishop of Vivers. They had laid their plot with such perfidy and cunning that the bishop permitted himself to be much given to the same. But it was only a passing cloud. The influence of the best people on the one hand, and on the other the patience and humility of the saint, soon succeeded in confounding the calumny and caused the discreet and enlightened ardour of Regis to shine forth with renewed splendour (Daubenton, loc. cit., 87). The "less moderate" mode of mortification, which he practised with extreme rigour on all occasions, without ruffling in the least his evenness of temper. As he returned to the house one evening after a hard day's toil, one of his confresseurs laughingly asked: "Well, Father Regis, speaking candidly, are you not very tired?" "Oh, Father, I feel as fresh as a rose." Then he took only a bowl of milk and a little fruit, which usually constituted both his dinner and
supper, and finally, after long hours of prayer, lay
don the floor of his room, the only bed he knew.
He desired ardently to go to Canada, which at that
time was one of the missions of the Society of Jesus
where one ran the greatest risks. Having been re-
fused, he finally sought and obtained from the general
permission to spend six months in the missions, and
the three months of winter, on the missions of the
society. The remainder of the time he devoted to the
most thankless labour in the cities, especially to the
rescue of public women, whom he helped to persevere
after their conversion by opening refuges for them,
where they found honest means of livelihood. He
never made a great part of his time and
caused him many annoyances, but his strength of soul
was above the dangers which he ran. Dissolute men
often presented a pistol at him or held a dagger to his
throat. He did not even change colour, and the
brightness of his countenance, his fearlessness, and the
power of his words caused them to drop the
weapons from their hands. He was more sensitive to that opposition which occasionally proceeded from those who should have seconded his courage. His work among penitents urged his zeal to enormous undertakings. His superiors, as his first biographers candidly state, did not often share his optimism, nor rather his
unshaken faith in Providence, and it sometimes happened that they were alarmed at his charitable projects and manifested to him their disapproval.
This was the cross which caused the saint the greatest
suffering, but it was sufficient for him that obedience
spoke: he silenced all the murmurs of human nature,
and abandoned his most cherished designs. Seventy-
two years after his death a French ecclesiastic, who
believed he had a grievance against the Jesuits, cir-
culated the legend that towards the end of his life St.
John Francis Regis had been expelled from the Soc-
ety of Jesus. Many different accounts were given, but
finally the enemies of the Jesuits settled on the
version that the letter of the general announcing to
John his dismissal was sent from Rome, but that it
was late in reaching its destination, only arriving some
days after the death of the saint. This calumny will not
stand the slightest examination. (For its refuta-
tion see de Curley, "S. Jean-François Regis", 336-51;
mored briefly and completely in "Analecta Bollandi-
dana", XIII, 78-9.)

It was in the depth of winter, at la Louveau, a poor
hamlet of the mountains of Ardèche, after having
spent with heroic courage the little strength that he
had left, while he was contemplating the conver-
sion of the Cévennes, that the saint's death occurred,
on 30 December, 1640. There was no delay in order-
ing canonical investigations. On 18 May, 1716, the
decree of beatification was issued by Clement XI.
On 5 April, 1737, Clement XII promulgated the
decree of canonization. Benedict XIV established the
feast-day for 16 June. But immediately after his
death Regis was venerated as a saint. Pilgrims came
crowds to his tomb, and since then the concourse has
only grown. Mention must be made of the fact
that a visit made in 1804 to the blessed remains of the
Apostle of Vivarais was the beginning of the vocation
of the Blessed Curé of Ars, Jean-Baptiste Vianney,
whom the Church has raised in his turn to her altars.
"Everything good that I have done", he said when
dying, "I owe to him" (de Curley, op. cit., 371).
The place where Regis died has been transformed into a
sanctuary. Near by is a spring of fresh water to
which those who are devoted to St. John Francis
Regis attribute miraculous cures through his inter-
cession. The old church of la Louveau has received
(1888) the title and privileges of a basilica. On this
sacred site was founded in the beginning of the nine-
teenth century the Convent of the Sisters of St. Thérèse
or Sisters of Retreat, better known under the name of
the Religious of the Cenacle; and it was the memory
of his merciful seal in behalf of so many unfortunate
falten women that gave rise to the now flourishing
work of St. Francis Regis, which is to provide for the
poor and working people who wish to marry, and which
is chiefly concerned with bringing illegitimate
unions into conformity with Divine law. Besides the
biographies mentioned in Carayon, Bibliographie
historique de la Compagnie de Jésus, nn. 2442-54, must be
mentioned the more recent work of Jean-François
Regis (Lyons, 1893), which, together with Daubenton's
work—often reprinted—is the most complete history of Regis;
see Jean-François Regis' (Lyons, 1894), in which
the new portion consists of unedited papers regarding the
saint's family. Among the early biographers Lamberre, a pupil of the
philosopher Bossuet, occupies an undiminished place for the
vitality, and the documentary value of the relation. His book appeared
in 1690, ten years after the death of the saint.

FRANCIS VAN ORTROY.

John Gualbert, Saint. See Valombrosa.

John Hale, Blessed. See John Houghton,
Blessed.

John Houghton, Blessed, proto-martyr of the persuc-
deration under Henry VIII, b. in Essex, 1487; d.
at Tylburn, 4 May, 1535. He was educated at Cam-
bridge, graduating LL.B. about 1497, and later LL.D.
and D.D.; he was ordained priest in 1501 and entered the
Carthusian novitiate at the London Charterhouse in
1505, where he was professed in 1516. He filled the
office of sacristan, 1523-28; of procurator, 1528-31;
of prior of Beaulieu, Nottinghamshire, from June to
November, 1531; of prior of the London Charterhouse,
1531-35; and of provincial visitor, 1532-35. He was
imprisoned in the Tower for a month, with the
procurator, Blessed Humphrey Middlemore, for refus-
ing to swear that the King's marriage with Queen
Catherine was invalid, but took the oath of succession
under the condition quatenus licitum esset, with some
of his monks, 29 May, 1534, the others being sworn 6
June. On or about 13 April, 1535, he was committed
again to the Tower for refusing the oath of supremacy.
With him were sent Blessed Robert Laurence, who
had succeeded him as prior of Beaulieu, and had pre-
viously been chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk and then
a monk of the London Charterhouse; and Blessed
Augustine Webster, prior of Axlholme, Lincolnshire, formerly a monk of Sleen. These priests, who were on a
visit to the London Charterhouse, refused to take
oath tendered to them, but were brought before the
Rolls for that purpose on 20 April, and, on refusing it,
were sent back to the Tower. There they were joined
by Blessed Richard Reynolds, a Brigitine of Syon,
born about 1492, educated at Christ's and Corpus
Christi colleges, Cambridge, Fellow of Corpus Christi,
1510, B.D. 1513, subrector (B.D.). He became a
Brigitine in 1513, and was considered one of the fore-
most scholars of his day. All four were indicted 28
April, 1535, under 26 Henry VIII, c. 1, for refusing
the oath of supremacy. The jury at first refused to
find them guilty, but were intimidated by Cromwell into
doing so the next day. All were hanged in their
habits without being previously degraded, and all
were disembowelled while fully conscious, Houghton
being the first to suffer and Reynolds the last.

With them died a secular priest, Blessed John Hale,
LL.B., Fellow of King's Hall, Cambridge, and Vicar of
Iseworth, Middlesex, since 12 August, 1531. He
took this living in exchange for the Rectory of Cranford,
Middlesex, which he had held since 11 September,
1505. There is nothing to identify him with the Re-
tor of Chelsford of 1492. He may possibly be the
person of this name who became scholar of Eton in
1488. He was indicted 20 April, 1535, with the per-
petual curate of Teddington, Middlesex, named Rob-
ert Feron, for offences against 25 Henry VIII, c. 22.
Both pleaded guilty and were condemned; but Feron
was pardoned. Hale was the fourth to suffer.

Camis, Lives of the English Martyrs (London, 1904), 1,1-35;
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JOHN B. WAINWRIGHT.

John Hunyady. See Hunyady, Janos.

John Joseph of the Cross, Saint, b. on the Island of Ischia, Southern Italy, 1654; d. 5 March, 1739. From his earliest years he was given to prayer and virtue. So great was his love of poverty that he used constantly to wear the dress of the poor, though of noble birth. At the age of sixteen years he entered the Order of St. Francis at Naples, amongst the Friars of the Alcantarine Reform, being the first Italian to join this reform, which had been instituted in Spain by St. Peter of Alcantara. Throughout all his life he was given to the greatest austerity: he fasted constantly, never drank wine, and slept but three hours each night. In 1674 he sent to found a friary at Afla, in Piedmont; and he assisted with his own hands in the building. Much against his will, he was raised to the priesthood. As superior, he always insisted upon performing the most humble offices in the community. In 1708 he was appointed Provincial of the Alcantarine Reform in Italy. He was adored in a high degree with the gift of miracles, people of every condition being brought to him in sickness. His zeal for souls was such that even in sickness he would not spare any labour for them. His great devotion was to Our Blessed Lady, and he was urgent with his penitents that they also should cultivate this. He was beatified in 1789, and canonized in 1839.

Compendium Vite... B. Joannis Josephi a Cruce (Rome, 1839); Vita di S. Giovanni Giuseppe della Croce, dal P. Diodato dell'Assesta (Rome, 1839); Manning, Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Order of St. Francis (London, 1886).

FATHER CUMBERT.

John Justus of Landsberg. See Lansfegius.

John Lever, Blessed, English martyr; d. at Tyburn, 7 March, 1543-4. He was rector of St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate, London, from 30 January, 1541-4, till his resignation in 1542; rector of Woodford, Essex 18 January, 1526-7, till his resignation in the following April; and rector of Chelsea on (the presentation of Bl. Thomas More, then lord chancellor, and the appointment of another priest being refused, he received the living) from 29 March, 1530, till his attaintee. Cressere More styles him doctor, but it is not known in what faculty he obtained this degree. He was indicted 15 February, 1543-4, with another priest and two laymen. The priest was Ven. John Ireland, of whom nothing is known, save that, having been chaplain of the Roper chantry annexed to St. Dunstan's, Canterbury, for a year (1533-4), became vicar of Etham, Kent, and, as such, parish priest to Bl. Thomas More's son-in-law, William Roper of Rotherham Hall. Of the laymen the more prominent is Bl. Gervase Garwood, a kinsman (probably a cousin or nephew) to Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, whose secretary he was. Educated at Cambridge, probably at Trinity Hall, he wrote against John Frith in 1534, and gave evidence against Cranmer in 1543. He resided at Southwark. The other layman was John Heywood, or Hayward, of London. All were condemned, but Heywood recanted on the hurdle, and made his recantation public at Paul's Cross on 6 July following. The other three suffered together, in the company of Robert Singleton, a priest, the cause of whose execution is uncertain, and their heads and quarters were buried under the gallows.


John B. WAINWRIGHT.

John Malalas, a Monophysite Byzantine chronicler of the sixth century, born at Antioch where he spent most if not the whole of his life. His surname Malalas, from the Syriac malātā, "the rhetor," points to a Syriac origin. John Malalas was a contemporary of Emperor Anastasius I, Justinian I, and Justin II. His "Chronographia," for which he is famous, was originally but a chronicle of the city of Antioch, expanded later by the author himself into a general history of the world up to the last years of Justinian (d. 565). It is divided into eighteen books, and the last of which, however, originally a chronicle of Constantinople, cannot be ascribed to John Malalas, but being evidently the work of an orthodox writer. Giving up the Hellenic and Byzantine traditions John Malalas struck a new path in historiography, and created the type of the Byzantine chronicle. He wrote not for the cultured public but for the bulk of the laymen and monks, seeking the narrative truth in matters of history and narrating such facts only and in such manner as could interest the people. The "Chronographia" is uncritical and teems with legends, anachronisms, repetitions, and inconsistencies, and its style and language are in keeping with the nature of the concept of history it exhibits. But it is an important monument of low Greek. In spite of the many authors he so ostentatiously names, it is highly probable that, beyond the archives of the city of Antioch and the current ecclesiastical and civil calendars, John Malalas had but very few reliable written sources. If he used at all Julius Africanus, it must have been through the now lost chronicles of Nestorian, Basilian, and theophilius, and Timotheus who he frequently cites. John Malalas enjoyed great authority with subsequent generations of Byzantine chroniclers who quote him quite freely and often worked whole books of his "Chronographia" into their own compositions. Such is the case with John of Ephesus and through him Bar-Heleme (two Syrian writers), the church historian Evagrius, the author of the "Tuscanian Fragments," John of Antioch, and especially the author of the "Chronicon Paschale," Daniel of Nikitin, the author of "Paschale," theophanes, George the Monk, Cedrenus, the author of the "Excerpta Constantiniana," and the authors of several similar compilations. John Malalas's work had the honour of a Slavonic translation (now lost) from which it passed into several Slavonic chronicles; it was also translated into Georgian, from some various sources that it was reconstructed; for, strange to say for such a popular work, independently of the above-named writings it has been preserved only in a single manuscript (Baroccius, 128, c. 12, Oxford, Bodleian Library; mutilated at both ends) and that in the shape of an epitome. The "Chronographia" was first edited by Edin Chilmes (Oxford, 1691), with a Latin translation and a commentary by the editor, a treatise of H. Hody, and a letter from R. Bentley, to J. Mill. A new critical and complete up-to-date edition is highly desirable.

Knobmacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur (2nd ed., Munich, 1877), pp. 332-331, where an exhaustive literature of the subject will be found. DEFOE, Nouvelle Biographie Générale, vol. XXXII, col. 1007.

H. HYVERNAULT.

John Moschus. See Moschus, Joannes.

John Nelson, Blessed, English Jesuit marty; b. at Skelton, four miles from York, in 1534; d. at Tyburn, 3 February, 1587. He was of the Society of Jesus in 1573, and of his four brothers followed his example and became priests. He was ordained priest at Binche, in Hainault, by Mgr Louis de Berlaymont,
Archbishop of Cambray, 11 June, 1578. He was sent
on the mission on 7 November following, and appears
to have laboured in London. His apprehension took
place 1 December, 1577, "late in the evening as he
was saying the Nocturne of the Matins for the next day
following", and he was committed to Newgate as a
suspected Papist. His arrest and its issue had been
foretold by a demon he had exercised a week before.
This suggests that he may have been not merely "in
examination induced him to say that the queen was
a schismatic. This constituted high treason under
the legislation of 1571. He was providentially en-
abled to say Mass in Newgate, 30 January, 1577-8,
and two days later he was brought to the bar and
charged with "concealing the Tower, furnishing the
most filthy underground dungeon", doubtless the
Pit of the Tower, preparing by prayer and fasting
for his end. He was cut down alive, and his last
words, when the hangman plucked out his heart,
are reported to have been: "I forgive the queen
and all the authors of my death." The date and place
of his admission to the Society of Jesus are unknown.

CAML. Lives of the English Martyrs, II (London, 1904-5),
223; ALLEN, A Brief History (Penguin's edition, London,
1909). "Political Dictionary of the English Catholics,
V (London and New York, 1885-1902), 160.

John B. WAINEWRIGHT.

John Nepomucene, SAINT, b. at Nepomuk about
1340; d. 20 March, 1393. The controversy concerning
the identity of John of Pomuk or Nepomuk (a small
town in the district of Pilzen, Bohemia), started in
the eighteenth century, is not yet decided. The principal
question at issue is whether there was only one John
of Nepomuk, or whether two persons of that name lived
at Prague in the second half of the fourteenth century
and met with precisely the same fate. This inquiry
leads naturally to the further question, as to the
true cause of John’s violent death. In a controversy
of this character it is of primary importance to set
down clearly the information given in the original
sources. Extant documents, ecclesiastical records,
and contemporaneous accounts of the second half
of the fourteenth century relate in unmistakable fashion
that in 1393 a certain John of Nepomuk was Vicar-
General of the Archdiocese of Prague, and that on 20
March, in the same year, by command of King Wen-
celaus IV of Bohemia he was thrown into the Moldau
and drowned. This John was the son of Welfin (or
Wolfin), a burger of Pomuk (Nepomuk), and studied
theology and jurisprudence at the University of
Prague. In 1373 he took orders and became public
minister; he was said that "out of his own abundance
he made prothonotary and first secretary of Archbishop
John of Jenzenstein (Jenzenstein). In 1380 he
received the parish of St. Gallus in Prague, and, continuing
meanwhile his studies of jurisprudence at the univer-
sity, was promoted in 1387 to the doctorate of canon
law. He was also a canon of the church of St. Em-
dius in Prague, and became in 1389 canon of the cath-
dral in Wyscheraud. In 1390 he gave up the parish of
St. Gallus to become Archdeacon of Saaz, and at the
same time canon of the Cathedral of St. Vitus, without
receiving however any cathedral benefice. Shortly
afterwards the archbishop named him president of the
ecclesiastical court, and in 1393 his vicar-general.
King Wenceslaus IV of Bohemia, wishing to found a
new bishopric for one of his favourites, ordered that at
the death of Abbot Racek of Kladrau no new abbot
should be elected, and that the abbey church should
be turned into a cathedral. The archbishop's vicar-gen-
eral, therefore, promptly confirmed this election
without reference to the wishes of the king. Upon
hearing this Wenceslaus fell into a violent rage, and
had the vicar-general, the cathedral official, Provoz
Wenceslaus of Meissen, the archbishop’s steward, and
after the death of the cathedral thrown into prison.
The first four were even tortured on 4 March, but,
although the others were thus brought to acquiesce in
the wishes of the king and the official even proposed
everlasting secrecy concerning all that had occurred,
John of Nepomuk resisted to the last. He was made
undergo all pains by the king and the archbishop, in
cluding the cutting of his sides with torches, but even this could not
move him. Finally, the king ordered him to be put in
chains, to be led through the city with a block of wood
in his mouth, and to be thrown from the Karlsbrücke
into the river Moldau. This cruel order was executed
on 20 March, 1393.

We possess four contemporaneous accounts con-
cerning these proceedings. First of all, the extant
bill of indictment against the king, presented to Bene-
dict IX by Archbishop John of Jenzenstein, who went
to Rome with the new Abbots of Kladrau on 23 April,
1393 ("Pildischka, Gescli., IV, app.; ed. Peisel, "Ge-
schichte König Wenzels. I": "Urkundenbuch. 143-
63"). Some years later Abbot Ludolf of Sagan gives
an account of it in a somewhat abbreviated form in
the catalogue of the Abbots of Sagan completed in 1398
(ed. Stenzel in "Script. rerum Silesiacarum", I, 1835,
p. 213 sq.), as well as in the treatise "De longevo
martyriose" (ib. VII, c. xiv), and in the "Geschichte,
LX, 1880, pp. 418 sq.). A fourth reference is to be
found in the "Chronik des Deutschedorfa", a
chronicle of the Teutonic Knights which was compiled
by John of Postige who died in 1405 ("Scriptores rerum
Prussiacarum", I, III, Leipzig, 1861-7). For the
discussion of the question it is important to remark
that Archbishop John of Jenzenstein in his above-
mentioned indictment (art. 26) calls John of Nepomuk
"martyr sanctus", and that, in the biography of John
of Jenzenstein by his chaplain, John of Nepomuk is
described as "gloriosum Christi martyrem miraculis-
rum corsum". It is thus clear that his contempor-
aries had already begun to honour as a martyr and a
saint the vicar-general put to death by the cruel and
licentious tyrant for his defence of the law of the
Church. The body of John of Nepomuk was drawn
out of the Moldau and entombed in the cathedral of
Prague, where in 1839 it is proved by later documents,
his grave was honoured.

In his "Chronicra regum Romanorum", finished in
1459, Thomas Ebendorfer (d. 1464) relates that King
Wenceslaus had Magister John, the father confessors
of his wife, drowned in the Moldau, not only because he
had refused to accept the new appointee to the name
of king", but also because he had refused to violate
the seal of the confessional. The refusal to
violate the seal of the confessional is here for the first
time given as the reason for John’s violent death.
The chronicler, who speaks of only the one John
drowned by order of Wenceslaus, evidently re-
fers to the John of Pomuk put to death in 1393. In
the other chronicles written in the second half of the
fifteenth century, we find the reason regularly assigned
for the execution of John, that he had refused to tell
the king what the queen had confessed to him.

Paul Ziek’s "Instructions for the King" (sc.
George of Podiebrad), completed in 1471, contains
still more details (cf. Schmude in "Zeitschrift für
ekath. Theologie", 1883, 90 sq.). He says that
King Wenceslaus suspected his wife, who was accus-
tomed to confess to Magister John, and called upon
the latter to declare the name of her paramour. On
John’s refusal to say anything about the king’s love-
affair, he was to be drowned. In this old account we do not find
the name of the queen or any date assigned to this oc-
currence; a little later the year 1383 is given, when Wen-
celaus’s first wife, Johanna (d. 1389), still lived.

In his "Annales Bohemiurn" ("Kronika česká")
first printed in Bohemian, Prague, 1541; translated
John of Antioch.—There are four persons commonly known by this name.

I. John, Patriarch of Antioch (428-41) at the time of the Council of Ephesus. He was a friend and had been a fellow-student of Nestorius. When the trouble about the word "consubstantial" began, he wrote and warned Nestorians not to make a disturbance, showing that this title of the Blessed Virgin had been constantly used by orthodox Fathers. Later, Nestorius wrote to him, enclosing Cyril of Alexandria's twelve anathemas and some of his own sermons, and defending himself. John then decided for his friend against his natural rival, "the Egyptian". He was summoned to Ephesus by the emperor in November, 430, with all the other bishops. But when the council was opened in June, 431, he had not come. The Fathers waited for him some time; then two of his metropolitans (those of Apamea and Hierapolis) declared in his name that the council was to begin without him. It was thought that he did not wish to be present, because of his friendship for his friend, so the first session was held in his absence. Six days later John arrived with a great number of his bishops, refused all invitations to take part in the council, and opened at his own lodging a rival synod, which defended Nestorius and condemned Cyril. This rival synod, assembled (in which John's candidate, Candidian, took part) caused the great trouble at Ephesus (see EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF). From this time John took the side of Nestorius, declared his deposition unjust, refused to acknowledge the new Bishop of Constantinople, Maximian, and was in schism with Alexandria and Rome. But he was put to death by Wenceslaus in 1393 for the reason given above, the controversy has never ceased.

We still find defenders of the opinion advanced by Hajek, that there are two Johns of Pomuk. Most modern historians, however, are probably correct in regarding the vice-general murdered in 1393 as the only historical personage. A few of these, however, do not look upon the confirmation of the election of the Abbot of Klára as the true reason for John's murder; they hold that Wenceslaus IV was already exasperated against John, because he would not violate the queen's conscience for opportunity for revenge. These details can in no way affect the validity of the canonization of the vice-general, who had been recognized as a martyr immediately after his death. Consequently, when Protestant historians, as Abel, assert that the veneration of St. John Nepomucene was first introduced by the Jesuits to banish the cult of John Hus from Bohemia, their contention is both unhistorical and without justification: the veneration of John of Nepomuk was widespread long before the Jesuits ever existed. St. John Nepomucene is patron saint of Bohemia. When in 1719 his grave in the Prague cathedral was opened, his skull could not be uncurtained through shrivelled. His feast is celebrated on 16 May.

J. P. Kirsch.

John of Antioch. — There are four persons commonly known by this name.

I. John, Patriarch of Antioch (428-41) at the time of the Council of Ephesus. He was a friend and had been a fellow-student of Nestorius. When the trouble about the word "consubstantial" began, he wrote and warned Nestorians not to make a disturbance, showing that this title of the Blessed Virgin had been constantly used by orthodox Fathers. Later, Nestorius wrote to him, enclosing Cyril of Alexandria's twelve anathemas and some of his own sermons, and defending himself. John then decided for his friend against his natural rival, "the Egyptian". He was summoned to Ephesus by the emperor in November, 430, with all the other bishops. But when the council was opened in June, 431, he had not come. The Fathers waited for him some time; then two of his metropolitans (those of Apamea and Hierapolis) declared in his name that the council was to begin without him. It was thought that he did not wish to be present, because of his friendship for his friend, so the first session was held in his absence. Six days later John arrived with a great number of his bishops, refused all invitations to take part in the council, and opened at his own lodging a rival synod, which defended Nestorius and condemned Cyril. This rival synod, assembled (in which John's candidate, Candidian, took part) caused the great trouble at Ephesus (see EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF). From this time John took the side of Nestorius, declared his deposition unjust, refused to acknowledge the new Bishop of Constantinople, Maximian, and was in schism with Alexandria and Rome. But he was put to death by Wenceslaus in 1393 for the reason given above, the controversy has never ceased.

We still find defenders of the opinion advanced by Hajek, that there are two Johns of Pomuk. Most modern historians, however, are probably correct in regarding the vice-general murdered in 1393 as the only historical personage. A few of these, however, do not look upon the confirmation of the election of the Abbot of Klára as the true reason for John's murder; they hold that Wenceslaus IV was already exasperated against John, because he would not violate the queen's conscience for opportunity for revenge. These details can in no way affect the validity of the canonization of the vice-general, who had been recognized as a martyr immediately after his death. Consequently, when Protestant historians, as Abel, assert that the veneration of St. John Nepomucene was first introduced by the Jesuits to banish the cult of John Hus from Bohemia, their contention is both unhistorical and without justification: the veneration of John of Nepomuk was widespread long before the Jesuits ever existed. St. John Nepomucene is patron saint of Bohemia. When in 1719 his grave in the Prague cathedral was opened, his skull could not be uncurtained through shrivelled. His feast is celebrated on 16 May.

Acta SS., III, 668 sqq.; Berghauser, Protopatria pomucena (2 vols., Graz and Augsburg, 1736-61); Athanasius A Regia Antiochenensis (chronologiecris der Patriarchen der Kirche von Pomuk (Prague, 1777); Dorner, Vindiciae episcopi confesstoris divini Joannis Nepomuceni; protopatria pomucena asserita (Prague and Vienna, 1734); Punctura, Chronologische Gesch. Böhmens, VII (Prague, 1788); Iadem, Unum on duo ecclesiae metropolitane Prophones canonici Joannis de Pomuk nomine in AThanasius, Patriarcha sui fidei (Prague, 1791); Zomper, Verboeit einer Lebensgesch. des hl. Johannes von Nepomuk (Prague, 1839); Fried, Der geschicht. hl. Johannes von Nepomuk (Prague, 1890); Abert, Die Legende vom hl. Johannes von Nepomuk (Prague, 1853); Scholz, Die Lebens- und der öffentlichen Verherrlichung des ersten Martyrers des Reichsmale (Innsbruck, 1883); Iadem, Studien über den hl. Johannes von Nepomuk in die Reiche, fürboth. Theol. Jh., 52-122; Amshield, Historisch-chronolog. Untersuchungen über das Zweihundert des hl. Johannes von Nepomuk (Würzburg, 1864).
Phokas (610), using for this purpose Sextus Julius Africanus, Eusebius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and other standard authorities. It is one of the many scholars who in the eleventh and twelfth centuries lived to spend the next three years in the practice of most austere piety. His wonderful sanctity impressed a Franciscan journeying through Almodóvar, and at the friar’s advice he took up the study of philosophy and divinity at Alcalá, where he was fortunate to have as his teacher the famous Bishop of Seville, Domingo de Deza. His parents died while he was a student and after his ordination he celebrated his first Mass in the church where they were buried, sold the family property and gave the proceeds to the poor. He saw in the severing of natural ties a vocation to foreign missionary work and made preparation to go to Mexico in America. He arrived there, at Seville in 1527, a favourable opportunity to start for his new field of labour, his extraordinary devotion in celebrating Mass attracted the attention of Hernando de Contercas, a priest of Seville, who reported his observations to the archbishop and general inquisitor, Don Alphonso Manrique. The archbishop saw in the young missionary a powerful instrument to stir up the faith of Andalusia, and after considerable persuasion Blessed John was induced to abandon his journey to America. His first sermon was preached on 22 July, 1529, and immediately his reputation was established; crowds thronged to hear his sermons. His success, however, brought with it the hatred of a certain class, and while living at Seville he was brought before the inquisitor and charged with exaggerating the dangers of wealth and closing the gates of heaven to the rich. His innocence of the charges was speedily proved, and by special invitation from the court he was appointed to preach the sermon at the next great feast in the church of San Salvador, in Seville. His appearance was a cause of public rejoicing. He began his career as apostolic preacher of Andalusia at the age of thirty. After nine years in that province he returned to Seville only to depart for the wider fields of Cordova, Granada, Bolza, Montilla, and Zafra. For eighteen years before his death he was the victim of constant illness, the result of the hardships of his apostolate of forty years. He was declared Venerable by Clement XIII, Feb., 1799, and beatified by Leo XIII, 12 Nov., 1893.

Among the disciples drawn to him by his preaching and saintly reputation may be named St. Teresa, St. John of God, St. Francis Borgia, and Ven. Louis of Granada. The spread of the Jesuits in Spain is attributed to his friendship for that body. Blessed John of Avila’s works were collected in thirteen volumes between 1575, 1792, 1805; a French translation by d’Andilly was published at Paris in 1673; and a German translation by Schermer in six volumes was issued at Ratibson between 1856 and 1881. His best known works are the “Audi Fili” (English translation, 1620), one of the best tracts on Christian perfection, and his “Spiritual Letters” (English translation, 1831, London, 1904) to his disciples.

John of Beverly, Saint, Bishop of Hexham and afterwards of York; b. at Harpham, in the East Riding of Yorkshire; d. at Beverley, 7 May, 721. In early life he was under the care of Archbishop Theodore, at Canterbury, who supervised his education, and is reputed to have given him the name John. He became a member of the Benedictine Order, and for a time was an attendant of St. Britta’s monastery at Streaneshalch (Whitby). Afterwards
he won renown as a preacher, displayed marked erudition in expounding Scripture, and taught history amongst other subjects. On 25 August, 687, he was consecrated Bishop of Hexham, a district with which he was not unfamiliar, as he had for a period led a life of retreat, to the south (Hermesbou), on the opposite bank of the Tyne. Here, too, he was afterwards wont to resort for seclusion, especially during Lent, when the cares of his episcopal ministration permitted of his doing. John was present at the synod on the Nidd in 705, convened by Oserd, King of the West Saxons, on Wilfrid's call. On the same year (705), on the death of Boe, John was translated to York after eighteen years of labour in the See of Hexham, where he was succeeded by Wilfrid. Of his new activity little is known beyond that he was diligent in visitation, considerate towards the poor, and exceedingly attentive to the training of students whom he maintained under his personal charge. His little company of pupils is said to have included: Bede, whom he ordained; Berthune, afterwards Abbet of Beverley; Herebal, Abbet of Tyne-mouth; and Wilfrid "the Younger", John's successor in York. Having purchased a place called Inderwood, to which a later age has given the name of Beverley, John established a monastery and also handsomely endowed the place, which became even in its founder's day an important ecclesiastical centre. To this monastery of Beverley, after resigning the See of York in 687, John retired and spent the remainder of his life with Abbet Berthune, a one time favourite scholar. In 697 he was canoniied by Benedict IX, his bones were translated by Eadric, Archbishop of York, and placed in a costly shrine. A second translation took place in 1197. The remains were discovered in 1864 and again brought to light in 1796. (See AVEYLET MINSTER.)


P. J. MACAULEY.

JOHN OF BICLARE (JOHNNES BICLARIENSIS), chronicler, b. in Portugal, probably about the middle of the sixth century; d. after 621. He was educated at Constantinople, where he devoted at least seven years to the study of Latin and Greek. When he returned an attempt was made to force him to join the State Church, then Arian in character. As he staunchly resisted, he was banished by King Leovigild to Barcelona. After Leovigild's death in 586, John founded the Benedictine monastery of Biclaro, the site of which has not yet been exactly determined, and presided over it as abbot for several years, until he was appointed Bishop of Gerona (the bishop known as "Johannes Gerourensis" seems to have been an early successor of the chronicler). John took part in the synod of Saragossa (592), of Barcelona (599), and of Gara (614). His chronicicle reaches to the year 590, and is a continuation (from 567) of the chronicle of Victor of Tournus, in Africa (Chronicon continuans Victorum Tournunesem). It was edited by H. Canlius (Ingolstadt, 1600), by Scaliger in "Thesaurus Temporum" (Leyden, 1606), and in Migne, P.L., LXXII (1849). The best edition, with copious prolegomena, is by Mommsen in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auct. ant.", XI (1893), 211-220. This chronicle is the most complete authority on the stormy period of Leovigild's reign, and on the Visigothic conquests from Germanizing Arianism to Romanizing Catholicism. The narrative is rigorously impartial, despite the preceding bitter religious conflicts during which the writer himself had to suffer.

GEBRÜDER, JOHANNES VON BICLARO IN THEOL. STUDIEN UND KUNSTEN, LXVIII (1898), 103-133; WATTENBACH, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen, I (Leipzig, 1883), 83.

PATRICK SCHLAGER.

JOHN OF CORNWALL (JOHANNES CORNUBIENSIUS, JOHANNES DE SACRO GERMANO) lived about 1176. He was the author of a treatise written against the doctrine of Abelard, "Eulogium ad Alexandrum Papam III, quo Christus sit aliquis hostis", whether anything is known of his life except the few facts to which he alludes by chance in this work. Though he is claimed by some French writers as a Bas-Breton, it appears certain from the varied forms of his name that he was a native of St. Germain's in Cornwall. He was a student under Peter Lombard and Robert of St. Victor at Paris, and subsequently became a teacher himself. From Peter Lombard he seems to have derived the view that which scholar held for a time, that Christ's humanity was but the vesture or garment wherewith the Logos was clothed; but he abandoned this doctrine, which was condemned at the Council of Tours held by Alexander III in 1163, and advocated the orthodox teaching. In support of this he wrote the "Eulogium", though not for many years after the council, since a reference in the preface to William, formerly Archbishop of Sens, as being then Archbishop of Reims, shows that it could not have been written before 1176, in which year the translation took place. It was first published by Martene in the "Thesaurus novus anecdotum" (Paris, 1717), and is reprinted in Migne, P. L., CXXVII. There is at Magdalene College, Oxford, a "Commentarius in Aristotelis libri duo analytico-rum posteriores", which may be his, and the Latin hexameters "Merlini prophetiae cum expositione", written at the request of Bishop Warelaw of Exeter, have been ascribed to him by reason of the reference to Cornwall it contains. Nothing is known of his death, nor can he be identified with the John of Cornwall who was archdeacon of Worrington.


EDWIN BURTON.

JOHN OF EPHESUS, also known as JOHN OF ARA, the earliest, and a very famous, Syrian historian. He was born at Amida (Diarbekir, on the upper Tigris), about 557; d. about 555. In 329 he was ordained deacon in St. John's monastery in the Syrian city, but on account of his monophysite doctrine was soon obliged to take refuge in Palestine, where we find him in 534; thence he came to Constantinople, driven from Palestine by the great pestilence of 534-7. In the capital he found a friend in Jacob Baradæus, the organizer of the Jacobite Church; a protector in Justinian; and a life-long collaborator in a new Deuterius. The emperor placed him at the head of the Monophysite community of Constantinople, and soon entrusted him with the mission of converting the heathens of Asia proper and the neighbouring provinces. Eventually John was consecrated (by Jacob Baradæus), Bishops of the Monophysite territory, but his official residence, it seems, was always Constantinople. In 546 he helped Justinian to search out and quash the secret practice of idolatry in the capital and its surround-
ings. Hence his beloved titles of "Teacher of the Heathens", and "Idol-breaker". Soon after Justinian's death (565), John's fortunes began to decline. When the persecution broke out in 571 he was one of the few who went into exile, and for many years suffered in prison, banishment, and all sorts of vexations at the hands of the orthodox patriarchs. He was resigned, in favour of Deuterius, his position as head of the community he had converted from heathenism, and consecrated Deuterius Bishop of Carta. When he returned, John must have been shortly after 585, for his history comes to an end with that year, and he was then about eighty years of age.

His principal work was an "Ecclesiastical History", from Julius Caesar to A.D. 585. It was divided into three parts of six books each. The first part has entirely perished; of the second part we have copious excerpts in two manuscripts in the British Museum, and possibly the whole of it in the third part of the "Chronicle" of Denys of Tell-Mahre. These excerpts have been edited by Land (Anecdota Syriaca; Leyden, 1668, II, 289-359, 355-390), and translated into Latin as an appendix to his "Church History" (Joannis Episcopi Epheсин Syri Monophysitici Commentarii de Beatitude Orientalibus et Historie Ecclesiastica Fragmenta, Amsterdam, 1889). The third part, which opens with the beginning of the persecution under Justin II (571), has come down to us, translated into Latin, as a technical, claiming to be an edition of it by Cureton (The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus, Oxford, 1833), also two translations, one English by Payne Smith (1860), and another in German by Schöpfelder (1862). John of Ephesus is also the author of the "De Estimativis of the Eastern Saints", written at different times and gathered into a "corpus" about 599. They were published by Land (op. et loc. cit., pp. 2-288), and done into Latin by von Douwen and Land (ibid.). Both works are of the greatest importance for the history of the writer's time. He evidently strove to be impartial, for which he is very much to be commended, considering the part he played in the events he related; he is also accurate and full of details. The troubled times in which he wrote the third part of the "History" and his unsettled condition during that period of his life easily explain the disorder and repetition found in the last years. They account also for the style, which is rude, entangled, and abounds with Greek words and phrases; besides, we must not overlook the fact that the writer spent most of his life outside the zone of spoken Syriac.


H. HYVERNAT.

John of Falkenberg, author, b. at Falkenberg, Pomerania, Prussia, date unknown; d. about 1418 in Italy.—of, according to other accounts, in his native town. Life little is known of him, except that he entered the Order of St. Dominic and spent a novice in the convent at Kammin, a town of the above-named province. The fact that he was a master in Sacred Theology indicates that for a number of years he taught philosophy and theology in his order. His principal work was to write the second part of the books of music and the first part of the books of canon law, which he took in the great papal schism which wrought such confusion in the Church during the first part of the fifteenth century, but chiefly to his involving himself in the long-standing troubles between the Teutonic Order of Knights of Livonia and the King of Poland. In opposition to the general order of his superior, Bernard de Datis, and to many of the brethren of his own province who were firm in their faith and determination, he took part in the rebellion of 1404, and at the meeting with Alexander V and John XXIII, he was a strong and ardent adherent of Gregory XIII, the legitimate pope; and, being of a quick and passionate temperament, he carried his opposition so far as to refuse publicly in the Council of Constance to acknowledge Bernard as his superior. In the end, he was excommunicated, and must have been shortly after 585, for his history comes to an end with that year, and he was then about eighty years of age.

John of Fécamp (also known as Jeanville on account of his diminutive stature), ascetic writer, b. near Ravenna about the beginning of the eleventh century; d. at Fécamp, Normandy, 22 February, 1079. He studied at Dijon under his compatriot William, Abbot of St. Benignus, whom he had accompanied to France. Under this skilled master he acquired an extensive knowledge of all the sciences, making a special study of medicine, of which he is reckoned by Bernier among the cleverest exponents trained in the monastic schools of the Middle Ages. When William was commissioned to reform the Abbey of Fécamp and to establish there a colony of Benedictine monks, John again accompanied him, and having founded the monastery, he remained there until his death in 1088.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

John of Fécamp (also known as Jeanville on account of his diminutive stature), ascetic writer, b. near Ravenna about the beginning of the eleventh century; d. at Fécamp, Normandy, 22 February, 1079. He studied at Dijon under his compatriot William, Abbot of St. Benignus, whom he had accompanied to France. Under this skilled master he acquired an extensive knowledge of all the sciences, making a special study of medicine, of which he is reckoned by Bernier among the cleverest exponents trained in the monastic schools of the Middle Ages. When William was commissioned to reform the Abbey of Fécamp and to establish there a colony of Benedictine monks, John again accompanied him, and having founded the monastery, he remained there until his death in 1088. In this year, worn out by his labours in the service of the Church, and seeking a more tranquil refuge for his old age, William appointed John his successor as abbot and retired to Italy. Taking his master for his model, John succeeded in winning an almost equally high reputation. If his authority was occasionally exercised with an approach to despotism, he succeeded at least in defending the privileges of his house against every
attack. In 1052, on the elevation of Hielard to the archiepiscopal See of Lyons, John was invited to succeed him as Abbott of Dijon. At first he retained also the abbotry of Fécamp, but, finding himself unable to carry the double burden, he resigned the office in 1056. Towards the close of his life he undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, desiring to see before his death the sanctified places towards which his thoughts had so often turned during his meditations. Seized and thrown into prison by the Turks, it was only in 1076 that he could return to France. He then retired to Fécamp.

As Abbot of St. Benignus John had been brought into close relations with Emperor Henry III—after 1038 also King of Burgundy—and with his spouse, Agnes of Poitiers. After Henry's death his widow placed herself entirely under the spiritual guidance of the abbot, and for her John composed a series of ascetical works. These were entitled the "Liber precum variarum", "De divina contemplatione Christi amore", "De superna Hierusalem", "De institutione vidae", "De vita et moribus virginum", "De fidei etiam moralibus dispensatione" (P. L. CXIII, 147 sqq., 445 sqq.). A good indication of John's value as a writer is afforded by the fact that the "De divina contemplatione" was for a long time regarded as a work of St. Augustine, although it is now certain that it was composed either wholly or partly by John. One of the earliest dependency accounts in the life of the cloisters are also collected in P. L., loc. cit., 153 sq.

"Hist. lit. de la France, VIII, 48 sqq.; Gallia Christ., XI, 206; Szczesny in Kempe, s. v. Johannes von Fécamp; Nouvelle biographie générale, XXVI, 831 sqq.

Thomas Kennedy.

John of Fermo, Blessed, more often called John of La Verne, from his long sojourn at that holy mountain, b. at Fermo in the Marches, 1259; d. at La Verne in Tuscany, 10 August, 1322. After a youth of precocious piety, he was received at the age of ten among the Canons of St. Peter's at Fermo. Three years later, desiring of leading a more austere life, he entered the Order of Friars Minor, and under the direction of the celebrated brother, James of Fallerone, soon made rapid progress in perfection. Shortly after his profession, John was sent by the minister general to Mount La Verna, where St. Francis had received the stigmata, and there he spent many years in solitude, penance, and contemplation, being favoured with ecstatic manifestations. His later years, however, were devoted to the Apostolic ministry, and he preached at Florence, Pisa, Siena, Arezzo, Perugia, and many other towns of northern and central Italy, working wonders everywhere. His contemporaries relate much of Blessed John: they tell us that he enjoyed the gift of infused science, and that prelates and princes alike were astounded at his learning. He was linked in bonds of the warmest friendship with Jacopone of Todi, and administered the last sacraments to the dying poet in 1306. John is said to have composed the preface which is said in the Mass of St. Francis. Feeling a lack of approach of death at Cortona while on his way to Assisi, John returned to La Verna and died there at the age of sixty-three. He was buried on the holy mountain, where many miracles were wrought through his intercession, and where his cell is still shown. The inmemorial cultus of Blessed John was approved XI of 1680, and his feast is kept in the Order of Friars Minor on 9 August. Acta SS., August, II, 438 sqq.; gives a contemporary life of Blessed John by an anonymous biographer with a Comment. Proc. of the Hollandish Synod. Other early lives found in the Chron. XXIV Generalium in Annot. Francisc., III (1897), 429 sqq.; Arrivoli, La vita di Fra Pisa, Labor de Confraternitate in Annot. Francisc., I (1900), 265 sqq.; See also Bibl. Holy. Lat., I, 650; Sabattier in Collection d'Études etc., II (1900), 59 sqq.; IV (1902) 50 sqq.; Florio, Le Monaci, 87 sqq.; Lenormant, Catalogue Sacrat. Prat. Minor. (1883), 15; Clary, Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis, II (1880), 533 sqq.; Mencken, Guida Illustrata delle Vene (2nd ed. Quaracchi, 1907), passim.

Pascal Robinson.

John of Gand. See John of Janduno.

John of Genoa (often called Baldis, or de Baldis), grammarian; b. at Genoa, date unknown; d. there about 1298. Of his early years nothing is known. He distributed his wealth among the poor of the city, and entered the Order of St. Dominic, apparently at a somewhat advanced age. His noted work, the "Summa Grammaticalis", more commonly known as the "Catholicum", has made his name widely celebrated. The work consists of treatises on orthography, etymology, grammar, prosody, rhetoric, and an etymological dictionary of the Latin language (prima, medii et infima Latinata). The great number of MSS. in which the "Catholicum" still exists, and the numerous editions through which it passed during the first seventy-five years after the invention of printing, attest the wide acceptance accorded it and the popularity it long enjoyed. For more than a century it was highly esteemed as a textbook. It has been the subject at once of excessive criticism and excessive praise. Erasmus, the most conspicuous of its critics, speaks of it in caustic terms in his "De Ratione Studiorum" and "Colloquia". Leander Alberti ("Viri Illustres Ord. Pred.") and "Discrizzioni di tutta Italia") defends it against the aspersions of the humanists. If we bear in mind the materials the author had at his disposal, the purposes of the work, and the needs of the time, it must be considered that the "Catholicum" possessed considerable merit. That it met the demands of the age is attested by its popularity. The author by his own assertion refuted those who would have made him an adept in Greek. Besides the "Catholicum", he wrote Liber Theologici qui vocatur Dialeclicus et de Questionibus Artificum et liberalium," and "Quodsum opus ad inveniendum festa mobilia. A "Postilla super Joanne" and a "Tractatus de Omnino Potentia Dei" are also attributed to John of Genoa.

Quoett-Écald, SS. Ord. Pred. I (Paris, 1719), 462; Notice bibliographique, s. v.

Victor F. O'DanTe.

John of God, Saint, b. at Montemor o Novo, Portugal, 8 March, 1495, of devout Christian parents; d. at Granada, 8 March, 1550. The wonders attending the saint's birth heralded the vast interests, but dominated throughout by implicit fidelity to the grace of God. A Spanish priest whom he followed to Oropesa, Spain, in his ninth year left him in charge of the chief shepherd of the place, to whom he gradually endeared himself through his punctuality and fidelity to duty, as well as his earnest piety. When he had reached manhood, to escape his master's well-meant, but persistent, offer of his daughter's hand in marriage, John took service for a time in the army of Charles V, and on the renewal of the proposal he enlisted in a regiment on its way to Austria to do battle with the Turks. Succeeding years found him first at his birthplace, saddened by the news of his mother's premature death, which had followed close upon his mysterious disappearance; then a shepherd at Seville, and still later at Gibraltar, on the way to Africs, to ransom with his liberty Christians held captive by the Moors. He accompanied to Africa a Portuguese facny just expelled from the country, to whom charily impelled him to offer his services. On the advice of his confessor he soon returned to Gibraltar, where, brief as had been the time since the invention of the printing-press, he inaugurated the Apostolate of the printed page, by making the circuit of the towns and villages about him, with a staff, and making collections of pictures, with practically no margin of profit, in order to place them within the reach of the poor.

It was during this period of his life that he is said to have been granted the vision of the Infant Jesus, Who bestowed on him the name by which he was later
known, John of God, also bidding him go to Granada. There he was so deeply impressed by the preaching of Blessed John of Avila that he distributed his worldly goods and went through the streets of the city, bearing his breast and calling on God for mercy. For some time his sanity was doubted by the people, and he was dealt with as a madman, until the zealous preacher obliged him to desist from his lamentations and take some other method of atoning for his past life. He then made a pilgrimage to the Shrine of Our Lady of Guadalupe, where the nature of his vocation was revealed to him by the Blessed Virgin. Returning to Granada, he gave himself up to the service of the sick and poor, renting a house in which to care for them, and after furnishing it with what was necessary, he searched the city for those afflicted with all manner of disease, bearing on his shoulders any who were unable to walk.

For some time he was alone in his charitable work, soliciting by night the needful supplies, and by day attending scrupulously to the needs of his patients and the care of the hospital; but he soon received the cooperation of charitable priests and physicians. Many benefactors were attracted by the beautiful stories that he told of his work, during the main following several days in which he left for the next town he came to Thule, the abode of the philosophers and sages of ancient Greece, and they were in the character of men of learning. He was soon able to seek new succors as a successor to the government of the order. The latter, Peter the Sinner, as he called himself, became a model of humility and charity.

Among the many miracles which are related of the saint the most famous is the one commemorated in the Office of his feast, his rescue of all the inmates during a fire in the Grand Hospital at Granada, himself passing through the flames unscathed. His boundless charity extended to widows and orphans, those out of employment, and the sick. In the thirteen years of severe mortification, unceasing prayer, and devotion to his patients, he died amid the lamentations of all the inhabitants of Granada. His last illness had resulted from an heroic but futile effort to save a young man from drowning. The magistrates and nobility of the city crowded about his death-bed to express their gratitude for his services to the poor, and he was buried with the pomp usually reserved for princes. He was beatified by Urban VIII, 21 September, 1638, and canonized by Alexander VIII, 16 October, 1690. Pope Leo XIII made St. John of God the patron of hospitals. (See also BROTHERS HOSPITALIERS OF ST. JOHN OF GOD.)

Acta SS., 1 March, I. 913; DE CASTRO, Miraculosos viajes y santas venidas del b. Juan de Dios (Granada, 1688); GIRARD DE VILLENUEVE, Vie de s. Juan de Dios (Paris, 1891); BUTLER, Lives of the Saints, 5 March; BIELMEL in Kirchenlexe., s. v. Johannes von Gott.

F. M. RUDGE.

John of Hauveville, moralist and satirical poet of the twelfth century (Flourished about 1184). Little is known of his life. There is not much probability in the opinion that he was born in England, and he was not a Benedictine monk. The only work that can be attributed to him with certainty has for its title and false name of 'Archithrenius' (The Prince of Lamentations). It is a Latin poem in eight cantos. In a prose prologue the hero deplores the unmerited woes of men, beginning with his own, and announces that he is going to Nature to seek the remedy for them. He begins by entering the palace of Venus and describes the beauty of one of the members of the goddess's retinue (I). Thence he passes to the Land of Gorging, inhabited by the Belly-worshipers (Vendscoce), and he proceeds to the palace where he opposes the sovereignty of the 'White Brothers' (II). He comes to Paris and delivers a pompous eulogy of that city, describing, in contrast, the wretchedness of the students—a valuable piece of first-hand evidence in regard to the period when the University of Paris was laboriously developing itself (III). Archithrenius then visits the Mountain of Ambition, which is situated in Macedon, near Pella, the birthplace of Alexander, greatest of conquerors, and is crowned with the palaces of kings (IV). The Mountain of Presumption forms a pendant to this, and is inhabited mostly by ecclesiastics and monks. A eulogy of Henry II, King of England and Duke of Normandy, is here dragged in clumsily. But the hero discovers a gigantic monster, Cupidity, and the encounter calls forth a picture of the greediness of princes. In another digression the hero contrives to relate the fabulous history of the Kings of Britain, and of Modern Rome, and the next cantos we come to Thule, the abode of the philosophers and sages of ancient Greece, and they vie with each other in declaiming against vices (VII—VIII). Lastly, Archithrenius meets Nature on a flowery plain, surrounded by a brilliant throng of attendants. He falls at her feet. She begins with a complete course of cosmo-ology and astronomy in five hundred lines, and ends by listening to the request of Archithrenius. For remedy, she prescribed for him marriage with a young girl whose physical beauty is minutely described. In the prologue this damsel was Moderation, but here there is nothing abstract about her, and Nature instructs her disciple in his conjugal duties (IX). These and other passages in the work exhibit a certain degree of sensuality. The imitation of the Latin poets is betrayed in the plagiarizing of whole verses at a time. John of Hauveville dedicated his work to Gautier de Coutances just when the latter had left the See of Lincoln for that of Rouen (1184). The poem had a great success. It was frequently copied and commented upon before being published in 1517, at Paris, by Jodocus Badius Ascencius. The latest edition is that of Th. Wright in "The Latin Satirical Poets of the Twelfth Century" (Rolls Series, London, 1872).


PAUL LEJAY.

John of Janduno, an Averroistic philosopher, theologian, and political writer of the fourteenth century. John of Janduno (Johannes de Genduno, de Ganduno, and de Gandavo) and John of Gand (or less correctly, of Ghent) are now generally said to have been two different persons. The former was born two years earlier than the latter, graduated in arts at the College of Navarre (University of Paris), wrote a work entitled "De Laudibus Parisiis", and, in collaboration with Marsilius of Padua, composed the celebrated "Defensor pacis", directed against Pope John XXII, for which the authors were condemned in 1327. John of Gand was born about 1270 or 1280, studied theology at the Sorbonne, and after having served as curé at Kiel- drecht was made a canon of the cathedral of Paris. These facts seem to be clearly established. However, there are extant a number of works, mostly philosophi- cal, which are ascribed to Johannes de Genduno, Ganduno, or Gandavo, and it is probable that they were written by John of Janduno or by John of Gand.

These works include commentaries on Peter Lombard's "Books of Sentences", on Aristotle's "Phys-
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iose", "Metaphysics", and "The Soul", also a treatise entitled "Quæstio in Aveiroem de substantia orbis". The author is strongly inclined towards the doctrines of Averroes. He defends the principle of twofold truth, according to which what is false in philosophy may be true in theology, or vice versa. Thus, he argues that the validity of the world is demonstrated by philosophy to be true and yet in theology it is false; according to this principle, we are to believe that the world was made, while we know that it was not made.

Again, he holds the Averroistic doctrine that there is only one intellect, which is common to all men, and is in no sense a part of the individual soul. Consequently, he is obliged to maintain that the immortality of the individual soul cannot be proved in philosophy. In his discussion of the nature and operations of the human mind he takes sides with the determinists, who deny that the will is free. Finally, the Averroist author of these commentaries is no friend of the Thomistic school. He tries to belittle the reputation of St. Thomas, and to prove him inferior to Averroes. Considering, therefore, the spirit and tendency of these works, one is inclined to assign them to the turbulent, anti-papal author of the "Defensor pæctis", and not to the theologian and canon who, for all we know, troubled the theological and intellectual world by going on between Thomists and Averroists as he did for the political conflict between Pope John XXII and Louis of Bavaria. The commentaries mentioned above and the "Quæstio" were published in Venice, 1497, 1535, etc.

De litera. Histoire de la phil. méd. (Louvain, 1902), 372 sqq.: HAUSER, Histoire de la phil. sol., 11 (Paris, 1898); 2nd part, 321; FERRI, La faculté de théologie de Paris, 111 (Paris, 1899), 25; PERSI, Storia della filosofia (Naples, 1899), 25. See also, the original treatise (Venice, 1497) and the commentary of P. de Nobili (Paris, 1600).

WILLIAM TURNER.

John of Maths, Saint. See Trinitarian Order.

John of Montecorvino, a Franciscan and founder of the Catholic mission in China, b. at Montecorvino in Southern Italy, in 1246; d. at Peking, in 1328. Being a member of a religious order which at that time was chiefly concerned with the conversion of unbelievers, and was commissioned by the Holy See to preach Christianity especially to the Asiatic hordes then threatening the West, he devoted himself to the Eastern missions, first that of Persia. In 1258 Argun, the khan or ruler of this kingdom, sent a request to the pope through the Nestorian bishop, Bar Sauma, to send him a prelate from the Council of the great Chinese emperor, Kublai Khan (1260-94), who was well disposed towards Christianity. About that time John of Montecorvino came to Rome with similar promising news, and Nicholas IV entrusted him with the important mission to Farther China, where about this time Marco Polo, the celebrated traveler, still lingered. He left Rome in 1269, provoking with letters to the Khan Argun, to the great Emperor Kublai Khan, to Kaidu, Prince of the Tartars, to the King of Armenia and to the Patriarch of the Jacobites. His companions were the Dominican Nicholas of Pistoia and the merchant Peter of Lucalongo. From Persia he went by sea to India, in 1291, where he preached for thirteen months and baptized about one hundred persons. Here also his companion, Nicholas, died. Travelling by sea from Meliapur, he reached China in 1294, only to find that Kublai Khan had just died, and Timurleng (1294-1307) had supplanted him on the throne. This latter did not embrace Christianity, he threw no obstacles in the way of the zealous missionary, who, in spite of the opposition of the Nestorians already settled there, soon won the confidence of the ruler. In 1299 he built a church at Peking and in 1305 a second opposite the imperial palace, together with workshops and dwellings for two hundred persons. He gradually bought from heathen parents about one hundred and fifty boys, from seven to eleven years of age, instructed them in Latin and Greek, wrote psalms and hymns for them, and then trained them to serve Mass and sing in the choir. At the same time he familiarized himself with the native language, preached in, and translated into Chinese the New Testament and the Psalms. Among the six thousand converts of John of Montecorvino was a Nestorian king named George, of the race of the priest John, a vassal of the great khan, mentioned by Marco Polo. After he had worked alone for eleven years, a German associate, Arnold of Cologne, was sent to him (1304). In 1307 Clement V, highly pleased with the missionary's success, sent seven Franciscans who were commissioned to consecrate John of Montecorvino Archbishop of Peking and chief archbishop (summus archiepiscopus) of all those countries; they were themselves to be his suffragan bishops. Only three of these envoy's arrived safely: Gerardus, Perergrinus, and Andrew of Perugia; the latter consecrated John in 1308 and succeeded each other in the See of Zaiton, established by Montecorvino. In 1312 three more Franciscans arrived from Rome as suffragans. John of Montecorvino departed this life (1328) honored as a saint by Christian and heathen.

Our chief information about his work is found in two letters written in 1305 and 1306, printed in Wadding, Annales minorum ordinis fratorum I, vi (Rome, 1732), 603-09, and in Himmelberger, Geschichte der Mission in China (Heidelberg, 1741), append. n. 44 and 45. There is an English translation of these letters in YULE, Cathay and the Way Thither, I (London, 1866), 299 sqq. The records from which the Nestorians in China are to be found, moreover, in BÉRAMARD, Nouveaux mélanges anatoliens, II (Paris, 1829), 193-96; KUNTSTADT, Die Mus- senen in Indien und China im 14. Jahrhundert in Geschichte der Blätter, XXXVII (Munich, 1858), 229-41; HUC, Le Christien en Chine (Paris, 1855), 87 sqq.; BERTX, Die Colonie der römischen Kirche in den Tsching-tschinern, 2d ed., 531 sqq.; HARTIG, Die Kolonie der rohenischen Kirche in dem Tschingtche, 2d ed., in Zeitschrift für die histor. Theol., XXVIII (Gotha, 1866), 285-98.

OTTÖ HARTIG.

John of Montesano, theologian and controversialist, b. at Monzón, Spain; dates of birth and death unknown. He joined the Dominicans probably in Valencia. In 1383 he was lecturing on theology at the cathedral in that city. Thence he went to Paris, taught there the convents of St. James there, and attained the master’s degree in theology in 1387. Here he entered the field of controversy on the question of the Immaculate Conception, which was not then defined. Maintaining the proposition that the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin was heretical, he aroused against him the faculty of the Paris university. They appointed four examiners to try him; but his answers warned him, first privately, then publicly, to retract, and when he refused carried the matter to Pierre Orge ment, Bishop of Paris, who promulgated a decree of excommunication against all who should defend the forbidden theses; and the faculty issued letters condemniatory of Montesano's errors and conduct, which Denielle conjectures, from their ascerity of speech, were written by Pierre d'Ailly. Denielle also says Montesano would not have been condemned had he not declared the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception heretical. Montesano appealed to Clement VIII, who cited him and the university before a public court. Later, foreseeing that the cause was going against him, Montesano, despite the command under pain of excommunication to remain at Avignon, secretly withdrew into Aragon, then went to Sicily, changing his allegiance to Urban VI, Clement's rival. There and in Spain, whether he afterwards returned, he died in 1412. Alberto, Duke of Gandia, chose him as head of a legation sent to defend his claim to the crown of Aragon. Besides four works against Clement's claim as pope, he wrote: "Tractus de Conceptione B. Virgins", a number of sermons, and various opuscula in the vernacular.


V. F. O'DAHL.
John of Nikifor, an Egyptian chronicler who flourished in the latter part of the seventh century. The little we know of his life is gathered from the "History of the Patriarchs" by Severus of Asmuneus. He lived under John of Semnud, Isaac, and Simeon, respectively fortieth, forty-first, and forty-second patriarchs, and seems to have played an important part in the affairs of the Egyptian Church, both as Bishop of Nikifor (Coptic, "Nikhaoti in the Delta) and as a defender of Nestorius the Monophysite. But having disciplined a monk guilty of a grave offence against morals so severely that he died ten days later, he was deposed from both offices by the patriarch Simeon, and reduced to the rank of a simple monk. His Chronicle", composed very likely before his deposition, is a valuable, extending from Adam to the end of the Arabic conquest. In many respects, it does not materially differ from the Byzantine chronicles, which the author often copies, especially those of John Malalas, and the monk John of Antioch. But it has preserved some local traditions, not to be found elsewhere, on the ancient history of Egypt, also some details otherwise unknown, and apparently authentic, on certain periods of the Eastern Empire, in particular on the revolution which brought about the fall of Phocas and the accession of Heraclius I, and the condition of Egypt during the seventh century. The last chapters concern events of Egypt by the Arabs, but little posterior to the events. This chronicle was originally written in Greek, with the exception of some of the chapters concerning Egypt, which were very probably written in Coptic. It has come down to us in an Ethiopic version made in 1602 by an Abyssinian scholar, with the assistance of an Egyptian monk, on a much older Arabic text now lost like the original. The text, unfortunately, has suffered much at the hands of the translators and copyists, especially in passing into Arabic. Such as it is, it has been the subject of a careful study and analysis by H. Zonertolin, in the "Journal Asiatique", 7th series, vols. X, XII, XIII (Paris, 1877-79), "La Chronique de Jean de Nikifor, notice et extraits" (also in book form, Paris, 1879); later it was published in its entirety, with a French version, by the same scholar; "La Chronique de Jean de Nikifor", Notice et extraits du manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale", t. XXIV, i, pp. 255-605 (also separately, Paris, 1883). The two above-named publications of Zonertolin: cf. the reviews in "Bibliothèque des Sciences de la Bibliothèque Nationale", 1881, 1883-84; "Bibliothèque de l'Égypte", 1884, 364-374; "Drozin, Le Musulman, III (Louvain, 1884), 233-258.

H. HYVERNAT.

John of Paris (called also Quidort and de Soarines, theologian and controversialist, b. at Paris, date unknown; d. at Bordeaux, 22 Sept., 1306. Having obtained the degree of Master of Arts with distinction, he joined the Dominican Order, when about twenty years of age, at the university of St. James in his native city. There he taught philosophy and theology, and obtained the degree of Master of Theology. He was endowed with great ability, was the most subtle dialectician of the age, possessed great literary and linguistic attainments, and was considered one of the best theologians of the university. Some ten of his works on theology, physics, and metaphysics, still exist in manuscript; two others, "De Antichristo" and "De modo existendi corporis Christi in sacramentario altaris", appeared in print centuries after his death. A treatise, "Contra corruptionem Sancti Thomae", published in 1516 under the name of Egidius Romanus, is commonly attributed to John of Paris; it was certainly not written by Egidius. All these show vast erudition. In his work on the temporal and spiritual power, "De potestate regis et papalis" written during the controversy between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, he favours the king, and advances some untenable propositions. He holds, for instance, that the pope, for grave crimes, e.g. heresy, may be deposed. The treatise was later condemned, in which he maintained that the Body of Christ is, or might be, present by assumption (i.e. by the body of Christ assuming the bread and wine), and that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not of faith, brought him into trouble. The faculty of the university reported the erudite William, Bishop of Paris, who forbade him under penalty of excommunication to defend such a doctrine, and deprived him of the offices of lecturing, preaching, and hearing confessions. John appealed to the Holy See, but died soon after, and the case was dropped. In justice to him, it must be said that he advanced these propositions tentatively; for in the beginning of the treatise he writes that he believes in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and if it is shown that transubstantiation is of faith, or should it be defined, he will willingly retract.


VICTOR F. O'DANIEL.

John of Parma, Blessed, Minister General of the Friars Minor (1247-1257), b. at Parma about 1209; d. at Camerino 19 March, 1268. His family name was probably Burali. Educated and trained in the church of St. Lazarus at Parma, his progress in learning was such that he quickly became a teacher of philosophy (magister logico). When and where he entered the Order of Friars Minor, the old sources do not say. Affo (Vita, p. 18, see below) assigns 1233 as the year, and Parma as the probable place. Ordained priest he taught theology at Bologna and at Naples, and finally read the "Sentences" at Paris, after having assisted at the First Council of Lyons, 1245. Through his great learning and sanctity, John gained many admirers, and at the general chapter of the order at Lyons in July, 1247, was elected minister general, which office he held till 2 Feb., 1257. We may judge of the spirit that animated the new general, and of his purposes for the full observance of the rule, from the joy felt (as recorded by Angelus Clararius) by the survivors of St. Francis's first companions at his election, though Brother Giles's words sound more pessimistic: "Welcome, Father, but you come late" (Archiv. Litt., II, 263). John set to work immediately. Wishing to know personally the state of the order, he began visiting the different provinces. His first visit was to England, with which he was extremely satisfied and where he was received with great honours by John of France, I, 252). At Sens in France St. Louis IX honoured with his presence the provincial chapter held by John. Having visited the provinces of Burgundy and of Provence, he set out in Sept., 1248, for Spain, whence Innocent IV recalled him to entrust him with an embassy to the East. Before departing, John appears to have held the General Chapter of Mts in 1249 (others put it after the embassy, 1251). It was at this chapter that John refused to draw up new statutes to avoid overburdening the friars (Salimbene, "Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.", XXXII, 300). Only some new rubrics were promulgated, which in a later chapter (Genoa, 1254) were included in the official ceremonial of the order, beginning: Ad omnes horas canonicas (last published by Golubovich in "Archivo Franc. Hist.", III, Quaranzi, 1910). The object of John's embassy to the East was the reunion of the Greek Church, whose representatives he met at Nice, and who saluted him as a brother. John's mission bore no immediate fruit, though it may have prepared the way for the union decreed at the Council of Lyons in 1274. In his generalate occurred also the famous dispute between the Mendicants and the University of Paris.
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According to Salimbene (op. cit., XXXII, 299 sqq.), John went to Paris (probably in 1253), and by his mild yet strenuous arguments strove to secure peace. It may have been in connexion with this attack on the Preachers and the Minoras that John of Parma and Humbert of Romans, Master General of the Dominicans, published at Milan in 1255 a letter recommending the peace of the two orders (see Wadding, III, 380). The "Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum" of Gerard of St. Dominico (1254), John's friend, having been denounced by the professors of Paris and condemned by a commission at Anagni in 1256 (Denifle, "Arch. f. Litt.", I, 49 sqq.), John himself was in a way compromised—new censure was added which, with others, finally brought about the end of his generalate. He convoked a general chapter at Rome, 2 Feb., 1257. If Peregrinus of Bologna [Bulletin critico di cote francese, I (1905), 46] be right, Alexander IV secretly intimated to John that he should resign, and decline re-election should it be offered him. On the contrary, Salimbene (I. c., 301 sqq.) insists that John resigned of his own free will. The pope may have exerted some pressure on John, who was only too glad to resign, seeing himself unable to promote henceforth the good of the order. Quoted as to the choice of a successor by St. Bonaventure, who had succeeded him as professor at Paris. John retired to the Hermitage of Greccio near Rieti, memorable for the Christmas celebrated there by St. Francis. There he lived in voluntary exile and complete solitude; his cell near a rock is still shown. But another hard trial awaited him. Accused of Joachism, he was submitted to a canonical process at Città della Pieve (Umbria), presided over by St. Bonaventure and Cardinal John Gaetano Orsini, protector of the order. The mention of this cardinal as protector brings us to a chronological difficulty, overlooked by all modern writers, who assign the obedience to John at 1257; for Alexander IV (1254-61) retained the protectorship (Anal. Franc., 696, 710; Mon. Germ. Hist.: Ser., XXXIII, 663, 681-2); and Cardinal Orsini became protector, at the earliest, at the end of 1261; see Oliger in "Arch. Francisc. Hist.", III, 346. St. Francis Clareus tells us that the concealed motive of this process was John's attachment to the literal observance of the rule, the accusation of Joachism, against which he professed his Catholic Faith, being only a pretext. Other sources, however (Anal. Franc., III, 350, 689), speak of reactradition. The same Clareus tells us that John was condemned not for the powerful intervention of Innocent IV's nephew, Cardinal Ottoboni Fisci, later Hadrian V (concerning whose letter to the judges see Arch. f. Litt., II, 286; Orbis Sarapheicus, I, 120). John certainly did not profess the dogmatical errors of Joachism, though he may have held some of its apocalyptic ideas. Upon his acquittal he returned to Greccio, and continued his life of prayer and work. It was there that an angel once served his Mass (Salimbene, i.e., 310; Anal. Franc., III, 289), and that in 1258 he received the visit of Urbanus Casile, who has left a touching account of this meeting ("Arbor vitae", Venice, 1485, V, 3). Hearing that the Greeks were abandoning the union agreed upon in 1274, John, now 80 years old, desired to use his last energies in the cause of union. He obtained permission of Nicolas IV to go to Greece, but only travelled as far as Camerino, Bari, and the town of Brindisi, where he died in the convent of the friars, 19 March, 1289. He was beatified 1777; his feast is kept 20 March.

With the exception of his letters scarcely any literary work can with surety be attributed to John. He is certainly not the author of the "Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum" of Gerard of St. Dominico (1254). The "Danico Fr. Johannis de Parma" (Anal. Franc., III, 646-49). With more probability can we attribute to John the "Dialogus de vitia ss. Fratrum Minorum", partly edited by L. Lomme O.F.M. (Rome, 1902). The "Chronicle of the XXIV Generals" (Anul. Franc., III, 283) ascribes to John the allegorical treatise on poverty: "Sacrum Commerium B. Francisci cum Domina Paupertate" (ed. Milan, 1539), edited by Ed. d'Alencéon (Paris and Rome, 1800), who ascribes it (without sufficient reason) to John. The "Sermone Dominus est 1274" (ed. London, 1855) is attributed to John by one of the sermons better known as "Lady Poverty, a thirteenth-century allegory" (London, 1901); another English translation is by Rawnsley (London, 1804): a good introduction and abbreviated version is given by Macdonell, "Sons of Francis", 189-213. Other works are mentioned by Bardsley, "Suppl. ad scriptur" (Rome, 1806), 389.


II. Literature.—McCulloch, "History of the Papacy" (London, 1820), 214-51; Likon on Clart, "Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Franci, I (Taunton, 1886), 493-514; there are three Italian lives written by Giacomo Camerini da Parma, by Camerino (Ravenna, 1750), by Acro (Parma, 1777), and by Lotti de Parma, 2nd ed. (Quaracchi, 1898); the 1st ed. had appeared in 1775; for the Brothers of the Convent of Parma, Periodico Bimannale (Parma, 1888-9); Jacobi, "Vita, Sacra e Beat. dell'Umbria" (Florence, 1547); Stich, "Le Annales in Memoria degli Scrittori e Letterati Parmigiani," I (Parma, 1789), 129-45; Daunou in "Histoire litteraire de la France, XX (Paris, 1849), 23-36 (antiqueste gay, "Histoire de la litterature de la France, Meyes Age, II (Paris, 1905), 94-9); Piccinoto, "Cronica, Storico, Biografico dei Minisatt e Vere Prov. della Minore Province di Bologna (Parma, 1909), 63-64; Quaracchi, "Annali Historia Ordinis Fratrum minorum" (Freiburg im Br., 1908), 25-30; German edition (Freiburg im Br., 1909); Ratze von Nantes, "Histoire des Spirituels" (Paris, 1892), 145-200.

LIVIARIUS OLIGER.

John of Ragusa (sometimes confounded with John of Segovia, q.v.), a Dominican theologian, president of the Council of Basle,legate to the Council of Ragusa about 1320; d. at Ragusa, probably 1443. He entered the Dominican Order and devoted himself to the observance of the rule of his order and the study of the sacred sciences. By reason of his great attainments in theology, Scripture, and the Oriental languages, he was considered an oracle in the church. His native Diocese of Ragusa had shone conspicuously and there received the doctor's cap about the beginning of the fifteen century. In the year 1426 he was appointed procurator general of the Dominican Order, and went to reside at Rome under Pope Martin V. There he received marks of honour and esteem from the pope and the College of Cardinals, and the former eventually named him papal theologian for the General Council of Basle. John was, moreover, chosen to open the council, in place of Cardinal Julian Cesarine, who was detained by other business. Arriving at Basle on 19 May, 1431, he on the same day arranged with the Bishop of Basle for the opening of the council on the 23rd of the same month. The opening did not take place, however, until 23 July, 1431, in the cathedral church, when John preached from the text: "Et angelus testemini, quem vos vultis. Eoce venit." (Mal., iii, 1). In the council he was desirous to moderate, and to keep in check the charge of contumacy (Feb., 1433). On eight mornings he spoke against the doctrines of the Husites and crushed all that was reprehensible in that heresy.

Having been sent as a legate of the council to Constantiopole to urge the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches, John of Ragusa induces the Emperor John Palaeologus and the Patriarch Joseph II to send an embassy to the council, though the treaty
which they made with Pope Eugenius IV was broken by the Greeks. John afterwards sojourned at Constantinople to study the Greek language and to become better acquainted with the situation of ecclesiastical affairs. Here he completed an etymological work bearing upon the Greek text of Scripture and destined to be of service to Catholic controversialists in treating of the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost against the Greek schismatics. He returned to Bologna as a member of a deputation, to obtain from Eugenius IV an assurance that the pope would be present at the council. Having acceded to this, Eugenius IV consecrated John at his own nomination to be the bearer of a document (dated 15 July, 1437) to the Greek emperor in which the emperor's assistance was invited at a meeting of the council to be held in some Italian city. John's subsequent course has been a subject of dispute: some authors assert that he remained in sympathy with the council, which, others insist that he allied himself with Eugenius IV, who made him Bishop of Argos. It is probable that he took the side of Eugenius. His extant writings are: (1) Discourse against the Hussites delivered at the Council of Basle, (2) the Acts, or Reports, of his embassies to Constantinople, to be found among the Acts of the Council of Basle, (3) the Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church, preserved by Leo Allatius. His work on Greek indeclinable nouns and Scriptural Greek etymology seems to have been lost.


ALBERT REINHART.

John of Roquestillade (de Rufescissa), Franciscan alchemist, date of birth unknown; d. probably at Avignon, 1362. After pursuing the study of philosophy for five years at Toulouse, he entered the Franciscan monastery at Orleans, where he continued his studies for five years longer. His experiments in distillation led to the discovery of what he termed aqua vitae, or usually, quinta essentia, and commended as a panacea for all disease. His work as an alchemist forms the subject-matter of "De consideratione quintae essentiae" (Bazel, 1561) and "De extractione quintae essentiae"; likewise "Libellus de conficiendo vero lapide philosophico ad sublevandum inopiam pastor et eremitam" (Strasbourg, 1659). His false prophecies and violent denunciation of ecclesiastical abuses brought him into disfavour with his superiors; resulting in his imprisonment by Clement VI (1345) and Innocent VI (1356). While there he wrote 1349 his "Visiones seu revelationes", and in 1356 "Vaticinio et veritate" and "Ostensionum" (in Brown, Fascicula rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum, III, London, 1640). His other works include commentaries on the Sentences and on the "Oraculum Cyrilii", "Fragmenta revelationum", "Apologia propheticarum", "De famulatu philosophiae in theologiam". BIBL., c. des script. Ord. Min. (Rome, 1860); JAEGER et KIRCHNER, s. v. Johannes von Roquestillade; SCHNEIDER in Kirchliche Handlex.

F. M. RUDGE.

John of Rupeolla, Franciscan theologian, b. at La Rochelle (Rupella), towards the end of the twelfth century; d. 1245 (al., 1271). He seems to have entered the Franciscan Order at an early age, and was admitted to the house of study at Paris. There he was a disciple and helper of Hales, who presented him for the bachelorship of theology. He was the first Franciscan to receive that degree at the University of Paris. In 1238 he was already a master of theology, with his own pupils, for his name is to be found in the list of masters convoked in that year by Woezel, Bishop of Paris, to discuss the vexed question of ecclesiastical benefices. John was of the number of those who declared against the general lawfulness of plurality, and who afterwards taught the same doctrine in their schools. He appears henceforward to have enjoyed a very considerable reputation, and is described by Bernard of Besse as a professor of great fame for holiness and learning, whose writings were both solid and extremely useful. The same writer maintained that he was the best preacher of his day. This judgment should perhaps be tempered by the consideration of Bernard's anxiety to prove that the greatest theologian (Alexander of Hales), the greatest warrior (John of Brienne), and the greatest preacher, all three belonged to his own Franciscan Order.

In the dissensions which already rent the Order, John was one of the most determined opponents of Brother Elias, and with Alexander of Hales placed himself at the head of the movement which brought about Elias's downfall in 1239. At the command of Haymo of Favergham, who succeeded Elias as general, he collaborated with Alexander of Hales, Robert of Bastia, Richard of Cornwall, and several others less important, on an explanation of the Rule of St. Francis. The work received the approbation of the chapter (probably definiotory) of the order held at Bologna in 1242, and subsequently became known as the "Exposition of John of Rupeolla". The work, and the majority of succeeding writers place John of Rupeolla's death in 1271, but a letter of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, written in Sept. or Oct., 1245, speaks of him as being then already dead: "mortuis fratris Alexandro de Hales et Joanne de Rupellis". The date according to Denifle was 3 Feb.

No complete edition of the works of John of Rupeolla has ever been published. The "Exposition of the Four Masters" was printed at Venice in 1513, in the "Firmamentum Trium Ordinarum", pars 3a, p. 15b–19a. Two priests of the Diocese of La Rochelle, Canon Chofet and Fr. Grasiller, had already in 1875 prepared for the press the following: "Tractatus de Bollandia", "De Articulis Edicis", "De Sanctorum Opere et Sacerdotio", "De decem praeceptis", "Commentaria in Matthew", "Postilla in Epistolae Pauli", "De vitis", "Sermones". Nothing has yet resulted from their enterprise. They had also catalogued as belonging to the same author: "Postilla super Daniele"; "in Marcum"; "in Lucam"; "in Apocalypsin". Du Boulay attributed to him a "Commentaria in qua tuor Libros Sententiarum", and says he was the first to write such a commentary. His best known work is the "Summa de Anima". Father Fidelis a Fanna (op. cit., 82) says that no work on the same subject is to be found so far as in the thirteenth and fourteenth century in the many European libraries he searched. The author avails himself fully of the teaching of Aristotle and Avicenna, and touches upon all the important questions of psychology afterwards to be treated by the great Scholastics. The work was edited with an introduction and studies 1852, by Father Theophilus Domenichelli, O.F.M., from a MS. of the Biblioteca Nazionale at Florence, collated principally with two others (A, IV, 25, nos. no. 1288, and B, IV, 4, no. 381) of the Casanatense, Rome.

BARTHOLOMÆUS OF PRAG, De Conformitate vitri B. Francisci in Articulis Franciscanis, I (Prague, 1500), 337, 379, 544; BERNARD OF BESSE, Libri de Logibus in Anal. Franc. (Quaracchi, 1897); III, 695; CANTUÆRITANUS, Summa universae de Articulis, I (Dorni, 1637), xx, 70; CHRONICON XXIV Generalium in Anal.
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John of Sahagun, Saint, hermit, b. 1419, at Sahagun (or San Fagondez) in the Kingdom of Leon, in Spain; d. 11 June, 1479, at Salamanca; feast 12 June.

In art he is represented holding a chalice and host surrounded by rays of light (see Chartarum). He had five children, the eldest of whom, John González de Casanova, was born of pious and respected parents. John González was a bishop in Naples and fought against the Saracens. He died in 1483 or 1484, and was buried in the cathedral of his native town.

John was canonized by Pope Paul III in 1537, and his feast is celebrated on 12 June.

BRENDAN JENNINGS.

JOHN OF SALISBURY (JOHANNES DE SARESBERIA, surnamed PARVUS), b. about 1115; d. 1180; a distinguished philosopher, historian, churchman, and man of letters. He was born near Salisbury, and at an early age went to Paris, where he studied arts and philosophy (1136–38) under Peter Abelard, Alberic of Reims, and Robert of Melun; and then under William of Conches, Richard l'Evèque, and Theodoric of Chartres at the famous school at this latter town (1138–40); finally, at Paris, completing his education under Gilbert de La Porree, Robert Pullus, and Simon of Poissy (1141–45). This solid education, under such brilliant masters, he perfected by some private teaching, perhaps with his lifelong friend Peter, Abbot of Mortier La Celle, near Troyes, with whom he was living in 1143. At the Council of Reims in this year, he was introduced to Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, by St. Bernard. After spending a few years at the papal Court at Rome, whither he went from Reims with Pope Eugene III, he returned to England and acted as private secretary to Theobald for several years, during which period he was repeatedly sent on delicate and important diplomatic missions to the Holy See; in 1159 he had "ten times crossed the Alps on his road from England." (Metalogicus, iii, prole., p. 113).

He was thus brought into intimate relations with princes and popes, especially with Henry II and his son Philip Augustus, with Louis VIII, also a Frenchman. In defending the rights of the Church, he incurred the king's displeasure in 1159—when his forced seclusion enabled him to complete his two principal works, the "Poli
cratie" and the "Metalogices", both dedicated to Thomas à Becket—and again in 1163, when he was obliged to quit England. The next six years he spent with his friend Peter of La Celle, now Abbot of St. Remigius at Reims. Here he wrote "Historia Pontificum". Thomas à Becket, who had succeeded Theobald as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162, was a friend of John, and when Stephen Langton, successor of Adrian IV, also an Englishman. In defending the rights of the Church, he incurred the king's displeasure in 1159—when his forced seclusion enabled him to complete his two principal works, the "Policratie" and the "Metalogices", both dedicated to Thomas à Becket—and again in 1163, when he was obliged to quit England. The next six years he spent with his friend Peter of La Celle, now Abbot of St. Remigius at Reims. Here he wrote "Historia Pontificum". Thomas à Becket, who had succeeded Theobald as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162, was a friend of John, and when Stephen Langton, successor of Adrian IV, also an
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extensive and lifelong correspondence on literary, educational, and ecclesiastical topics with the leading scholars of Europe. His collected letters (over 300 in number), no less than his other works, form an invaluable source for the history of thought and activity in the twelfth century. His fine taste and superior training made him the most elegant Latin writer of his time. Eugene IV was much disturbed by a historian and as a philosopher: he was the first medieval writer to emphasize the importance of historical studies in philosophy and in all other branches of learning. Naturally of an eccentric turn, he displayed in philosophy a remarkably sound and judicious knowledge of the Council of Basel (concilium de Basilea) (vestigis philosophorum) indicates, partly with church and state diplomacy, partly with philosophy and learning generally: a pleasing and readable miscellanea. The "Enthetics" (De dogmate philosophorum) is a Latin elegiac poem of 158 lines, apparently intended as an introduction to the "Policriticus," apparently the same as the "De Septem Septeniarum," a brief treatise on the seven liberal arts, is doubted by Mairau (Novelle Biographica, xxv, 539, 1858) and Schaarschmidt (pp. 278 sq.). The "Historia Pontificum" first published in the eighteenth century (Montemart, Germania Historica, xx, 517-45, 1868), and identified as the work of John, by Giesebrecht (Bay. Akad. d. Wissensch., Munich, 1873, 124). The actual MS. carries on the Gembloux continuation of Sigebert from 1148 to 1152. It was written about 1164, and dedicated to Peter of La Celle. John also wrote a "Vita S. Thom. Cantuari." (1171), and the letters already referred to. All these works (except "Hist. Pont.") were edited by Giles, 5 vols., London, 1848, reprinted in P. L., CXCIX; "Policriticus" also ed. by C. C. J. Webb (2 vols., Oxford, 1909). The "Historia Pontificum" was mainly in his own letters and other works, and in the letters of Peter of La Celle. For John of Salisbury and the Bull "Laudabiliter," see ADRIAN IV.


P. COFFET.

John of Segovia, a Spanish theologian, b. at Segovia towards the end of the fourteenth century; d. probably in 1458. Nothing is known of him before he took part in the Council of Basle, except that he was archdeacon at Villaviciosa, canon at Toledo, and professor of theology at the University of Salamanca. In 1429, with the approval of Bishop of Salamanca, and by the order of King John II of Castile sent him as their representative to the Council of Basle, where he was one of the ablest defenders of the superiority of the council over the pope. At first he endeavored to mitigate the conflict between the council and Pope Eugene IV, with whom he spent some time at Florence in 1435, but afterwards he became one of the chief supporters of the revolutionary party at the council. He took part in the twenty-eighth session (1 October, 1437) at which Eugene IV was declared a heretic, and in the thirty-third session (15 May, 1439) at which the pope was deposed. In March, 1439, John of Segovia represented the council at the Diet of Mainz. After Eugene IV was deposed by the council on 25 June, 1439, John of Segovia was appointed one of the commission of nine scholars whose duty it was to select a number of theologians to elect the new pope. He was one of the thirty-three who on 5 November, 1439, elected the antipope Felix V. In recognition for his services he was created cardinal by the antipope on 12 October, 1440. He represented Felix V at the Parliament of Bourges in 1440, at the Diet of Mainz in 1441, and that of Frankfort in 1442. At the end of the schism in 1449 he resigned the cardinalate, was appointed titular Bishop of Cesaeres by Eugene IV, and retired to a Spanish monastery. His most important literary work is an extensive history of the history of the Council of Basle. Libri XVIII," edited by Birk and Beer in "Monumenta conciliorum generalium sacelli decimi quinti: Scriptor.," II-IV (Vienna, 1873-96). His other works are a treatise in favour of the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, printed at Brussels in 1664; a refutation of the Karais, entitled "De mittendo gladio in Saracenos"; a defence of the "Filioque" against the Greeks, entitled "De processu Spiritus Sancti" (Basle, 1476); a Biblical concordance, "Concordantiae biblicae vocum indecimabiliun" (Basle, 1476); and a few works defending the sovereignty of a general council. ZIMMERMANN, Juan de Segovia (Breslau, 1892); ANTONIO, Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus, II (Madrid, 1788), 225-34; HALS, Conciliorum Basilensium, Studien und Dokumente, I (Basle, 1896), 19-53.
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John of St. Facundus. See JOHN OF SAHAUN, SAINT.

John of St. Thomas (family name JOHN POINBOT), theologian, b. at Lisbon, 9 June, 1589; d. at Fraga, Spain, 17 June, 1644. Of noble parentage, he was sent early to the University of Coimbra, displayed talents of the first order, completed his humanities and philosophy as a student of the University, and obtained his degree in 1608. He then entered the University of Louvain. Here, too, he showed remarkable ability, and won the title of Bachelor of Theology at an early age. He joined the Dominicans at Madrid in 1612 or 1613, taking the name of John of St. Thomas, by which he is known to history. As professor of philosophy and theology in a monastery at Alcalà, he soon took rank among the most learned men of the time, and was placed successively (1630 and 1640) in charge of the two principal chairs of theology in the university of that city. His renown drew the largest number of scholars that had ever attended its theological faculties. No man enjoyed a greater reputation in Spain, or was more frequently consulted on points of doctrine and ecclesiastical matters. His theological and philosophical writings, which have gone through many editions, are among the best expositions of St. Thomas's doctrine, of which he is acknowledged to be one of the foremost interpreters. Although he took an active part in the scholastic discussions of his times, his courtesy was such that he is said never to have hurt an opponent's feelings. So faithful was he to the traditions of his order and the principles of St. Thomas that in his last illness he could declare that, in all the thirty years he was devoted to teaching and writing, he had not taught or written
anything contrary to St. Thomas. His humility and his devotion to education caused him to refuse many dignities offered him by the Church and his order. In 1534, he was offered the position of royal canon of St. Peter, a position which only religious obedience could induce him to accept. His writings comprise: "Cursus philosophicus Thomisticus" (9 vols.); "Cursus Theologicus" (9 vols.): a commentary on the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas; "Tractatus de Approbatione et Praecepto P. Tomatis Aquinatis"; a "Compendium of Christian Doctrine" (in Spanish); and a "Treatise on a Happy Death" (in Spanish). Written at the command of Philip IV.


**VICTOR F. O’DANIEL.**

**John of the Cross, Saint,** founder (with St. Teresa) of the Discalced Carmelites, doctor of mystic theology, b. at Hontiveros, Old Castle, 24 June, 1542, d. at Ubeda, Andalusia, 14 Dec., 1591. John de la Cruz was the eldest child of Gonzalo de Yépez and Catharine Álvarez, poor silk weavers of Toledo, knew from his earliest years the hardships of life. The father, originally of a good family but disinherited on account of his marriage below his rank, died in the prime of his youth; the widow, assisted by her eldest sons, was enabled to provide for her children. John was sent to the poor school at Medina del Campo, whither the family had gone to live, and proved an attentive and diligent pupil; but when apprenticed to an artisan, he seemed incapable of learning anything. Thereupon the governor of the hospital of Medina took him into his service, and for seven years John divided his time between waiting on the poorest of the poor, and frequenting a school established by the Jesuits. Already at that early age he treated his body with the utmost rigour; twice he was saved from certain death by the intervention of the Blessed Virgin. Anxious about his future life, he was told in prayer that he was to serve God in an order the ancient perfection of which he was to help to bring back again. The Carmelites having founded a house at Medina, he there received the habit on 24 February, 1563, and took the name of John of St. Matthias. After profession he obtained leave from his superiors to follow the monastic rule without the mitigations granted by various popes. He was sent to Salamanca for the higher studies, and was ordained priest in 1567; at his first Mass he received the assurance that he should preserve his baptismal innocence. But, shrinking from the responsibilities of the priesthood, he determined to join the Carthusians. However, before taking any further step he made the acquaintance of St. Teresa, who had come to Medina to found a convent of nuns, and who persuaded him to remain in the Carmelite Order and to assist her in the establishment of a monastery of nuns carrying out the primitive rule. He accompanied her to Valladolid in order to gain practical experience of the manner of life led by the reformed nuns. A small house having been offered, St. John resolved to try at once the new form of life, although St. Teresa did not think anyone, however great his spirituality, could bear the discomfort of that cloister. He was joined by two companions, and a lay brother and a lay brother with whom he inaugurated the reform among friars, 28 Nov., 1568. St. Teresa has left a classical description of the sort of life led by these first Discalced Carmelites, in chaps. xiii and xiv of her "Book of Foundations". John of the Cross, as he now called himself, was made the first master of the foundation of the spiritual edifice which soon was to assume majestic proportions. He filled various posts in different places until St. Teresa called him to Avila as director and confessor to the convent of the Incarna-

**tion, of which she had been nominated prioress. He remained there, with a few interruptions, for over five years. Meanwhile the reform spread rapidly, and, partly through the zeal of his eloquence and, partly through the orders issued by the general and the general chapter on one hand, and the Apostolic nunciato on the other, and partly through human passion which sometimes ran high, its existence became seriously endangered. St. John was ordered by his provincial to return to the house of his profession (Medina), and, on his refusing to do so, owing to the fact that he held not from the order but from the Apostolic delegate, he was taken prisoner in the night of 3 December, 1577, and carried off to Toledo, where he suffered for more than nine months close imprisonment in a narrow, stifling cell, together with such additional punish-

ments as might have been called one of the most serious crimes. In the midst of his sufferings he was visited with heavenly consolations, and some of his exquisite poetry dates from that period. He made good his escape in a miraculous manner, August, 1578. During the next years he was chiefly occupied with the foundation and government of monasteries at Baeza, Granada, Cordova, Segoría, and elsewhere, but took no prominent part in the negotiations which led to the establishment of separate government for the Discalced Carmelites. After the death of St. Teresa (4 Oct., 1582), when the order was too partly the bare necessities, St. John and the Zelanti under Núria Doria struggled for the upper hand, St. John supported the former and shared his fate. For some time he filled the post of vicar provincial of Andalusia, but when Doria changed the government of the order, concentrating all power in the hands of a permanent committee, St. John resisted and, supporting the nuns in their endeavour to secure the papal approbation of their constitutions, drew upon himself the displeasure of the superior, who deprived him of his offices and relegated him to one of the poorest monasteries, where he fell seriously ill. One of his opponents went so far as to go from monastery to monastery gathering materials in order to bring grave charges against him, hoping for his expulsion from the order which he had helped to found.

As his illness increased he was removed to the monastery of Ubeda, where he at first was treated very kindly. But, gradually, rule without mitigation was despised, being thus literally fulfilled almost to the end of his life. But at last even his adversaries came to acknowledge his sanctity, and his funeral was the occasion of a great outburst of enthusiasm. The body, still incorrupt, as has been ascertained within the last few years, was reburied at Segovia, and a small portion remaining at Ubeda; there was some litigation about its possession. A strange phenomenon, for which no satisfactory explanation has been given, has frequently been observed in connexion with the relics of St. John of the Cross: Francis de Yépez, the brother of the saint, and after him many other persons, have noticed the appearance in his relics of images of Christ on the Cross, the Blessed Virgin, St. Elias, St. Francis Xavier, or other saints, according to the devotion of the beholder. The beatification took place on 25 Jan., 1675, the translation of his body on 21 May of the same year, and the canonization on 27 Dec., 1726.

He left the following works, which for the first time appeared at Barcelona in 1619, but a critical edition of which is urgently needed:—1. "The Ascent of Mount Carmel", an explanation of some verses beginning: "In a dark night with anxious heart, I set off". This consists of four books, but breaks off in the middle of the third. —2. "The Dark Night of the Soul", another explanation of the same verses, breaking off in the second book. Both these works were written soon after his
escape from prison, and, though incomplete, supplement each other, forming a full treatise on mystic theology. —3. An explanation of the "Spiritual Canticle" (a paraphrase of the Canticle of Canticles), beginning: "Where hast Thou hidden Thyself?" composed in part during the imprisonment, and completed and finished by St. John, who was probably latest among the company. —4. An explanation of a poem beginning: "O Living Flame of Love", written about 1584 at the bidding of Dona Ana de Penafoosa ...

—5. Some instructions and precautions on matters spiritual. —6. Some twenty letters, chiefly to his penitent and wise, who were the goal of his spiritual teaching, including numerous letters to and from St. Teresa, was destroyed, partly by himself, partly during the persecutions to which he fell a victim. —7. "Poems", of which twenty-six have been hitherto published, viz., twenty in the older editions, and recently six more, discovered partly at the National Library at Madrid, and partly at the convent of Carmelites nuns at Pamplona. —8. "A Collection of Spiritual Maxims" (in some editions to the number of one hundred, and in others three hundred and sixty-five) can scarcely count as an independent work...

John of Vicedom (Johannes Victorieniris of de Victoria), chronicler, b. probably between 1270 and 1280; d. at Vicedom, Austria, 12 November, 1347. Nothing is known of his early life. In 1307 he became abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Vicedom, in Karinthia (Austria), and was later both chaplain and confidential secretary to Duke Henry of Karinthia. On the latter's death in 1335, John journeyed to Linz at the request of the duke's daughter, Margaretha Maulteich, to defend before Louis IV her claims to her father's estates. But the two sides, Albert II and Otto of Austria, were not at first won over by the arguments of the contestants, but were brought to an understanding, and John was finally set free to the quiet of his monastery to write the history of his own time. His chronicle, to which he himself gave the title of "Liber certarum historiae", has come down to us under various forms. In its original form, as preserved in a manuscript at Munich, it is a history of Austria and Karinthia from 1231 to 1341, and is based for the earlier period on the rhyming chronicle of Otto von Styria, while the rest was written from data which he himself had collected in the course of his travels.

This work was enlarged the following year (1342) into a chronicle of the empire, which began with the year 1217 (published by Bohrer, "Fontes rerum Germanicarum", I, 271-450; German translation by Friedensburg in the "Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit", Leipzig, 1888). Once more he rewrote it in 1343, and this time he began with the Carolingian period. This revised work has only reached us through later hands, the so-called "Chronicon Anonymi Leobiensis", published by Pez, "Scriptores rerum Austriacarum", I, 751-966. John ranks among the most important chroniclers of the end of the Middle Ages. He was a very learned man and well acquainted with the Latin and Greek poets. His narrative is lucid and his judgments on the events of his own time show great impartiality.
He is influenced by Otto of Freising, and condemned in his chronicle the anti-Roman policy of Emperor Louis the Bavarian (1314-47).

MAHRENHOLTZ, Uber Johann von Vicking als Historiker in Forschungen und Bilddarstellungen, XIII (Berlin, 1872), 525 sqq.; FOURNIER, Ab Johann von Vicking (Berlin, 1874); IDEM in Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, XIV (Munich, 1861), 476 sqq.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

John of Winterthur (Johannes Vütsouranunus histrian, b. about 1300 at Winterthur (Switzerland); d. subsequently to 1348, probably at Zurich. All that is known of his life is that he attended the school of his native town from 1309 to 1315, and that as a Franciscan he lived at Basle in 1326, at Villingen in 1336, and at Lindau from 1343 onwards. His chronicle (Chronicon a Friderico II Imperatore ad annum 1348) was first published by Ercard, "Corpus hist. medii aevi", I (1725); a better edition was provided by Füsslin, "Theodorus historiae Helveticae" (1735), but the best edition was given by Wyss in "Archiv für schweizerische Geschichte", XI (1856). It was translated into German by Freuler ("Johannes von Winterthür Chronik von der Stadt Winterthury in 1340, beginnend bis zu den aufs Äusserste wichtigen und berühmten Roesten und Vorkommnissen bis zu dem Jahre 1348") and into Latin by J. de Montfaucon, "Annales Helveticorum" (Paris, 1728). John's chronicle is a most useful source for the history of the time, as it contains records of events of the year 1340, and provides a basis for the study of the events of the year 1341.

On the 25th of November, 1347, the Duke of Burgundy, brother of King Charles VI, was murdered by assassins in the pay of John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy. The Duke of Burgundy was unpopular with the people and was held responsible for the disorders and the taxes. He was, however, a man of great power and influence, and the people had a great deal of sympathy for him. His death was a great loss to the kingdom, and his brother, the Duke of Burgundy, continued to rule the kingdom, but with a much reduced power. The University of Paris was bitterly opposed to him for having renewed obedience to Benedict XII. The Duke of Burgundy, on the contrary, was very popular; he was regarded as a friend of the common people and an opponent of taxation. John Parvus, who was a professor at the University of Paris, delivered a speech in which he praised the Duke of Burgundy. He said that the Duke was a man of great courage and bravery, and that he had done much for the country. He also praised the Duke's policy of taxation, which he thought was necessary to keep the country strong. John Parvus' speech was well received by the audience, and it was said that he had done much for the country.

There, in presence of the Dauphin, of the Duke of Anjou, King of Sicily, of Cardinal de Bar, of the Duke of Berry, of Brittany, of Lorraine, of the rector of the University of Paris, and of many counts, barons, knights, and citizens, John Parvus delivered on behalf of his client a pedantic address, bristling with propositions, syllogisms, Scriptural texts, and examples from Holy Writ. His argument may be expressed in the following syllogism: Whosoever is guilty of high treason and murder, and who is punished with death, all the more so when he is a near relative of the king; and in that case the natural, moral, and Divine laws allow any subject whatever, without any command or public authorization, to kill him or to have him killed, openly, or by stealth; and the more closely the author of the slaying is related to the king, the more meritorious is the act. Now, the Duke of Orleans—so ran the minor proposition—a slave to the passion of greed, the source of all evil, was guilty of high treason, and was a tyrant; which was proved by holding him guilty of all the pretended crimes which popular imagination and the particulars of the Duke of Burgundy laid to his charge. John Parvus was therefore that the Duke of Burgundy not only should not be punished or blamed for what had been done to the Duke of Orleans, but rather should be rewarded. This thesis seemed preposterous to the more rational members of the assembly, but the Duke of Burgundy was ready to accept any attempt at reply, and further he was in the good graces of the university; so he had no difficulty in obtaining letters of pardon from the king. As for John Parvus, who in his address was not ashamed to admit that he was receiving, and expected still to receive, a pension from the Duke of Burgundy, he was compelled to withdraw from Paris, and retire to the estate of the Duke of Burgundy at Hesdin, Artois, where he died in a house of his protector, regretting, it
is said, that he had ever allowed himself to defend such a proposition.

The interest it excited was not to die with him. As long as the Duke of Burgundy was all-powerful in Paris, the argument could not be attacked publicly, but when he was expelled, Gerson, in a sermon delivered before the king, strongly denounced seven propositions of John Parvus as heretical and scandalous (1413). Shortly afterwards the king asked the Bishop of Paris, Gérard de Montaigne, and the inquisitor to examine them and to take such action they judged proper—without however mentioning the name of John Parvus. The bishop and the inquisitor with sixty doctors went into what was called "a Council of the Faith". After several sittings the speech of John Parvus and nine propositions, said to have been extracted from it, were condemned (23 February, 1414) by decree of the Bishop of Paris and of the inquisitor, and the book containing them was publicly burnt three days later. In the month of March following, the Duke of Burgundy appealed from the decision of the Bishop of Paris to Pope John XXIII. The pope entrusted the investigation to the three cardinals. On the other hand Gerson and chief ambassadors of the King of France brought the affair before the council. At this juncture, Pope John XXIII left Constance (20 March, 1415) and withdrew from the council, while the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy made peace by the Treaty of Amiens (22 April, 1415). Thereupon Charles VI ordered his representatives to take no action at the council against John Parvus, provided the Duke of Burgundy would also let the matter rest. Gerson broke the agreement by trying to obtain from the council a declaration that the writings of John Parvus contained numerous errors in matters of faith. The Duke of Burgundy replied by a letter in which, while disavowing the general principles that formed the major proposition of the argument of John Parvus, he maintained that the propositions condemned by the Bishop of Paris were not contained in the discourse. Thereupon the three cardinals entrusted with the duke's appeal, cited the Bishop of Paris to appear before them, and as he failed to do so, they reversed his decision, declaring at the same time that they did not intend thereby to approve of the propositions condemned by him, but only wished to do justice to the bishop, who had not been heard at the trial. From that moment the trial of John Parvus became the battleground of the ambassadors of France and of the Duke of Burgundy, and even of the Emperor Sigismund. The council had no intention of lending its authority to any political party, and in its fifteenth session, 6 July, 1415, contented itself with a general condemnation of tyramicide as upheld in the following proposition: "A tyrant may be licitly and meritiously, and rightly put to death by any vassal or subject, even by resorting to secret plots, adulation, and feigned friendship, notwithstanding any oath of fealty to him or any judicial proceeding or judicial decree or order". But John Parvus was not mentioned and the council avoided saying that any such proposition was contained in his address, and no further decision was pronounced by the council on the particular case of John Parvus. After securing the condemnation of John Parvus in August, 1416, King Charles VI two years later disavowed Gerson and his supporters (6 October, 1418), and on 3 November, 1418, he rehabilitated John Parvus and annulled the sentences pronounced against him. This perhaps was the fairest settlement of the case against him. His venal and odious defence of the assassination is worthy of all censure, but in justice it must be admitted that the propositions attributed to him by his adversaries are not contained in his discourse, at least in the form in which it has reached us.

JOHN Payne, BLESSED, b. in the Diocese of Peterborough; d. at Chelmsford, 2 April, 1582. He went to Douai in 1574, was ordained priest by the Archbishop of Cambrai on 7 April, 1576, and left for England with Blessed George Godsalve on 24 April. He resided for the most part with Anne, widow of Sir William Petre, and daughter of Sir William Browne, sometime Lord Mayor of London, at Ingatestone, Essex, but also in London. Shortly after his arrival he reconciled George Godsalve, B.A., Oxon., a Marian deacon, of Bath diocese, whom he sent to Douai to be prepared for the priesthood, which he received at Cambrai on 20 December, 1576. John was arrested and imprisoned early in 1577, but, being not long afterwards discharged, came back to Douai in November. He probably returned to Ingatestone before Christmas 1577. In 1581, he and Godsalve, who had come to England in June, 1577, were arrested in Warwickshire through the instrumentality of "judas" Eliot, and, after being examined by Walsingham at Greenwich, were committed to the Tower on 14 July. There Blessed George was racked on 14 August, and again on 1 October. Eliot had accused him of plotting to kill the queen and her three most trusted statesmen. On this charge he was indicted at Chelmsford on 23 March, and, though no attempt was made to corrobate Eliot's story, the jury gave the verdict expected of them. At his execution the crowd interfered to prevent the infliction of the last barbarities until he was dead.


John B. Wainwright.

John Rochester, BLESSED, priest and martyr, born probably at Terling, Essex, England, about 1488; died at York, 11 May, 1537. He was the third son of John Rochester, of Thomond, and Grace, daughter of Sir Walter Writtle, of Bobbingworth. He joined the Carthusians, was a choir monk of the Charterhouse in London, and strenuously opposed the new doctrine of the royal supremacy. He was arrested and sent a prisoner to the Carthusian convent at Hull. From there he was removed to York, where he was hung in chains. With him there suffered one James Walworth (WAN- HERT; WALWERKE), Carthusian priest and martyr, concerning whom little or nothing is known. He may have been the "Jacobus Walweker" who signed the Oath of Succession of 1534. John Rochester was beheaded in 1585 by Leo XIII, his elder brother, Sir Robert Rochester, K. G. (b. about 1494; d. 28 Nov., 1557), was a zealous Catholic. Before 1551 he had received the appointment of comptroller of the household to Princess Mary Tudor. In that year the Privy Council ordered him to prevent any priest saying Mass in the princess's household, but he refused to interfere in any way with her private devotions, and was accordingly sent to the Tower. The next year he was allowed to retire to the country on account of his health, and was soon permitted to take up the post of comptroller once more. When the princess ascended the throne as Mary I, she remembered Rochester's faithful service to her and made him Warden of the Duchy of Lancaster; and he entered the inner circle of the Privy Council. He was one of the parliamentary representatives of Essex, 1553-5. He was buried at the Charterhouse at Sheen.
John Sarkander, Blessed, martyr of the seal of confession, b. at Skotschau in Austrian Silesia, 20 Dec., 1576; d. at Olmütz, 17 March, 1620. In 1603 he merited the title of master of philosophy at Prague, and after four years' study of theology was ordained priest at Graz. He exercised his sacred functions in several places in the Diocese of Olmütz, and was made parish priest (1613) of Belokowitz, and (1616) of Holleschau in Moravia. Since the fifteenth century the sects of the Hussites and of the Bohemian (or United) Brethren had spread rapidly and taken possession of the churches and institutions of the Catholics, but when (1604) Ladislaus PoppeI of Lobkowitz bought the church of Holleschau, he had the church taken over by the Catholics, and made a Jesuit college out of the house occupied by the Bohemian Brethren. With the aid of the Jesuits, John Sarkander converted two hundred and fifty of the stray sheep, but thereby drew upon himself the hatred of the neighbouring landlord, Bitowski of Bistritz. In 1618 the Protocols, seeking to drive the Jesuits out of Moravia, and John left Holleschau, made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady at Czentschau and passed a few weeks of retreat with the Minims, who had a house there. He spent some months at Krakow and (1619) returned to Holleschau. In February of the following year the Polish auxiliary troops sent to the emperor by King Sigismund passed through Moravia and committed many depredations on the lands of the Protestants, but spared Holleschau when John met them with the Blessed Sacrament in his hands. Bitowski threw suspicion upon John Sarkander as if he, in conspiracy with Lobkowitz, had brought the enemy into the territory. John was taken prisoner and brought to Olmütz. The commission appointed for the trial was made up entirely of Protestants, but the Catholic city judge Johann Scintilla was forced to attend. He made a report of the whole transaction to the bishop, Franz Cardinal von Dietrichstein (1623). The question put to them who had called the troops into the country: what underhand dealings John had practised in Poland; what had been confided to him by Lobkowitz, whose confessor he was, and whose secret plans he therefore knew. Because John would not violate the secrets of the holy tribunal the rack was used on 13, 17 and 18 February. On each of the latter days the tortures lasted for two and three hours, lighted candles and feathers soaked in oil, pitch, and sulphur were strewed over his body and ignited. He lingered from the effects for a month and died in prison. The people immediately began to venerate John Sarkander and to ask for his beatification. The process was initiated under Emperor Leopold I in 1725, and John was beatified in 1773. His body was translated to Constantiopole in the reign of Justinian I (527–65). In 565 Eutychius I of Constantinople was deposed, and John succeeded him. When John died in 577, Eutychius was restored. Before his elevation to the patriarchate John had already made a collection of canons. To save them from loss, he put them in a systematic order, such as the “Codex canonum” used by the Council of Chalcedon (451). Since the fifth century these collections had increased, and at last attempts were made to reduce them to a chronological order by a systematic one. Of such systematic arrangements that of John Scholasticus was, if not absolutely the first, at any rate the first of any importance. Between the years 540 and 580 he made what he called Κανόνες και Μετακανόνες. Pope Nicholas I (658–67), writing to Photius, alludes to it as “Concordia canonum.” The work contained fifty titles, each with the canons concerning the subject of the title. For instance, the first title is: “Of the honour towards patriarcas ordained by the Canons.” This is established by canons vii and vi of Nicea, ii of Constantinople I, viii of Ephesus. Altogether it is the compiler quoting the Apostolic canons, those of ten synods, and sixty-eight canons from St. Basil’s second and third letters to Amphicius. It is the first attempt to collect canons from the letters of the Fathers. The first edition contains 777 canons, arranged under fifty titles. After he became patriarch, John III enlarged his collection to sixty titles, and added to it eight more chapters from the “Novelle” of Justinian. Towards the end of the sixth century another author added twenty-five more chapters taken from both the Codex and the “Novelle,” concerning civil laws that affect Church matters. So the collection grew till it was finally enlarged into the “Nomocanon” (Συγκαταλειφθείς) of Photius.


Adrian Fortescue.

John Scotus Erigena. See Erigena, John Scotus.

John Short, Blessed. See Thomas Ford, Blessed.


Johnston, Richard Malcolm, educator, author, b. 8 March, 1822, at Powellton, Georgia, U. S. A.; d. at Baltimore, Maryland, 23 September, 1898. His father was a Baptist minister, and his early education was received at a country school and finished at Mercers College. After graduating there he spent a year teaching and then took up the study of law and was admitted to the bar in 1841. In 1858 he was appointed to the chair of belles-lettres in the State University of Georgia, retaining it until the opening of the Civil War, when he began a school for boys on his farm near Sparta. He kept coming during the war, serving also for a time on the staff of General E. B. Johnson, and helping to organize the state militia. At the close of the war he moved to Maryland, where he opened the Penn Lucy School for boys near Baltimore. One of his teaching staff here was the poet Sidney Lanier, who persuaded him to begin work for publication, although he was then over fifty years old. His first stories were collected in "The War was Much Talked About"; others to "The Century" followed, and became immediately popular. He had the knack of story-telling that depicted the lonely homes in the soil, quaint characters that filled the memories of his youth, and
he embalmed their fading images with facility and a faithful regard to accuracy that preserved the bourgeois type of old Middle Georgia. His style was serene and facile, mingling humour with moral philosophy. As a poet he had poetic sympathy with wise discrimination.

Johnston became a Catholic in 1875, accepting the truth after long hesitation. His wife Frances Manfield, of old New England stock, had been received into the Church six months previously. He relates that he was thirty years old when he first saw a priest, and that his first investigations into the Faith were during the "Know-Nothing" campaign of 1855, when he read some of Bishop England's and Newman's works to confute a political opponent. With his conversion the attendance at his school, which had been small, increased with Baptist parents, who, delighted, and gave it up and devoted himself entirely to literature—his popularity as a story writer having steadily increased—and to lecturing on literary topics. His published works include: "Dukesborough Tales" (1871-81), in which the impressions of his early school days in Georgia were elaborated; "Old Mark Langston" (1884); "Two Gray Turtles" (1885); "Mr. Absalom Billingslea and Other Georgia Folks" (1888); "The Primes" (1889); "Widow Guthrie" (1890); "Ogeechee Cross Riddles" (1899); "Old Times in New Georgia" (1897); a Life of Alexander H. Stephens with whom he had been associated in law practice (1875). At this time he was preparing his "History of Georgia," when he was commissioned by the University of Georgia to prepare an "Historical Sketch of English Literature" (1872), a text-book for advanced students, used in Johns Hopkins University, and other institutions at which he gave lecture courses. ARMSTRONG, in The Catholic World Magazine (New York, November, 1898); ALLISON, Dictionary of Authors, supplement, s. v.; National Cyclopaedia of American Biography, s. v.; The Catholic News (New York, September, 1898), bles.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

John Stone, Blessed, English martyr, executed at the Dane-John, Canterbury, probably in December, 1539, for denying the royal supremacy. He was an Austin Friar of Canterbury, and a doctor of divinity. He is probably the Austin Friar of whom Bishop Winthrop complained on 14 December, 1538, that "at all times he still held and still desired to die for it, that the king may not be head of the Church of England". When in prison before his martyrdom "after fervently investigated fasted and prayed, he heard no voice, but without seeing the presence of anyone, calling him by name and exhorting him to be of good courage and not to hesitate to suffer with constancy for the truth of the opinion which he had professed". CAMM, Ld. in The Catholic World Magazine (New York, 1894-5), 288; GARROX, Henry VIII and the English Monasteries (London, 1898), 521; STANTON, Menology of England and Wales (London and New York, 1897), 229, 347.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

John Story (or Storey), Blessed, martyr; b. 1564; d. at Tyburn, 1 June, 1571. He was educated at Oxford, and was president of Broadsates Hall, now Pembroke College, from 1537 to 1539. He entered Parliament as member for Hindon, Wilts, in 1547, and was imprisoned for opposing the Bill of Uniformity, 24 Jan.—2 March, 1548-9. On his release he retired with his family to Louvain, but after the accession of Queen Mary he returned to England (Aug. 1553), and became chancellor to Bishop Bonner. From 1553 to 1560 he sat for one or other parliamentary division of Wiltshire, and in the latter year he incurred the displeasure of Elizabeth for his outspoken opposition to the Bill of Supremacy. He was committed to the Fleet Prison (1560) but escaped and was arrested and imprisoned in the Marshalsea (1563). He once more made good his escape to Antwerp, where he renounced his English allegiance and became a Spanish subject. Under the Duke of Alva he held a position in the customs of Flanders until August, 1570, when he was kidnaped at Bergen-op-Zoon by Cecil's agents. He was brought to London and imprisoned in the Tower, where he was frequently racked, and on 26 May, 1571, he was, it is said, hit in Westminster Hall with a sword directed against the queen's life and for having while at Antwerp assisted the Northern rebels. The anti-Catholic order bore his tortures with fortitude, asserted over and over his innocence of the charges, but refused to make any further plea, on the ground that he was a foreigner, as his judges had no jurisdiction. The spectacle of this trial moved Edmund Campion, who was present in the Hall, to reconsider his own position and opened his eyes to his duty as a Catholic. Blessed John Story was condemned 27 May, and spent his last night in the Tower, preparing for a death which his persecutors made as barbarously cruel as it was possible.


JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

John Talia, Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria (481-482) at the time of the Monophysite troubles. He had been a monk in the Canopis and administrator (μητρας εκκλησιας) of the diocese under the Patriarch Timothy Salofoicius, who had sent him with Gennadius of Hermopolis as legate to the Emperor Zeno (474-491). Zeno was on very good terms with John Talia, in whom he reposed great confidence. He viewed with favor the appointment of Acacius of Constantinople (471-489), who had been his imperial enemy. Acacius afterwards said that Talia had sworn that he would not accept the patriarchate. Just before his death, Timothy Salofoicius again sent John Talia to Constantinople with the petition that when he, Timothy, died he might have a Catholic (Chalcedonian) successor. This time, too, Talia enjoyed the Emperor's favor. Zeno promised all he asked and spoke with great admiration of Timothy's piouslegate. But Talia ignored Acacius, who shut himself up and awaited his chance of revenge. Talia made friends among the courtiers and ingratiating himself essentially with Illus, administrator of the palace. As soon as Timothy died (481) the Catholics of Alexandria chose John Talia to succeed him. Unfortunately the new patriarch then offended the emperor and gave Acacius his chance. He announced his succession at once to Rome and Antioch, according to custom. But he sent no announcement to the Patriarch of Constantinople, only writing to Illus begging him to tell the emperor. Illus was away at Antioch; so people at Constantinople heard the news before the official announcement arrived. This Zeno took as a personal affront. Acacius then took the opportunity to take the situation. He persuaded Zeno that Talia had broken his oath in accepting election and had advised his clergy to restore the name of the great Monophysite champion, Dioscorus, to their diptychs. This accusation was sheer calumny. Talia was always uncompromisingly orthodox. Zeno then refused to acknowledge Talia and supported his rival Peter Mungus.

Peter Mongus (Μουγος, hoarse) was a Monophysite who had already been set up as patriarch by his party when Timothy Alluros died (477). During the life of Salofoicius he had not made much headway; but now he was again brought forward by the Monophysites as rival patriarch to Talia. Acacius had formerly been an enemy of Mongus; now he and the emperor supported him. The situation was further complicated by the publication of the famous "Henoticon" (482),
by which Zeno and Acacius hoped to conciliate the Monophysites (see HENOTICON). Peter Mongus ac-
cepted it at once, whereas Talaia rejected it. Zeno then wrote to the pope (Simplicius, 463–483), saying
that Talaia was unworthy of the See of Alexandria, being a perjurer and friend of Dioscorus, that Mongus
was the right man to be patriarch. A result of this let-
ter was that the Holy See devoted itself to Talaia.
Talaia. But the pope answered the emperor, refusing to admit Mongus as patriarch in any case.
Zeno, however, ordered the governor (dux) of Egypt
to expel Talaia and establish Mongus in his place.
Mongus then sent notice of his succession to Rome,
Antioch, and Constantinople of inus acknowledged
him and inserted his name in the Byzantine diplomas.
Talaia, expelled from Alexandria, fled to Rome in 483.
He there explained the whole situation to the pope and
persuaded him to write two letters to Acacius den-
nouncing Mongus. So also he advised the
controversy about Mongus and the "Henoticon" that led
to the Acacian schism. Mongus from this time be-
came the great subject of dispute. Communion with
him meant Monophysitism. John Talaia practically
disappeared from the field. He stayed at Rome under
the pope's protection (always of course opposed to Mongus.
The "Henoticon" was not the papal fault with his advice and knowledge of Eastern affairs.
Liberatus thinks he became Bishop of Nolana in the
Campagna; Lequien thinks this unlikely (Orients
Christ., II, 419). Under Gelasius I (492–496) Ta-
laia's name still occurs as that of a counsellor whose
advice the pope willingly followed. He was never
able to go back to his own see and died at Rome at a
date unknown.

It may be of interest to note that Paul Drews ("Zur
Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der röm. Messe", Tübingen, 1902) attributes the present ar-
rangement of the Canon of the Mass in some measure to
John Talaia of Alexandria. His thesis is this: Originally the order of the Canon corresponded to
the Antiochene Anaphora. It was re-arranged in the
fifth century to make it conform more or less to the
Alexandrine Liturgy, most probably by Gelasius I by
his influence. Lequien (Orients Christ., II, 417–419.
All the historians of Monophysitism and the Acacian schism contain
nomen Liberatus, Historia et Historia eucaristica,
Epirusianorum et Eutychianorum in P. L., LXVII, 992–1032; Evd.
Hieron., Historia ecclesiast., III, vii sqq., in P. G., LXXVI;
H. E., vita Liberati et Hieronimi, in P. G., LXXXIII, 930;
HERGENROTHER, Handbuch der altchristlichen Kirchengeschichte,

ADRIAN FORTESECUE

John the Almsgiver (JOANNEIS ELEMEMOSYNARIUS; JOANNEIS MISERICORS), SAINT, Patriarch of Alex-
andria (606–16), b. at Amathus in Cyprus about 550;
d. there, 616. He was the son of one Ephiphanus,
governor of Cyprus, and of noble descent; in his early
life he was married and had children, but they
and his wife soon died, whereupon he entered the
religious life.

On the death of the Patriarch Theodorus, the
Alexandrians besought Emperor Phocas to appoint
John his successor, which was accordingly done.
In his youth John had had a vision of a beauti-
ful maiden with a garland of olives on her head, who
said that she was Compassion, the eldest daughter
of the Great King. This had evidently made a deep
impression on John's mind, and, now that he had the
opportunity of exercising benevolence, he soon became widely known all over the East for his
munificent liberality towards the poor. One of the
first steps he took was to make a list of several thou-
sand needy persons, whom he took under his especial
care. He always referred to the poor as his "lords
and masters," because of their mighty influence at the
Court of the Most High. He assisted people of every
class who were in need. A shipwrecked merchant was
thus helped three times, on the first two occasions
apparently without doing him much good; the third
time however, John fitted him out with a ship and a
cargo of wheat, and by favourable winds he was taken
as far as Britain, where, as there was a shortage of
wheat, he obtained his own price. Another person,
who was not really in need, applied for alms and was
detected by the officers of the palace; but John merely
said "Give unto him; he may be Our Lord in dis-
guise." He visited the hospitals three times every
week, and he freed a great many slaves. He was
a reformer who attacked simony, and fought heresy by
teaching and instruction. He also reorganized the system of weights and measures for the sake of the poor, and put a stop to corruption among the officers. He increased the number of
churches in Alexandria from seven to seventy.

John is said to have devoted the entire revenues of
his see to the alleviation of those in need. A rich man
presented him with a magnificent bed-covering; he
accepted it for one night, but then sold it, and dis-
posed of the money in alms. The rich man "bought in"
the article, and again presented it to John, with the
same result. This was repeated several times; but
John drily remarked: "We will see who tires first."
It was not long before the man realized that he had
caused his own grave to be dug, but only partly so,
and appointed a servant to come before him on all
state occasions and say "My Lord, your tomb is
unfinished; pray give orders for its completion, for
you know not the hour when death may seize you."

When the Persians sucked Jerusalem in 614, John
sent large supplies of food, wine, and money to the
fleeing Christians. But eventually the Persians
occupied Alexandria, and John himself in his old
age was forced to flee to his native country, where
he died.

His body was brought to Constantinople, thence to
Oken by King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary;
travelling to 1530 to Toll near Priburg, and finally
in 1632 to Priburg cathedral. He was the original
patron saint of the Hospitaliers, and was commemor-
ated by the Greeks on 12 Nov. His life, written
by Leontius (C.I., cited., p. 85), was translated into
Latin by Anastasio Libri, at the end of the 16th
century and was referred to at the Seventh General
Council.

SCHRODL in Kirchenlex., s. v. Johannes, des Almosengebers; BURHAK, Lives of the Saints, 1887, 305; MERCIER in Dict. Chr. Bio., s. v. Johannes (15); MIGNES, P. G., XVIII, CVIII; LEQUIEN, Orients Christ., II, 445; PALAPAX Y
MENDEZ, Pala de S. Juan (Madrid, 1762).

C. P. WEMSTY BROWN
us regarding the Precursor’s popularity, together with a few details of minor importance, are worthy of the historian’s attention. The same cannot be said of the apocryphal gospels, because the scant information they give of the Precursor is either copied from the canonical Gospels (and to the eyes of no authority), or else is a mass of idle vagaries.

Zachary, the father of John the Baptist, was a priest of the course of Abia, the eighth of the twenty-four courses into which the priests were divided (1 Par. xxiv, 2). Elizabeth, the mother of John, was of the daughters of Aaron,” according to St. Luke (i, 6); the same Evangelist, a few verses farther on (i, 26), calls her the “cousin” (μαρίθα) of Mary. These two statements appear to be conflicting, for how, it will be asked, could a cousin of the Blessed Virgin be “of the daughters of Aaron”? The problem might be solved by adopting the reading given in an old Persian version, where we find “mother’s sister” (μητριτή δεκάδη) instead of “cousin.”

A somewhat analogous explanation, probably borrowed from some apocryphal writing, and perhaps correct, is given by St. Hippolytus (in Nisecop. II. 9). Mary, Saba, and Elisabet, the predecessors: Mary, Saba, and Mary. The oldest, married a man of Bethlehem and was the mother of Salome; Saba married at Bethlehem also, but a “son of Levi”, by whom she had Elizabeth; Ann wedded a Galilean (Joschim) and bore Mary, the Mother of God. Thus Salome, Elizabeth, and the Blessed Virgin were first cousins, and Elizabeth, “of the daughters of Aaron” on her father’s side, was, on her mother’s side, the cousin of Mary. Zachary’s home is designated only in a vague manner by St. Luke: it was “a city of Juda,” “in the hill-country” (i, 39). Relying on the unwaranted assumption that Juda might be a misspelling of the name, proposed to read in its stead Justin (Jos., xv, 55; xxxi, 16; D.V.; Jota, Jeta), a priestly town south of Hebron. But priests did not always live in priestly towns (Mathathias’s home was at Modin; Simon Machabeus’s at Gaza). A tradition, which can be traced back to the time before the Crusades, points to the little town of Ain-Karim, five miles south-west of Jerusalem.

The birth of the Precursor was announced in a most striking manner. Zachary and Elizabeth, as we learn from St. Luke, were both just before God, having been selected to bring forth a saint and to be the parents of the Lord without blame; and they had no son, for that Elizabeth was barren” (i, 6-7). Long they had prayed that their union might be blessed with offspring; but, now that “they were both advanced in years,” the reproach of barrenness bore heavily upon them. And it came to pass, when he executed the priestly function in the order of his course before God, according to the custom of the priestly office, it was his lot to offer incense, going into the temple of the Lord. And all the multitude of the people was praying without, at the hour of incense. And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord, standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And Zachary seeing him, was troubled, and fear fell upon him. But the angel said to him: Fear not, Zachary, for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John: and he shall be great before the Lord; and shall drink no wine nor strong drink: and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb. And he shall be in the sight of all people a sign and a wonder in the eyes of God. And he shall turn the hearts of the fathers unto the children, and the inconstant to the wisdom of the just, to prepare unto the Lord a perfect people (i, 8-17). As Zachary was slow in believing this startling prediction, the angel, making himself known to him, announced that, in punishment of his incredulity, he should be stricken with dumbness until the promise was fulfilled. “And it came to pass, after the days of his oath, he departed to his own house. And after those days, Elizabeth his wife conceived, and hid herself five months” (i, 23-24).

Now during the sixth month, the Annunciation had taken place, and, as Mary had heard from the angel the fact of her conception, she went “with haste” to congratulate her. “And it came to pass, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the infant”—filled, like the mother, with the Holy Ghost—“leaped for joy in her womb” as, to acknowledge the presence of his Lord. Then was accomplished the prophecetic utterance of the angel that the child should “be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother’s womb.” Now as the presence of the angel’s visitation. No sin whatever is incompatible with the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the soul, it follows that at this moment John was cleansed from the stain of original sin. When “Elizabeth’s full time of being brought forth a son” (i, 57); and “on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child, and they called him by his father’s name Zachary. And his mother answering, said: Not so, but he shall be called John. And they said to her: There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name. And they made signs to his father, how he should be named. And demanding a writing table, he wrote, saying: John is his name. And they all wondered” (i, 59-63). They were not aware that no better name could be applied (John, Hebr.: Jehovah, i.e. “Jahweh hath mercy”) to him who, as his father prophesied, was to “go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways: to give knowledge of salvation to his people, unto remission of their sins: through the bowels of the mercy of our God” (i, 76-78). Moreover, all these events, to wit, a child born to an aged couple, Zachary’s sudden dumbness, his equally sudden recovery of speech, his astounding utterance, might justly strike with wonderment the assembled neighbours; these could hardly help asking: “What one, think ye, shall this child be?” (i, 66).

As to the date of the birth of John the Baptist, nothing can be said with certainty. The Gospel suggests that the Precursor was born about six months before Christ; but the year of Christ’s nativity has not so far been ascertained. Nor is there anything certain about the season of Christ’s birth, for it is well known that the assignation of the feast of Christmas to the twenty-fifth of December is not grounded on historical evidence, but is possibly suggested by merely astronomical considerations, also, perhaps, inferred from astronomico-theological reasons. Besides, no calculations can be based upon the time of the year when the course of Abia was serving in the Temple, since each one of the twenty-four courses of priests had two turns a year. John’s early life St. Luke tells us that “this child grew, and was strengthened in spirit; and was in the deserts, until the day of his manifestation to Israel” (i, 80). Should we ask just when the Precursor went into the wilderness, an old tradition echoed by Paul Warnefried (Paul the Deacon), in the hymn, “Ut quanta laxitis,” composed in Sicily, and known as a more answer hardly more definite than the statement of the Gospel: “Antra deserti tenebris sub annis… petit…” Other writers, however, thought they knew better. For instance, St. Peter of Alexandria believed St. John was taken into the desert to escape the wrath of Herod, who, if we may believe a report, was impelled by fear of losing his kingdom to seek the life of the Precursor, just as he was, later on, to seek that of the new-born Saviour. It was added also
that Herod on this account had Zachary put to death between the temple and the altar, because he had publicly called the Messiah (Baron. "Antiq." Biurilical). Up to this he had led in the desert the life of an anchoress; now he comes forth to deliver his message to the world. "In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar ... the word of the Lord was made unto John, the son of Zachary, in the desert. And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching" (Luke, iii, 1-3), clothed not in the soft garments of a courtier (Matt., xi, 8; Luke, vii, 24), but in those "of camel's hair, and a leather girdle about his loins"; and "his meat"—he looked as if he came neither eating nor drinking (Matt., xi, 18; Luke, vii, 33)—"was locusts and wild honey" (Matt., iii, 4; Mark, i, 6); his whole life in countenance, far from suggesting the idea of a reed shaken by the wind (Matt., xi, 7; Luke, vii, 24), manifested undaunted constancy. A few incredulous scoffers feigned to be scandalised: "He hath a devil" (Matt., xi, 18). Nevertheless, "Jerusalem and all Judaea, and all the country about Jordan" (Matt., iii, 5), drawn by his strong and winning personality, went out to him; the austerity of his life added immensely to the weight of his words; for the simple folk, he was truly a prophet (Matt., xi, 9; cf. Luke, i, 76, 77). "Do penance: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt., iii, 2), such was the burden of his teaching. Men of all conditions flocked round him.

Pharisees and Sadducees were there; the latter attracted perhaps by curiosity and scepticism, the former expecting possibly a word of praise for their multitudinous customs and practices, and all, probably, more anxious to see which of the rival sects the new prophet would commend than to seek instruction. But John laid bare their hypocrisy. Drawing his similes from the surrounding scenery, and even, after the Oriental fashion, making use of a play on words, he dares to say of the "Baptist" (Matt., iii, 4), he takes to task the well-deserved rebuke: "Ye brood of vipers, who hath shewed you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of penance. And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham for our father. For I tell you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham. For now the axe is laid to the root of the trees. Every tree therefore that doth not yield good fruit, shall be cut down, and cast into the fire" (Matt., iii, 7-10; Luke, iii, 7-9). It was clear something had to be done. The men of good will among the listeners asked: "What shall we do?" (Probably some were very gay and, according to the custom of people in such circumstances, were clad in two tunics—Joseph., "Antiq." XVII, v, 7.) "And he answering, said to them: He that hath two coats, let him give to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do in like manner" (Luke, ii, 11). Some were publicans; on them he enjoined not to exact more than the rate of taxes fixed by law (Luke, iii, 13). To the soldiers (probably Jewish police officers) he recommended not to do violence to any man, nor falsely to denounce anyone, and to be content with their pay (Luke, iii, 14). In other words, he cautioned them against taxation in general, saying: "Ye do the works of stringent justice" (Luke, iii, 13). The Fathers of the Church answer very appropriately that this was the occasion preordained by the Father when Jesus should be manifested to the world as the Son of God; then again, by submitting to it, Jesus sanctioned the baptism of John. "But John stayed privately in the country of Juda, he said: "I am not he; but he that shall come after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry"" (Luke, iii, 16-17). Whatever John may have meant by this baptism "with fire", he, at all events, in this declaration clearly defined his relation to the One to come.

Here it will not be amiss to touch on the scene of the Predecessor's ministry. The locality should be sought in part of the Jordan valley (Luke, iii, 2) which is called the desert (Mark, i, 4). Two places are mentioned in the Fourth Gospel in this connection: Bethania (John, i, 28) and Ennon (A. V. Esonon, John, iii, 23). As to Bethania, the reading Bethabara, first given by Origen, should be discarded; but the Alexandrine scholar perhaps was less wrong in suggesting the other reading, Bethabara, possibly a Greek derivative of Bethany (Bethania). As to Ennon, it must be looked for "beyond the Jordan" (John, i, 28). The second place, Ennon, "near Salim" (John, iii, 23), the extreme northern point marked in the Madaba mosaic map, is described in Eusebius's "Onomasticon" as being eight miles south of Seeythys (Seiyyit) and should be sought probably at Ed-Deir or El-Fatir; an ancient site is named in the Jordan (Lagrange, in "Revue Biblique", IV, 1895, pp. 502-05). Moreover, a long-standing tradition, traced back to A.D. 333, associates the activity of the Predecessor, particularly the Baptism of the Lord, with the neighbourhood of Deir Mar-Yuhana (Qasr el-Yedd).

The Predecessor had been preaching and baptising for some time (just how long is not known), when Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan, to be baptized by him. Why, it might be asked, should He "who did no sin" (I Pet., ii, 22) seek John's "baptism of penance for the remission of sins" (Luke, iii, 3)? The Fathers of the Church answer very appropriately that this was the occasion preordained by the Father when Jesus should be manifested to the world as the Son of God; then again, by submitting to it, Jesus sanctioned the baptism of John. "But John stayed privately in the country of Juda, he said: "I am not he; but he that shall come after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry"" (Luke, iii, 16-17). These words, implying, as they do, that John knew Jesus, are in seeming conflict with a later declaration of John recorded in the Fourth Gospel: "I knew him not" (John, i, 33). Most interpreters take it that the Predecessor had some intimation of Jesus being the
left their business to devote themselves exclusively to the Gospel or its preparation, there is clearly no absolute discordance between the narration of the first three Gospels and that of St. John.

The Precursor, now, took the laymen of several months, again appears on the scene, and he is still preaching and baptizing on the banks of the Jordan (John, i, 23). Jesus, in the meantime, had gathered about Himself a following of disciples, and He came "into the land of Judea: and there He abode with them, and baptized" (John, iii, 22).—"What! though the disciples of John came not to him? "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond the Jordan, to whom thou gavest testimony, beheld he baptized, and all men come to him" (John, iii, 26–27). They undoubtedly meant that Jesus should give way to John who had recommended Him, and that, by baptizing, He was encroaching upon the rights of John. "John answered and said: A man cannot receive any thing, unless it be given him from heaven. You yourselves do bear me witness, that I said, I am not Christ, but that I am sent before him. He that hath the bride is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy, therefore, is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease. He that cometh from above is above all. He that is of the earth, of the earth he is, and of the earth he speaketh. He that cometh from heaven, is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth: . . ." (John, iii, 27–36).

The above narration recalls the fact before mentioned (John, i, 28), that part of the Baptist's ministry was exercised in Perea: Ennon, another scene of his labours, was within the borders of Galilee, both Perea and Galilee made up the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas. This prince, a son worthy of his father Herod the Great, had married, likely for political reasons, the daughter of Aretas, king of the Nabatæans. But on a visit to Rome, he fell in love with his niece Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Philip, and marrying her, he caused her husband to be beheaded and to come on to Galilee. When and where the Precursor met Herod, we are not told, but from the synoptic Gospels we learn that John dared to rebuke the tetrarch for his evil deeds, especially his public adultery. Herod, swayed by Herodias, did not allow the unwelcome renouncer to go unpunished. He "sent and apprehended John and bound him in prison". Josephus tells us quite another story, containing perhaps also an element of truth. "As great crowds clustered around John, Herod became afraid lest the Baptist should abuse his moral authority over them to incite them to rebuke or to rebuke anything at his bidding; therefore he thought it wiser, so as to prevent possible happenings, to take away the dangerous preacher . . . and he imprisoned him in the fortress of Macherus" (Antiq., XVIII, v, 2). Whatever may have been the chief motive of the tetrarch's policy, it is certain that Herodias nourished a bitter hatred against John: "She laid snares for him: and was desirous to put him to death" (Mark, vii, 19). Although Herod first shared her desire, yet "he feared the people: because they esteemed him as a prophet" (Matt., xiv, 5). After that time this rest at Macherus "he was not heard of any more of him". (John, xii, 4). The question: have abated, for, according to Mark, vi, 19, 20, he heard John willingly and did many things at his suggestion.

John, in his letters, was attended by some of his disciples, who kept him in touch with the events of
the day. He thus learned of the wonders wrought by Jesus. At this point it cannot be supposed that John’s faith wavered in the least. Some of his disciples, however, would not be convinced by his word. So Jesus was the Messiah was the Messias and sent them to Jesus, bidding them say: “John the Baptist hath sent us to thee, saying: Art thou he that art to come; or look we for another? (And in that same hour, he cured many of their diseases, and hurts, and evil spirits; and to many that were blind he gave sight.) And answering, he said to them: Go at once to John what you have heard and seen: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are made clean, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, to the poor the gospel is preached: and blessed is he whosoever shall not be scandalized in me” (Luke, vii, 20–23; Matt., xi, 9–15).

How this interview affected John’s disciples, we do not know; but we do know the encomium it occasioned of John from the lips of Jesus: “And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak to the multitudes concerning John. What went ye out into the desert to see? A reed shaken with the wind? But why see ye no figure of power full of glory, and that in his captivity he was more than ever the undaunted champion of truth and virtue.—But what went you out to see? A man clothed in soft garments? Behold they that are in costly apparel, and live delicately, are in the houses of kings. But what see ye out to see? A prophet? Yes, I say you, and more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. For I say to you: Amongst those that are born of women, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist” (Luke, vii, 24–28). And continuing Jesus pointed out the inconsistency of the world in its opinions both of himself and his precursor: “John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and you say: He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking: and you say: Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified by all her children” (Luke, vii, 33–35).

St. John languished probably for some time in the fortress of Macheraus; but the ire of Herodias, unlike that of Herod, never abated: she watched her chance. It came at the birthday feast which Herod, after Rome’s fashion, gave to the “princes and chief men of Galilee. And when the daughter of the same Herodias [Josephus gives her name: Salome] had come in, and had danced, and pleased Herod and them that were at table with him, the king said to the damsel: Ask of me what thou wilt, and I will give it thee. And she said: Give me here this head of John the Baptist” (Luke, ix, 7–9). This is the moment when the account given in the Synoptic Gospels is reversed. In the Synoptics, it is after the time Herod had banished John to the desert that he患病, and that John’s disciples, hearing of his death, “came, and took his body, and laid it in a tomb” (Mark, vi, 29), “and came and told Jesus” (Matt., xiv, 12).

The last impression made by the Precursor upon those who had come within his influence cannot be better illustrated than by mentioning the awe which seized upon Herod when he heard of the wonders wrought by Jesus; who, in his mind, was no other than John the Baptist come to life (Matt., xiii, 57). The Precursor’s influence did not die with him. It was far-reaching, too, as we learn from Acts, xviii, 25; xix, 3, where we find that proselytes at Ephesus had received from Apollo and others the baptism of John. Moreover, early Christian writers speak of a sect taking its name from John what you have heard and seen: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are made clean, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, to the poor the gospel is preached: and blessed is he whosoever shall not be scandalized in me” (Luke, vii, 20–23; Matt., xi, 9–15).

How this interview affected John’s disciples, we do not know; but we do know the encomium it occasioned of John from the lips of Jesus: “And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak to the multitudes concerning John. What went ye out into the desert to see? A reed shaken with the wind? But why see ye no figure of power full of glory, and that in his captivity he was more than ever the undaunted champion of truth and virtue.—But what went you out to see? A man clothed in soft garments? Behold they that are in costly apparel, and live delicately, are in the houses of kings. But what see ye out to see? A prophet? Yes, I say you, and more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written: Behold, I send my angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. For I say to you: Amongst those that are born of women, there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist” (Luke, vii, 24–28). And continuing Jesus pointed out the inconsistency of the world in its opinions both of himself and his precursor: “John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and you say: He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking: and you say: Behold a man that is a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners. And wisdom is justified by all her children” (Luke, vii, 33–35).

St. John languished probably for some time in the fortress of Macheraus; but the ire of Herodias, unlike that of Herod, never abated: she watched her chance. It came at the birthday feast which Herod, after Rome’s fashion, gave to the “princes and chief men of Galilee. And when the daughter of the same Herodias [Josephus gives her name: Salome] had come in, and had danced, and pleased Herod and them that were at table with him, the king said to the damsel: Ask of me what thou wilt, and I will give it thee. And she said: Give me here this head of John the Baptist” (Luke, ix, 7–9). This is the moment when the account given in the Synoptic Gospels is reversed. In the Synoptics, it is after the time Herod had banished John to the desert that he患病, and that John’s disciples, hearing of his death, “came, and took his body, and laid it in a tomb” (Mark, vi, 29), “and came and told Jesus” (Matt., xiv, 12).
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day of triumph. The celebration of the Decolla-
tion of John the Baptist, on 29 August, enjoys almost the same antiquity. We find also in June the
maundy Thursday in the Roman liturgy of the Consecration of the Precursor on 24 September. But the most
solemn celebration in honour of this saint was always that of his Nativity, preceded until recently by a
fast. Many places adopted the custom introduced by St. Sabas of having a double Office on this day, as
on 16 June, the feast of St. John the Baptist. The Office, intended to signify the time of the law and
the Prophets which lasted up to St. John (Luke, xvi,
16), began at sunset, and was chanted without Alleluia; the second, meant to celebrate the opening of the
time of grace, and gladdened by the singing of
Alleluia, was held during the night. The resem-
bliance of the feast of St. John with that of Christmas was carried farther, for another feature of the 24th
of June was the celebration of the three masses:
the first, in the dead of night, recalled his mission
of Precursor; the second, at daybreak, commemorated
the baptism he conferred; and the third, at the hour of
This last, quite like the others, daily, repeatedly enriched by the
additions of several popes, was in suggestive sens and beauty on a
par with the liturgy of Christmas. So sacred
was St. John’s day deemed that two rival armies,
meeting face to face on 23 June, by common accord
set about to complete the battle under the
feast (Battle of Fontenay, 841). “Joy, which is the
characteristic of the day, radiated from the sacred
precincts. The lovely summer nights, at St. John’s
tide, gave free scope to popular display of lively
faith among various nationalities. Scarce had the
last rays of the setting sun died of the Roman Chil
world over, immense columns of flame arose from
every mountain-top, and in an instant, every town,
and village, and hamlet was lighted up” (Guéranger).
The custom of the “St. John’s fires”, whatever its origin, has, in certain regions, endured unto this day.
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CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

John the Deacon (JOHANNES DIACONUS).—Among
the writers of the Middle Ages who bear this name, four
historians deserve particular mention on account of
the importance of their work. In chronological or
der they are as follows:—

(1) John, deacon of Rome, date of birth unknown;
d. before 882. Johannes, surnamed Hymonides, was
from the middle of the ninth century a monk of
Monte Cassino, and later a deacon of the Roman
Church. Possessed of an considerable learning, he
was closely associated with the learned Anastasius,
Librarian of the Roman Church (d. 879), and at the
instance of John VIII (872-82) wrote a life of St.
Gregory the Great, making use of the works of this
popes of this time in the church of the Roman
City. The work is divided into four books: in the first he
first gives an account of the life of Gregory up to the
time of his pontificate; in the second, of his activities
as pope; in the third, of his teachings; and in the fourth,
of his progress in perfection. The life is edited by
Mabillon (Acta SS., ord. S. Benedicti I, 396-406)
and P. L. LXXV, 50 sqq.). He intended to write also a detailed history of
the Church, and at his request the aforesaid Anas-
tasius compiled a history in three parts (tripartita)
from Greek sources for the use of John, whose
purpose, however, was never executed. On the invitation
of Bishop Gaudericus of Vellétri (867-79), he under-
took to re-edit the "Gesta Clementis", a life of Clem-
ent II, himself the son of a great man and a close
relative of the Popes who had lived in the 7th cen-
tury. The text of the famous "Vita S. Clementis", the
"Virginianus", "Vir illustris", treats of the ceremonies
of baptism; it is not however, the work of the John
mentioned here, but of an old deacon of this name (ed.
P. L., LIX, 399-408).
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(2) John, deacon of Naples, d. after 910. This dea-
con, or head of a diaconia at the church of St. Janu-
arius of Naples, flourished towards the end of the
ninth and the beginning of the tenth century, and
can from his writings appears to have been a very learned
and accomplished cleric. We owe to him several hi-
storical works, which are among the most important
sources of information for the history of his time. He
first wrote a continuation of the diocesan history of
Naples (Gesta episcoporum Neapolitanorum), begun by
another cleric, who died about 890, and finished by
John to 872. He makes use of both written and oral
tradition, and contributes from personal knowledge.
The narrative is graphic and spirited, and impresses the
reader as a frank and accurate story (ed. Waits in
CAPASSO, "Monumenta ad Neapolitani du-
307 sqq.). He also wrote a history of the trans-
lation in the fifth century of the remains of St. Sev-
erius, the Apostle of Naricum, from the Castellum
Lucullanum near Naples to a new monastery within
the city. This work contains the important account
of the destruction of Taormina in Sicily by the Sam-
cens under Ibrahim, and of the martyrdom of Bishop
in 910 the relics of St. Sossius, a companion of St. Jan-
uarius, were transferred from the ruined monastery
at Naples, John wrote a history of St. Januarius and his
companions, in which, as an eye-witness he describes the aforesaid transfer (Acta SS., Sept. VI, 874 sqq.; the text of the "Translatio"
alone is found in Waits, loc. cit., 459-63). A biogra-
phy of St. Nicholas of Mira (ed. in "Spiegelum Romanum", IV, 223 sqq.) is not by this
John but by another author of the same name.
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(3) John, deacon of Venice, d. after 1008. The
oldest chronicle of Venice, formerly known as the
"Chronicon Sagornini", was compiled by a deacon
John, the chaplain and perhaps a relative of Doge
Peter II Urseolus (991-1009). John enjoyed the con-
dom of this great dux, and was often sent as his
ambassador to Emperors Otto III and Henry II.
In the first part of his chronicle, which deals with the
early period of the republic, the narrative is often con-
fused and deficient; later it becomes more accurate
and complete, and for the time in which the writer
himself lived it is particularly significant. The narra-
tive to 1008 and treats in detail of the reign
SS.", VII, 1-36; ed. Monticoli, "Cronache Veneziane antichissime" I (1890), 59-171, in "Fonti per la
storia d’Italia", IX). John has also been credited,
but erroneously, with the "Chronicon Gradenae";
which is in the manuscripts usually given with "Chronicon Venetum".
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(4) John, a Roman deacon, lived in the second half of the twelfth century. This deacon and canon of the Lateran compiled a work on this papal basilica, and dedicated it, in the preface, to Alexander III (1159-81), thereby indicating the date of its composition. It was obviously a secondary object of the author in composing this work to support the canons of the Lateran in their dispute for precedence with the canons of Peter's (ed. Mahillon, "Her Halicarnas," II, 560-76; P. L., CXCVI, 1453-50).


J. P. KIRCH.

JOHN the Evangelist. SAINT.—I. NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNTS.—John was the son of Zebedee and Salome, and the brother of James the Greater. In the Gospel the provinces there are often referred to by their father "the sons of Zebedee" and received from Christ the honourable title of "Boanerges," i.e. "sons of thunder" (Mark, iii, 17). Originally they were fishermen and fished with their father in the Lake of Geneareth. According to the usual and entirely probable explanation of this name, John was a disciple of John the Baptist, and were called by Christ from the circle of John's followers, together with Peter and Andrew, to become His disciples (John, i, 35-42). The first disciples returned with their new Master from the Jordan to Galilee and apparently both John and the others remained for some time with Jesus (cf. John, ii, 12, 22; iv, 2, 8, 27 sqq.). Yet after the second return from Judea John and his companions went back again to their trade of fishing until he and they were called by Christ to definitive discipleship (Matt., iv, 18-22; Mark, i, 16-20). In the lists of the Apostles John has the second place (Acts, i, 12), the third (Mark, iii, 17), and the fourth (Matt., x, 3; Luke, vi, 14), yet always after James with the exception of a few passages (Luke, viii, 51; ix, 28 in the Greek text; Acts, i, 13).

From James being thus placed first, the conclusion is drawn that John was the younger of the two brothers. In any case John had a prominent position in the Apostolic body. Peter, James, and he were the only witnesses of the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mark, v, 37), of the Transfiguration (Matt., xvi, 1), and of the Agony in Gethsemanii (Matt., xxvii, 37). Only he and Peter were sent into the city to make the preparation for the Last Supper (Luke, xxii, 8). At the Supper itself his place was next to Christ on Whose breast he leaned (John, xii, 23, 25). According to the general interpretation John was also that "other disciple" who with Peter followed Christ after the arrest into the palace of the high priest (John, xxi, 5-18). "This disciple he testifies" (Freiburg, 1903, 295 sqq., 299 sqq., opposes this view). John alone remained near his beloved Master at the foot of the Cross on Calvary with the Mother of Jesus and the pious women, and took the desolate Mother into his care as the last legacy of Christ (John, xix, 25-27). After the Resurrection John with Peter was the first of the disciples to hasten to the grave and he was the first to believe that Christ had truly risen (John, xx, 2-10). When later Christ appeared at the Lake of Genesareth John was also the first of the seven disciples present who recognized his Master standing on the shore (John, xxi, 7). The Fourth Evangelist (John, xxi, 15-25) says: "And Jacobus the leucophoros, "the ancient," "the old"; Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, also uses the same name to designate the "Presbyter John" as, in addition to Ariost, his particular authority, directly after he has named the presbyters Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthias in Egypt (in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., xxxix, 4). Eusebius was the first to draw, on account of these words of Papias, the distinction between a Presbyter John and the Apostle John, and this distinction was also spread in Western Europe by St.
Jerome on the authority of Eusebius. The opinion of Eusebius has been frequently revived by modern writers, chiefly to support the denial of the Apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel. The distinction, however, has no historical basis. First, the testimony of Eusebius in this matter is not worthy of belief. He calls the Gospel of John "apocryphal." It is true, as Eusebius expressly calls the Apostle John the teacher of Papias ("ad annum Abrabae 2144"), as does Jerome also in Ep. Ixxv, "Ad Theodoram," iii, and in "De viris illustribus," xviii. Eusebius was also influenced by his erroneous doctrinal opinions as he denied the Apostolic origin rose in the Apostles and John was the writing to an author differing from St. John but of the same name. St. Ireneus also positively designates the Apostle and Evangelist John as the teacher of Papias, and neither he nor any other writer before Eusebius had any idea of a second John in Asia (Adv. haer. V, xxxiii, 4). In what Papias himself says the connexion plainly shows that in this passage by the word presbyter only Apostles can be understood. If John is mentioned twice the explanation lies in the peculiarity in which Papias stood to this, his most eminent teacher. By inquiring of others he had learned something indirectly from John, just as he had from the other Apostles referred to. In addition, he had received information concerning the teachings and acts of Jesus directly, without the intervention of others, from the still living "Presbyter John," as he also had from Aristion. Thus the teaching of Papias casts absolutely no doubt upon what the New-Testament writings presuppose and expressly mention concerning the residence of the Evangelist John in Asia.

III. The Later Accounts of John.—The Christian writers of the second and third centuries testify to us as a tradition universally recognized and doubted by no one that the Apostle and Evangelist John lived in Asia in the last decades of the first century, and from Ephesus had guided the Churches of that province. In his "Dialogue with Tryphon" (c. Ixxxi) St. Justin Martyr refers to "John, one of the Apostles of Christ" as a witness who had lived with "us," that is, at Ephesus. St. Ireneus speaks in very many places of the Apostle John and his residence in Asia and expressly declares that he wrote his Gospel at Ephesus (Adv. haer., III, i, 1), and that he had lived there until the reign of Trajan (loc. cit., II, xxii, 5). With Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xii, 1) and others we are obliged to place the Apostle's banishment to Patmos and Emperor Domitian (85–96). Previous to this, according to Tertullian's testimony (De praep. sexti), John had been thrown into a cauldron of boiling oil before the Porta Latina at Rome without suffering injury. After Domitian's death the Apostle returned to Ephesus during the reign of Trajan, and at Ephesus he died about A.D. 100 at a great age. Traditions reports many beautiful traits of the last years of his life: that he refused to remain under the same roof with Cerinthus (Ireneus, "Ad. haer." III, iii, 4); his touching anxiety about a youth who had become a robber (Clemens Alex., "Ep. to the Rom.," xi, 8), his touching regard for words of exhortation at the end of his life, "Little children, love one another" (Jerome, "Comm. in ep. ad. Gal.", vi, 10). On the other hand the stories told in the apocryphal Acts of John, which appeared as early as the second century, are unhistorical invention.

IV. Feasts of St. John.—St. John is commemorated on 27 December—especially in Byzantine times. The Roman Church celebrates the feast of St. John the Greater. At Rome the feast was reserved to St. John alone at an early date, though both names are found in the Carthaginian Calendar, the Hieronymian Martyrology, and the Gallican liturgical books. The "departure" or "assumption" of the Apostle is noted in the Menologium of Constantine and the Calendar of Naples (28 Sept.), which seems to have been regarded as the date of his death. The feast of St. John before the Latin Gate, supposed to commemorate the dedication of the church near the Porta Latina, is first mentioned in the Sacramentary of Adrian I (772–95).

V. St. John in Christian Art.—Early Christian art usually represents St. John with an eagle, symbolizing the heights to which he rises in the first chapter of his Gospel. The title of "Evangelist" St. John never received according to some authorities, was not adopted until the thirteenth century, is sometimes interpreted with reference to the Last Supper, again as connected with the legend according to which St. John was handed a cup of poisoned wine, from which, at his blessing, the poison was driven out. A natural explanation is to be found in the words of Christ to John and James "My chalice indeed you shall drink" (Matt., xx, 23; Krull in Kraus, "Realencyk.," s. v. "Johannes Evangelista").


LEOPOLD FONCK.

John the Faster (ομηρυκός, i.e., junctor), Patriarch of Constantinople (John IV, 582–595), famous chiefly through his assumption of the title "ocumenical patriarch"; d. 2 September, 595. He was brought up (apparently also born) at Constantinople. Under the Patriarch John III (Scholasticus, 555–577) he was deacon at the Hagia Sophia church; then he became sakellarios (an official who acts as patriarchal vicar for monasteries). He had little learning, but was so famous for his ascetical life that he was already called "the Faster." Under Eutychius I (restored to the patriarchate when John III died, 577–592) he became an important person among the clergy of the church. At Eutychius's death he was made patriarch by the Emperor Tiberius II (578–582). Under the next emperor, Maurice (582–602), he was still a favourite at court. There is little to tell of his life besides the great question of the title. He is said to have been tolerant towards the Monophysites of the East, but he persuaded Maurice to have a certain wizard, Paulinus, burnt. He had always a great reputation for asceticism and charity to the poor.

The dispute about the title was this: it was not new in John IV's time; till then the Bishop of Constantinople had commonly been called "επισκοπεύων ταραπάνων," but at various times he (and other patriarchs) had been addressed as οικουμένης ταραπάνων. H. Gelzer (Der Streit um den Titel des ökumenischen Patriarchen) thinks that it became usual in the time of the Aecian schism (484–519). The first known use of it applied to John I of Constantinople is in a letter from the monks of Antioch to John II (518–520) in 518. Before that the Patriarch of Alexandria had been so called by one of his bishops at the Robber Synod of Ephesus (in the year 449; Gelzer, op. cit., p. 568). Since 518 the whole combination, ἐπισκοπεύων όικουμενικός, had been commonly used in addresses to the Byzantine patriarchs. But they had not called themselves so before John IV. There is a real difference between these two uses of a title. In addresses to other people, particularly superiors, one may always allow a margin for compli- ments—especially in Byzantine times. If a man uses a title he sets up a formal claim to it. In 588 John the Faster held a synod at Constantinople to examine certain charges against Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch (in this fact already one sees a sign of the growing ambition of Constantine). By what right then did Constantine dare to discuss the affairs of Antioch? The Acts of this synod appear to have been sent to Rome; and Pope Pelagius II (579–590) saw in them
that John was described as "archbishop and oecumenical patriarch". It may be that this was the first time that the use of the title was noticed at Rome; it appears, in any case, to be the first time it was used officially as a title claimed—not merely a vague compliment. Pelagius protested against the novelty and forms of the title. The pope, at any rate (apocryphal) there (578–584), and had sent him notice of his succession as pope in a friendly letter (Epp. I, iv, in P. L., LXXVII, 447). It has been thought that the John to whom he dedicates his "Regula pastoralis" is John of Constantinople (others think it to be John of Ravenna, Bardenhewer, "Patrology", tr. Shahan, St. Louis, 1908, p. 652). But in 593 this affair of the new and arrogant title provoked a serious dispute. It should be noticed that Gregory was still old-fashioned enough to cling to the theory of three patriarchates only, although officially he accepted the five of "the Orthodox East" (Epp. I, 444). He was therefore not well-disposed towards Constantinople as a patriarchate at all. That it should claim to be the universal one seemed to him unheared-of insolence. John had crudely scourgéd two priests accused of heresy. They appealed to the pope. In the correspondence that ensued John assumed this title of oecumenical patriarch "in almost every line" of his letter (Epp. I, xviii, in P. L., LXXVII, 738). Gregory protested vehemently against it in a long correspondence addressed first to John, then to the Emperor Maurice, the Empress Constantina, and others. He argues that "if one patriarch is called universal, the title is thereby taken from the others" (Epp. I, xviii, ibid., 740). It is a special effrontery for the Byzantine bishop, whose existence as a patriarch at all is new and still uncertain (Rome had refused to accept the third canon of the First Council of Constantinople and the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon), to assume such a title as this. It further argues independence of any superior; whereas, says Gregory, "who doubts that the Church of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolic See?" (Epp. I, IX, xii, ibid., 957); and again: "I know of no bishop who is not subject to the Apostolic See." (Epp., xiii, ibid., 964).

The pope expressly disclaims the name "universal" for any bishop, including himself. He says that the Council of Chalcedon had wanted to give it to Leo I, but he had refused it (Epp., x, xviii, printed, 740, xx, 747, etc.). This idea rests on a misconception (Hefele-Leclercq, "Histoire des Conciles", II, Paris, 1908, pp. 834–5), but his reason for resenting the title in any bishop is obvious throughout his letters. "He understood it as an exclusion of all the others [private quod omnes alias] so that he who calls himself oecumenic, that is universal, thinks all other patriarchs and bishops more than a private person, the pastor of the inhabited earth" (so Horace Giustiniani at the Council of Florence; Hegenrother, "Photius", I, 184). For this reason Gregory does not spare his language in denouncing it. It is "diabolical arrogance" (Epp., V, xx, in P. L., LXXVII, 746, xxi, 750, etc.); he who so calls himself is anticlerical. Opposed to it Gregory assumed the title borne ever since by his successors. "He refuted the name 'universal!' and first of all began to write himself 'servant of the servants of God' at the beginning of his letters, with sufficient humility, leaving to all his successors this honourable title (his mother, "Vita S. Gregori", II, in P. L., LXXV, 87). Nevertheless the patriarchs of Constantinople kept their "oecumenical" title till it became part of their official style. The Orthodox patriarch subscribes himself still: "Archbishop of Constantinople, New Rome, and Oecumenical Patriarch." It is noticeable that even Photius (d. 891) never dared use the word when writing to Rome. The Catholic Church has never admitted it. It became a symbol of Byzantine arrogance as the Byzantine emperors and patriarchs stumbled over the name of "Pope" in the presence of the Emperor Basil II (956–1025) and tried to persuade Pope John XIX (1024–1033) to acknowledge it. The pope seems to have been ready to do so, but an outburst of indignation throughout the West and a stern letter from Abbot William of Dijon made him think better of it (Fortescue, "Orthodox East", p. 106). In 1035, indeed, at the time of the final schism of Rome and the Latin Rite, Leo IX writes to Michael Cerularius of Constantinople (in 1053): "How lamentable and detestable is the sacrilegious usurpation by which you everywhere boast yourself to be the Universal Patriarch" (op. cit., p. 182). No Catholic bishop since then has ever dared assume this title.

With regard to the issue, one should note first that Gregory knew no Greek. He saw the words only in a Latin version: "Patriarcha universalis," in which they certainly sound more scandalous than in Greek. How he understood them is plain from his letters. They seem to mean to him the authority of a metropolitan bishop, that all other bishops are only his vicars and delegates. Catholic theology does not affirm this of the pope or anyone. Diocesan bishops have ordinary, not delegte, jurisdiction; they receive their authority immediately from Christ, though they may use it only in the communion of the Roman See. It is the whole difference between diocesan ordinaries and vicars Apostolic. All bishops are not Apostolic vicars of the pope. Nor has any pope ever assumed the title "universal bishop," though occasionally they have been so called in complimentary addresses from other persons. The accusation, then, that Gregory's successors have usurped the title that he so resented is false.

Whether John IV or other patriarchs of Constantinople really meant to advance so arrogant a claim is another question. Oecumenikos patriarchas in Greek is susceptible of a milder interpretation. "H Oecumenikos patriarchas was often a name for the civilized, cultivated land of the Greeks, as opposed to the wild country of the barbarians. It was then often used for the Roman Empire. It is at least probable that the clause εκείνη τῆς οἰκουμένης in the Greek Intercession of the Byzantine Liturgy means the "empire" (Fortescue, "Liturgia of St. Basil", London, 1906, p. 106). In that sense, then, oecumenikos patriarchas meant no more than "imperial patriarch," as the Greeks of Constantinople told Anastasius Bibliothecarius at the time of Photius (see his statement in Gelzer, op. cit., p. 572). Kattenbusch (Konfessionskunde, I, 116) thinks it should be translated "Reichspatriarch." Even so it is still false. The Patriarch of Constantinople had no sort of claim over the whole empire. The most that can be allowed is that if "oecumenical" means only "imperial," and if "imperial" means only "of the imperial court," the title (in this case equal to "court patriarch") is no worse than if it were. It is a question of Greek interpretation is by no means obvious. In Greek, too, an "oecumenical synod" is one that has authority for the whole Church; the "oecumenic doctors" (St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. John Chrysostom) are those whose teaching must be followed by all. Pichler's comparison with the form "catholic bishop" ("Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung", II, Munich, 1865, pp. 647 sq.) is absurd. The humblest member of the Church is (in any language) a Catholic; in no language could he be called oecumenical.

Yet another dispute between John and Gregory was about some relics, especially the head of St. Paul, that the Court of Constantinople wanted the pope to send to them. Gregory would not part with them; eventually he sent part of St. Paul's chains. The works in
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Migne attributed to John the Faster (a treatise on Confession (P. G., LXXXVIII., 1859–1818), a shorter work on the same subject (ibid., 1919–1932), "Of Penance, Temperance, and Virginity" (ibid., 1937–1975)) are not authentic. No authentic works of his are extant. He has often been confused with a certain Cappadocian monk, John the Faster, who came to Constantinople about the year 1100. The patriarch, at his death, left no property but a cloak, a blanket, and a praying-stool, which the emperor kept as relics. The Orthodox Church has canonized him and keeps his feast as St. Sebasteus.

One of his clerics, Photinos, wrote his life soon after his death. Fragments of this are preserved in the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils (see MANUS, XIII., 495: LEGENDA ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA, I (Paris, 1740), 226; GRODON, HORAIROUOI KHRISTIANOU (Constantinople, 1890), 250-56; HERZOG, Photius, I (Ratisbon, 1867), 178-90; J. F. SCHNEIDER, "Der lokale Tyrannus und der Patriarch Photios", Zentralblatt für Orkumenischer Patriarch und Diener der Diener Gottes in Zeitschriften für Kath. Theologie, IV (Jena, 1890), 490-525; GELEEN, Der Streit um den Titel des ecumenischen Patriarchen in Jahrhunderten des Kaisertums, XIII (1887), 540-584; KATZENBACH, Konklammerkunde, I (Freiburg im Br., 1892), 111-17.

ADRIAN FORSCHE

John the Silent (HESYCHASTES, SILENTIARUS), Saint, Bishop of Colonie, in Armenia, b. at Nicopolis, Armenia, 8 Jan., 452; d. 558. His parents, Encratius and Euphemia, wealthy and honoured, belonged to families that had done great service in the State and had risen in the scale of the nobility; in addition, they were also good Christians, and gave their son a holy education. After their death in 471, John distributed his inheritance among his relatives, retaining only a small share, with which he built a church and a monastery. Here, with ten congenial companions, he began a life of mortification and self-denial, wonderful traits of which are recorded by his biographer. The Bishop of Sebaste drew him out of his solitude and made him Bishop of Colonie (Taxara) in 481, against which promotion John vainly struggled. In his new dignity he preserved the monastic spirit entire, and the austerity of his life as far as was consistent with duty. His brother-in-law Pasinious oppressed the Church to such an extent that John had to call upon the Emperor Zeno for assistance. As soon as matters had been properly arranged, John left his see, went to the Laura, near Jerusalem, and placed himself under the care of St. Sabas, without revealing his identity. In course of time Sabas, who had subjected John to all kinds of trials and had found him ready to perform even the most common and menial labours, thought him worthy of receiving priesthood, and for this purpose sent him to Elias, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Elias fell, not Flidean, and Elias informed Sabas that John had confided to him things which would be the ordination. Sabas at first felt very sad, but was comforted by a vision in which the true state of affairs was made known to him. John with the permission of his superior entered a hut built against the face of a rock in the desert, and here passed the remainder of his days in seclusion and perpetual silence, with no other name than a contemporary, Cyril of Scythopolis, wrote his life. His feast is on 13 May.

JOHN THORNE, BLESSED. See RICHARD WHITING, BLESSED.

JOINVILLE, JEAN, SIRE DE, Seneschal of Champagne, historian, b. in 1223; d. at Joinville, 1317. His family held an important place in the feudal system of Champagne in the eleventh century. His father, Simon de Joinville, hereditary Seneschal of Champagne, defended Troyes in 1250 against the enmity of Count Thibault IV, Simon having died in 1233, Jean was reared by his mother, Beatrice, daughter of the Count of Burgundy. He received the knightly education of the times, learned to read and write, and

even a little Latin. In 1241, Jean de Joinville appeared for the first time at the French Court on the occasion of the festival given at Saumur for the knighthood of Alfonso of Poitou, brother of the king. He afterwards made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James at Compostela. In 1248, he took the Cross, following the example of St. Louis, but refused to be sworn by the king, as he was not his "man". He took at his own expense two banners and ten knights and allied himself with his cousin Jean d'Apremont, Count of Saarbruecken. His little troop went down the Saone and the Rhone by boat and embarked at Marseilles (August, 1348). In three weeks they arrived at Limassol, in Cyprus, where Louis IX then was. He welcomed Joinville and took him into his pay.

Joinville took part in the Crusade of Egypt, where he conducted himself valiantly; he was in grave danger at Mansourah (Feb., 1250), fell ill in his tent, and was taken prisoner with the king. Having been liberated in May, 1250, he followed Louis IX to Saint-Jean d'Acre despite the advice of powerful barons who counselled him to remain in Palestine until all the prisoners should have been freed from "d'Acre", of which he is probably the author, makes allusion to these facts ("Romania", 1893, 544). The king, who was charmed, made him henceforth his familiar friend, and gave him command over fifty knights. In 1253 he granted him in fief a rental of 200 pounds (4053 francs).

Having returned to France with the king and queen in 1254, Joinville thenceforth divided his time between the management of his estates and the court of his royal friend. However, in 1267, despite the solicitations of St. Louis, he refused to take the cross and disapproved of the Crusade of Tunisia. "Je entendis que tuit cil firet pechier mortel qui li loierent l'alle" (ed. Natalis de Wailly, 262). After the death of St. Louis in 1282, he was one of the witnesses heard in the inquiry of canonization, and he erected an altar to the saint in his chapel of St. Laurent at Joinville. Under Philip the Fair, Joinville played an important part in Champagne and did not conceal his dislike for the new methods of government. In 1314 he entered the league of the nobility of Champagne. In 1315 he wrote a letter of reconciliation to King Louis X. He died at Joinville, where he was buried.

Joinville is the author of a new chronicle of the Crusades, composed at Acre in 1250-51, which contains information concerning his captivity (ed. Natalis de Wailly, at the end of the history of St. Louis). But his chief work is "Le livre des saintes paroles et des bonnes actions de St Louis", composed at the request of Jeanne de Navarre, wife of Philip the Fair (d. 1305). The work is divided into two unequal parts; the first, which is very short, comprises anecdotes concerning St. Louis's manner of life and his familiar speech; the second, which is very much longer, is a real autobiography of Joinville during the Egyptian Crusade. Gaston Paris ("Romania", 1894, 358-324) supposes that this portion was written by Joinville as early as 1273, because there is no allusion to subsequent events.

Joinville appears to have written from personal recollections. Beginning with 1254, he is satisfied with making extracts from the "Chronique de France". The book concludes with an abridgment of the instructions given by St. Louis to his son, and with details concerning his canonization. The original MS, which was presented to the king and preserved in the bibliothèque of Charles V, no longer exists. The two principal MSS are: that of Brussels (Paris, Bib. Nat. fr., 15.350), written by Joinville (Paris, Bib. Nat. fr., 10148), copied from the original at the Château of Joinville about 1550. The first edition (Antoine-Pierre de Rieux, Poitiers, 1547) was made from a poor copy and was reproduced many
times until the discovery of the two above-mentioned manuscripts. The text has been studied and amended by Natale de Wailly (editions of 1868, Société de l’Histoire de France, of 1874, of 1881). The history of St. Louis is rightly regarded as one of the masterpieces of French literature in the Middle Ages. It constitutes besides an inappreciable testimony concerning the personality of one of the best sovereigns who ever reigned. The figure of St. Louis is most vividly portrayed in Joliet’s book. Moreover, few personal memoirs possess the same note of sincerity. In depicting himself, Joliet discloses to us the soul of a perfect knight of the thirteenth century; the book is thus an important witness concerning French society of the Middle Ages.

Natale de Wailly, Feltrae à éditions mentionné et un long passage in Bibliothèque de l’Ecole des Chartes (1857), 557-606; (1858), 329-478; (1872), 386-423; (1874), 217-248; Paris, Le texte de Joliette en Roumanie, XXIII, 408-424; Simonetti, Essai sur l'histoire et la généalogie des Sires de Joliet (Lagny, 1876); Delaborde, Recherches critiques sur les premiers seigneurs de Joliette in Bob. de l’Ecole des Chartes (1890). [Note: This sentence is incomplete and contains a reference to a work that is not visible in the image.]

JOLIET, the son of a wagon-maker, was born at Quebec, Canada, on 21 September, 1645; d. in Canada, May, 1700. He gave great promise of scholarship, especially in mathe-matics, at the Jesuits’ school at Quebec, and received the minor orders in 1662. But, caught with the adventurous spirit of the times, he early abandoned his studies and became a rover in the Canadian wilderness and a trader among the Indians. A fleeting glimpse is caught of Joliet searching for a copper mine on the borders of Lake Superior, in 1689; and again, in 1761, he is seen standing by the side of Saint-Lusson as he plants the arms of France at Saint-Tamate. In 1672, upon the advice of the intendant, Talon, Joliet was dispatched by Governor Frontenac to explore the grande rivière beyond the Lakes, which the Indians alleged flowed into the southern sea. In the order the French governor refers to Joliet as one “experienced in these kinds of discoveries and who had been already very near the river.” In December of the same year Joliet reached the Straits of Mackinaw, where, with Père Marquette, he spent the winter and the early spring in questionnaire the Indians and preparing maps for the journey.

In May of the following year, 1673, the historic quest began. With five voyageurs and two canoes, Joliet and Marquette in June reached the Fox River. A few leagues beyond, a short portage was found by which they reached the Wisconsin, down whose course they glided until, on 17 June, the little party drifted into the great waters of the Mississippi. For a month they paddled southward, passing a great river from the west which the Indians assured them flowed into the Vermilion Sea—the Gulf of Chichagoo; near in a land of the Sacs, they were told, traded with the Indians on the Pacific coast. Joliet descended the river to 30° 40', christening rivers, plateaus, and elevations with Indian and French names which were destined to endure no longer than La Salle’s great dream of the “Empire of New France.”

The Joliet establishment beyond doubt the important fact that the great river emptied into the Gulf of Mexico, the expedition returned, arriving at Green Bay in September, after having paddled 2500 miles. Here Marquette remained while Joliet hurried to Quebec, where he arrived the middle of August, 1674, after having been absent from Canada, and not daring to set foot in the Lachine Rapids. Whether or not Joliet was the first Frenchman to have gazed upon the Great River, the reports that he laid before the governor and his establishment of the fact that the Mississippi was a highway to the sea led to the immediate formation of plans on the part of Canadian merchant and officers for the settlement of the Mississippi Valley, though Joliet’s offer to plant a colony among the Illinois was refused. Shortly after his return Joliet was married to Claire-Françoise Bissot. In 1680 he was granted the Island of Anticosti, where he erected a fort, which was subsequently captured by the English in 1690, upon which occasion his wife was taken prisoner. The restless spirit of the explorer possessed Joliet to the end, for mention is made, within a few years of his death, of extensive wanderings in Labrador. In 1693 he was appointed royal hydrographer, and, on 30 April, 1697, he was granted the seigniory of Joliet, south of Quebec, which is still in the possession of his descendants. He died in Canada in May, 1700, one of the first native Americans to have achieved historical distinction.

Map drawn by Joliet in the Fox River valley on the eve of the Mississippi expedition in 1673. Discovery and Explorations of the Mississippi Valley (New York, 1862). Maps drawn from memory, as presented to Governor Frontenac, on his return, in 1674, are now in the Library of Congress. For questions as to priority of discovery between Marquette, Joliet, and La Salle, see Mémoires de Nicolas Perrot, vol. III of the Bibliothèques Amérindiennes (Paris and Leipzig, 1864). Margot, Mémoires et documents (Paris, 1879-90); and Bussière, Burial of Pierre Marquett’s Salle Bubble (New York, 1879).

The general bibliography on Jolliet is contained in Narratives and Critical History of America (Boston, 1884-7).

JARVIS KILEY.

Joliette, Diocese of (Joliettensis), created by Pius X, 27 January, 1904, by division of the Archdiocese of Montreal, comprises three counties, Joliette, Berthier, and Montcalm, with four parishes of the Assumption County. It forms a recto 105 miles long by about 45 wide. (1) Religious Organization.—The total population is 63,500 souls, of whom 1200 are non-Catholics. This population is divided into thirty-eight canonically erected parishes and four with resident priests. According to its need each parish has one or another of the following associations or confraternities: the Third Order of St. Francis; the League of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, for men and children; the Congregation of the Most Blessed Virgin, for men, youths and young women; the Confraternities of Mount Carmel; of the Holy Rosary; of the Mona Bors; of the Holy Adorers; of the Holy Name; of the Holy Sacred Sacrament; of the Way of the Cross; the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; and the Temperance Society. The last-named, established in each parish, gives good results. Frequent communion is observed in the diocese, and the faithful generally acquit themselves well of their religious duties. There are four vicariates-forane. Ecclesiastical conferences are held twice yearly in each vicariate. The bishop is assisted by a chapter composed of eight titular canons, a vicar-general, and archdeacon for parochial affairs, a procurator for the administration of episcopal revenue, an assistant procurator of the whole diocese for matrimonial affairs and the duties of a secretary. There are 115 priests in the diocese, 104 of whom are secular and 11 religious. The religious in all number 134 men and 390 women. The religious institutions of men are those of the Clerics of St. Viateur (novitiate at Jolliet); Brothers of Christian Instruction; and Brothers of St. Gabriel. The nuns are Sisters of Charity of Providence, Sisters of the Congregation of Notre-Dame, Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of St. Anne, Sisters of the Holy Cross and of the Seven Dolours, Sisters of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of the Holy Cross and of the Sacred Heart.

(2) Educational Institutions.—The diocese contains 1 seminary, 3 commercial colleges, 3 commercial academies, 21 boarding-schools for young women, 5
academies, 25 model schools, and 330 elementary schools. There are in these 288 institutions 600 professors, 11 of whom are priests, 9 seminarians, 75 religious, 225 nuns, and 280 lay persons; 15,108 pupils receive instruction in the various institutions, 6067 being under the direction of religious men and women, and 9041 under that of lay teachers. The communities of men and women in the diocese which are charged with education are those mentioned above, with the exception of the Sisters Adorers of the Precious Blood, who lead a communal but not a cloistered life.

(3) Charitable Institutions.—In the diocese there are: 1 hospital, 5 homes for the aged, 5 orphanages for girls, 1 orphanage for boys. These institutions are under the direction of the Sisters of Providence. There are, besides, 6 associations of Ladies of Charity, and 1 Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

(4) Progress of the Diocese.—The first bishop of the Diocese of Joliette was Mgr. Joseph Alfred Archambault. Born at L'Assomption, 23 May, 1859, he made his classical studies at the College of L'Assomption and Laval University, Quebec, and his theological studies at the Grand Séminaire of Montreal. He entered the diocesan College of Quebec, the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and the College of Ste. Cécile, where he remained under the direction of the Jesuits. He was ordained to the priesthood at Quebec, 25 June, 1883, and was appointed vicar general of the diocese on the death of Bishop Joliette. He was consecrated as bishop of Joliette, 22 August, 1887. He died at Joliette, 21 August, 1904.

JOLLY, PHILIPP JACOB GUSTAV VON, German physi- ciest, b. at Mannheim, 26 September, 1809; d. at Munich, 24 December, 1884. His family came originally from France at the end of the seventeenth century. After attending the gymnasium and lyceum at Heidelberg, Jolly went to the University of Heidelberg in 1829, where he studied chiefly mathematics and physics. From 1832 to 1833 he was in Vienna, taking up the technological branches, working as a mechanician, and visiting factories and mining plants. Returning to Heidelberg in 1834, he took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and began his career as a teacher of mathematics, physics, and technology. He became extraordinary professor of mathematics in 1839, and ordinary professor of physics in 1846. In 1854 he was called to the University of Munich to succeed Ohm as professor of physics. His principal work was in experimental physics, for which he de- signed new apparatus and modified and improved the older forms. His studies of osmosis, of the laws of gravity, and of the density of the earth, of the composition of the air, etc., suggested the design of the Joly balance (1864), of a special eudiometer (1879), of an improved mercury air-pump, the Jolly air thermometer. The following are some of his published works: "De Euleri merito de functionibus circularibus" (prize essay, Heidelberg, 1834); "Anleitung zur Differential- und Integralrechnung" (Heidelberg, 1846); "Die Principien der Mechanik" (Stuttgart, 1852); "Physik der Mole- keln" (München, 1863); and "Beiträge zu G. Gendig's "Amalen", "Heidelberger Jahrbücher", and "Berichte der Münchener Akademie der Wissen- schaften".

VIII.—32

JONAS, the fifth of the Minor Prophets. The name is usually taken to mean "dove" (Hb. ناقة), but in view of the complaining words of the Prophet (Jonas, iv), it is not unlikely that name is derived from the root יָנָה = to mourn, with the signification dolens or "complaining". This interpretation goes back to St. Jerome (Comm. on Jonas, iv, 1). It is clear from the book that this is a type name for him. Jonas is mentioned only once in the Old Testament, IV Kings, xiv, 25, where it is stated that the restoration by Jeroboam II (see JEROBOAM) of the borders of Israel against the incursions of foreign invaders was a fulfilment of the words of the Lord the God of Israel, which he spoke by his servant Jonas the son of Amathi, the prophet, who was of Gath, which is in Opher". This last is but a paraphrastic rendering of the name Cath-Hepher, a town in the territory of Zabulon (Josephus, "Antiq.", XIX, xiii), which was probably the birthplace of the Prophet, and where his grave was still pointed out in the time of St. Jerome. Mention is made of Jonas in Matt. 12: 10, 25, 33, 37, 38. He is likewise in the parallel passages of Luke (xi, 29, 30, 32), but these references add nothing to the information contained in the Old Testament data. According to an ancient tradition mentioned by St. Jerome (Comm. in Jonas, Prolog., P. L., XXV, 118), and which is paralleled in Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Prop., xvi, P. L., XLIII, 407), Jonas was the son of the widow of Sarepta whose resuscitation by the Prophet Elijah is narrated in III Kings, xviii, but this legend seems to have no other foundation than the phonetic resemblance between the proper name Amathi (אמהתי), father of the Prophet, and the Hebrew word אמה (תָּמָה), "truth", applied to the word of God through Elias by the widow of Sarepta (III Kings, xviii, 24).

The chief interest in the Prophet Jonas centres around two remarkable incidents narrated in the book which bears his name. In the opening verse it is stated that "the word of the Lord came to Jonas the son of Amathi, saying: Arise, and go to Ninive, the great city, and preach in it: for the wickedness thereof is come up before me." But the Prophet, instead of obeying the Divine command, "rose up to flee into Tharsis from the face of the Lord," that he might escape the task assigned to him. He lands bound for that port, but a violent storm over- takes him, and on his admission that he is the cause of it, he is cast overboard. He is swallowed by a great fish providentially prepared for the purpose, and after a three days' sojourn in the belly of the monster, during which time he composes a hymn of thanksgiving, he is cast upon dry land. After this episode he again receives the command to preach in Ninive, and the account of his second journey is scarcely less mar-vellous than that of the first. He proceeds to Ninive and enters "a day's journey" into it, foretelling its destruction in forty days. A general repentance is immediately caused by the announcement of which God relents and spares the wicked city. Jonas, angry and disappointed, wishes for death. He expostulates with the Lord, and declares that it was in anticipation of this result that on the former occasion he had wished to flee to Tharsis. He withdraws from Ninive and, under a booth which he has erected, he awaits the destiny of the city. In this abode he enjoys for a time the refreshing shade of a gourd which the Lord prepares for him. Shortly, however, the gourd is stricken by a worm and the Prophet is exposed to the burning rays of the sun, whereupon he again murmurs and wishes to die. Then the Lord rebukes him for his selfish grief over the withering of a gourd, while still desiring that God should not be touched by the repentance of a city in which "there
are more than a hundred and twenty thousand persons that know not how to distinguish between their right hand and their left, and many beasts." Apart from the hymn ascribed to Jonas (ii, 2-11) the contents of the book may be called defective. 

HISTORICITY.—Catholics have always looked upon the Book of Jonas as a fact-narrative. In the works of some recent Catholic writers there is a leaning to regard the book as fiction. Only Simon and Jahn, among prominent Catholic scholars, have clearly denied the historicity of Jonas; and the orthodoxy of these two critics may not be defended by the "Prophetissimus Deus" implicitly condemned the ideas of both in the matter of inspiration, and the Congregation of the Index expressly condemned the "Introduction" of the latter.

Reasons for the traditional acceptance of the historicity of Jonas:—

I. Jewish Tradition.—According to the Septuagint text of the Book of Tobias (xiv, 4), the words of Jonas in regard to the destruction of Nineveh are accepted as facts; the same reading is found in the Aramaic text and one Hebrew Ms. (see Kaulen, "Einleitung in die Hebraischen Propheten," 1890, p. 305). The apocryphal III Mach., vi, 8, lists the saving of Jonas in the belly of the fish along with the other wonders of Old Testament history. Josephus (Ant. Jud., IX, x, 2) clearly deems the story of Jonas to be historical.

II. The Authority of Our Lord.—This reason is deemed by Catholics to remove all doubt as to the fact of the story of Jonas (see Knaab, "Comm. in Prophetas Minores," II, 361). The Jews asked a "sign"—a miracle to prove the Messianship of Jesus. He made answer that no "sign" would be given them other than the "sign of Jonas the prophet. For as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights: so shall the Son of man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights. The men of Ninive shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas. And behold a greater than Jonas here!" (Matt., xii, 40-1; xvi, 4; Luke, xi, 29-32). The Jews asked for a real miracle; Christ would have deceived them had He presented a mere fancy. He argues clearly that just as Jonas was in the whale's belly three days and three nights even so He will be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights. If, then, the story of Jonas is not the miracle, the story of Christ's body in the heart of the earth is only a fiction. If the men of Ninive will really not rise in judgment, neither will the Jews really rise. Christ contrasts fact with fact, not fancy nor fancy with fact. It would be very strange, indeed, were He to say that He was greater than a mere fancy-formed man. It would be little less strange were He to berate the Jews for their real lack of penance by rating this lack in contrast with the penance of Ninive which never existed at all. The whole force of these striking contrasts is lost, if we admit that the story of Jonas is not fact-narrative. Finally, Christ makes no distinction between the story of the Queen of Sheba and that of Jonas (see Matt., xii, 42). He sets the very same historical value upon the Book of Jonas as upon the Third Book of Kings. Such is the very strongest argument that Catholics offer for the firm stand they take upon the ground of the fact-narrative of the story of Jonas.

III. The Authority of the Fathers.—Not a single Father has ever been cited in favour of the opinion that Jonas is a fancy-tale and not fact-narrative at all. To the Fathers Jonas was a fact and a type of the Messianist past. One as Christ is to the Jews. Saints Jerome, Cyril, and Theophilus explain in detail the type-meaning of the facts of the Book of Jonas. St. Cyril even forestalls the objections of the Rationalists of to-day: Jonas flees his ministry, be-
JONAS

Jonas of Orleans, bishop and ecclesiastical writer, b. in Aquitaine; d. in 483 or 484. From 818, when he succeeded Bishop Theodulf in the See of Orleans, until the time of his death he played an important rôle in the ecclesiastical affairs of France. He was present in 829 at the so-called Council of Paris, at which the question of the veneration of images was again discussed, and Jonas was one of the messengers sent by the council to submit the complaints and excerpts from the acts of the meeting. He also attended the Council of Paris in 829, which treated of reforms to be introduced in Church and State, and drew up the report of the proceedings of the Synod of Thionville (833) concerning the deposition of Ébo of Reims. His good will toward the monastic institutions was demonstrated by the restoration of the monastery of Saint-Mesmin in his diocese.

Jonas left the following writings: (1) "De Institutiones laicæ" (rules of Christian life for laymen); (2) "De Institutiones regæ" (rules of Christian life for princes); (3) "De Cultu imaginum" (the veneration of images); (4) a recension of the "Vita" of St. Hubert. The first of these was destined for Matfrid, Count of Orleans, and is almost entirely made up of citations from the Scriptures and the Fathers. To the second work of Jonas, which bears no inscription in the manuscript, d' Aubéry has appropriately prefixed. The title De Institutione destined for Pepin, King of Aquitaine, son of Louis the Pious. A sort of supplement to the bishop's first work, it follows the same method and bears the same character. The fact that the acts of the Council of Paris (829) and the contents of these two treatises of Jonas are largely identical has raised the question of their priority. The view, at one time more commonly held (d'Aubéry, Bähr, Knust, Himsly, Dümmler), that the synodal acts borrowed from the "De Institutione regæ" of Jonas, has been abandoned by several recent scholars who have reversed the relationship of dependence (Waite, Simson, Ebert).

In spite of the difference of opinion in this regard, it is generally conceded that Jonas is the author of both the treatises and that his is the "Vita" of Hubert, by which he chiefly owes his literary fame comprises, besides the "Life of St. Hubert", the lives of the abbots Attala and Bertulf of Bobbio, Eustace of Luxeuil, and the Abbess Burgundofara (or Fara) of Evrardia (now Faremountier). The biographies of Bobbio and his successors, though written in a bombastic style, contain invaluable historical information. Jonas arrived at Bobbio but three years after Columbanus's death, and based his invaluable account of the great Irish saint on the testimony of persons who had known him intimately. Eustace, Attala, and Bertulf, he knew personally in Arden, and their lives are only known through his ecclesiastical history, while Flodoard turned that of St. Columbanus into hexameter verse. The "Life of St. Fara" is chiefly an account of the miraculous events alleged to have occurred during this saint's rule at Evrardia. The works of Jonas, exclusive of the "Life of St. Vaes" are printed in P.L., L.XLVIII, 1011-88; better edition by Krusch in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script. Rd. Mer"., III, 406-13, 505-17; IV, 61-152 (Hanover, 1896 and 1902).

N. A. WEBER.

BEAUFRANC,

Jonas (יונתן), name of several persons mentioned in the Old Testament. Among these may be mentioned the following:—

(1) JONATHAN, the son of Gersam the son of Moses, mentioned by name in Judges, xviii, 30, and as a young Levite in xvii, 7 sqq. Having left Bethlehem, his native town, he came to Mt. Ephraim, where he was induced by a certain Michas to remain as priest of an idol. This idol was afterwards seized by the Danites and carried to Lails, whither Jonathan accompanied them, and he and his descendants acted as priests of the idol until the days of the Captivity.

(2) JONATHAN (Vulg. JONATHAS), eldest son of Saul by Michal, and the brother of King Saul. He is called "son of Saul" (I Kings, xiv, 17) as well as "son of Michas", and is mentioned as taking part with his father in the struggle against the Philistines, and such was his bravery that Saul confided to him the command of a thousand soldiers in Gaba. Jonathan's defeat of the garrison of the Philistines in Gaba, and his subsequent victory on the confines of the same town are narrated in I Kings, xiii, xiv. Through an intervention regarded as miraculous (xiv, 15) the latter combat resulted in a general rout of the Philistines, and Saul in the excitement of the pursuit proclaimed a rash oath, saying: "Cursed be the man that shall eat food till evening, till I be revenged of my enemies." The course of the flight led through a forest where wild honey appeared upon the ground, but the people tasted it not for they feared the oath. But Jonathan, not having heard his father's pronouncement, innocently tasted the honey, and, when a halt was called in the evening and the priest consulted Yahweh as to a further pursuit of the enemy, he answered: "I have tasted honey..." It is probable that some sin had been committed against the Lord, and again he rashly swore that, even should the guilt be found on his son Jonathan, he should surely die. The lots having indicated Jonathan as the guilty one, he confessed to having tasted the honey, and was saved only by the intervention of the people (I Kings, xiv, 45). When, after his victory over Goliath, the
youthful David appeared at the court of Saul, a most deep and loyal friendship sprang up between him and Jonathan, who more than once was instrumental in saving his friend from Saul’s envious wrath (1 Kings, xviii seq.). But Saul, though having several times relented, finally became implacable. David, knowing his efforts useless, sent his friend away to Nobé after a renewal of the mutual covenant of friendship between themselves and their posterity (1 Kings, xx). Jonathan cheerfully renounced in favour of his friend his right to the throne of his father, counting himself happy to be second to him in the kingdom. This covenant was renewed later when David after the siege of Cælara withdrew into the desert of Ziph (1 Kings, xxiii, 15–18), but Jonathan was not destined to share in the ultimate triumph of his friend. In a battle against the Philistines in Mount Gelboe he was slain together with his two brothers Abinadab and Melchisedus, and Saul his father. Their bodies were piously buried by the inhabitants of Jabes Gilead (1 Kings, xxxi).

(3) Jonathan, son of the high priest Abiahaar and faithful servant of King David. He was instrumental in saving the king’s life by securing for David information concerning the plans of the king’s enemies. (4) Jonathan (surnamed Apphus), youngest son of Mathathias and brother of Judas Machabeus. The patriotic exploits of this family of Jewish heroes are narrated in the First and Second Books of the Machaebes and also in the works of Josephus (Antiquities, XIII). After the defeat and death of Judas (about 161 b.c.) Jonathan was chosen leader of the patriotic band, at the time hard-pressed and obliged to retire beyond the Jordan. But the death of the unworthy high priest Aleimus brought about a change in public sentiment, and the invading general Baccideus withdrew into Syria giving the Jews a respite of two years. Encouraged by the party of the Hellenists or apostate Jews, however, he made a new attempt to subjugate the country. This attempt was foiled by Jonathan, and the result of the short campaign was a treaty whereby the latter remained practically master of Judæa. This state of things continued for six years with a continued increase of power and influence on the part of the Machaebes, so that an alliance with their party was solicited by Bales and Demetrius, the two competitors for the Syrian throne. Jonathan decided in favour of Bales who, having vanquished his rival, bestowed upon Jonathan not only the title of High Priest, but also the office of High Captain and that of being of a part of the Syrian empire (1 Mach., i, 1–66). After many military exploits (1 Mach., xi, 60–74) Jonathan sent ambassadors to Rome to renew the treaty made by Judas with the Roman Senate, and he also entered into an alliance with the Spartans (1 Mach., xii, 23). For a time it seemed as if he were destined to restore his country to complete independence, but Tryphon, the aspirant to the throne of Syria, recognizing in Jonathan his chief obstacle, made him a prisoner by foul treachery and put an end to his career by casting him into a dungeon (1 Mach., xii, 24–54). The rule extended from 161 to 143 a.c.

James F. Driscoll.

Jones, Edward, Venerable, priest and martyr, b. in the Diocese of St. Asaph, Wales, date unknown; d. in London, 6 May, 1590. Bred an Anglican, he was received into the Church at the English College, Rheims, in 1581, ordained priest in 1588, and went to England in the same year. In 1590 he was arrested by a priest-catcher, who pretended to be a Catholic, in a shop in Fleet Street. He was imprisoned in the Tower and brutally tortured by Topelhife, finally admitting he was a priest and had been an Anglican. These admissions were used against him at his trial, but he made a skilful and learned defence, pleading that a confession elicited under torture was not legally sufficient to ensure a conviction. The court complimented him on his courageous bearing, but of course he was convicted of high treason as a priest coming into England. On the same day he was hanged, drawn, and quartered, opposite the grocer’s shop where he had been captured, in Fleet Street near the Conduit. On the same day there suffered Anthony Middleton, priest and the martyr, born probably at Middleton-Tyas, Yorkshire, date unknown, son of Ambrose Middleton of Barnard Castle, Durham, and Cecil, daughter of Anthony Crackenthorpe of Howgill Castle, Westmoreland. He entered the English College at Reims, 8 Jan., 1582; was ordained 30 May, 1588, and went to England in the same year. His work lay in London and the neighbourhood and he laboured very successfully; he was captured at a house in Clerkenwell (London) by the same artifice which was practised on Father Jones. On the ladder he said: “I call God to witness I die merely for the Catholic Faith, and for being a priest of true Religion”; and someone present called out, “Sir, you have spoken very well”. The martyr was cut down and dismembered whilst yet alive.


C. F. Wemyss Brown.

Jones, Inigo, a famous English architect, b. 15 July, 1573, in London; d. 21 June, 1652, and was buried in the chancel of St. Benet’s, Paul’s Wharf, London. His father was a clothworker in the neighbourhood of St. Paul’s, and a Catholic; the son adhered to his father’s faith throughout his life. Little is known of the first thirty years of his life. Towards the end of the sixteenth century he went to Italy and lived there for many years, principally in Venice. Christian IV, King of Denmark, induced him to leave Italy and accept an appointment at the Danish Court. Buildings are named both in Italy and Denmark as having been designed by Jones, but seemingly without proof. He returned to England in 1604, and for some time was engaged in designing the costly scenery and machinery of the court masques. About 1614 he again went to Italy, and his notes show that he studied the writings of Serlio, Vignola, Fontana, Labacco, and Phillibert d’Orme, and was acquainted with the most famous architects then living in Rome. He also studied the style of Renaissance architecture known as Palladian. On his return to England he was appointed surveyor to the king. Jones designed the queen’s house, Greenwich, the banqueting house, Whitehall, St. Paul’s church and the piazzas of Covent Garden (burnt to the ground 1795), a portico to old St. Paul’s cathedral, parts of Somerset House, the Bar-
Joppa

JORDANIS

Joppa (Joppe). See JAFFA.

JORDAN, The (in Hebrew Yarden, from the root Yārdād, to descend).—The difference of elevation between the highest point of this river (1847 feet above the sea-level) and its lowest (1286 feet below the sea-level) is 561 feet. It issues from the side of Mount Hermon by three principal sources: the Nahar el Hasānī, coming from Hasheba; the Nahar el Liddān, which rises at Tell el Qādī (the ancient Late-Dan); and the Nahar Banias, the glory of what was Caesarea Philippi. Formed at a point about five and a half miles by Banias, by the junction of these two streams, the Jordan enters Lake Huleh about one and a third miles lower down. This lake, which is probably "the waters of Jerboa", is rather more than three and a half miles in length. Between the Babrat el Huleh and the Lake of Tiberias, nearly ten miles, the Jordan is clear, and in some places reaches a width of one hundred yards and a depth of nearly seventy feet. It is crossed by a bridge which connects Damascus with Galilee, the Jīr Bānāt Yaqūb. Near it Tell, which is Bethsaida Julias, the river enters the Lake of Genesareth, which is 682 feet below the level of the Mediterranean and is more than thirteen miles in length. At Lake Tiberias, the Jordan begins its innumerable wanderings. The direct distance from the Lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea is sixty-five miles, but the Jordan, owing to its sinuosities, has a course of 200 miles. At a little distance from where it leaves the lake there are remains of two bridges, Jīr es Sehmakh and Jīr es Sidd, and in this reach of the river it is still fordable at many points. At about six and a quarter miles from the lake, after receiving the Yarmuk, it passes under an old Arab basalt bridge, the Jīr el Mudjamihe, and the bridge of the railroad from Ceifa to Damascus.

Beyond the Wādí 'Arabah is the ford of Aḥārah, where some locate the Bethera of the story of Gedeon (Judges, vii, 24). At five and a half miles from the mouth of the Jalid, which passes Beisam (Sctytopolis), the Jordan passes between Tell es Sārīm (Salm) and Tabaqāt Tali (Tell). It receives the waters of three streams, the waters of such important springs as the Bēda and 'Ain esh Shemsieh, where the first Christian tradition placed Enohn: "John also was baptizing in Enohn near Salim" (John, iii, 23). Umm el Amdān, which is very near, was supposed, in the fourth century, to be the Sarīm (Salm) of the Bible, from which the Wādí Yable rushes down precipitately, the name of which recalls Jābes Galaad, delivered by Saul (Kings, xi). From the lake to this point the whole valley is cultivated; thence to Sarṭabeh, the mountains of Samaria reach to the river. Opposite Sarṭabeh is the confluence of the Nahar ez Zērōq (Jabbok), and just below are to be seen the ruins of the Roman bridge of Damieh and the ford of the same name which made the death of the Amalekites and the Sibboleth (Judges, xii, 5, 6). The cisterns and the columns of the Temple of Solomon were cast near here (III Kings, vii, 46). From Damieh onwards the valley ceases to be cultivated; the waters of the Jordan, disturbed by rapids, become yellow and muddy. A two-hours' journey northwards of this stretch are to be seen the wooden bridge and the ford of Ghūranieh, where the great highways of Galad and Moab meet. The Greek monastery of Qār el Yehūd, two and a half miles farther down the river, marks the traditional scene of the passage of the Hebrews (Jos., iii, 9-13) and of the baptism of Christ (Matt., iii). The scene of the ministrations of St. John the Baptist, however, has been very plausibly placed at the ford of the Ghūranieh, which has always been more frequented. In its lower portion the river is swelled by many affluents, which formerly watered a part of the Kikkar, whereas Lot came when Abraham; these affluents are the Wādí Kelt, the Wādí Kefren, and the Wā’dī Nimrin.

The Jordan, called by the Arabs ash Sheriat el Kebr (the great drinking-place), flows between steep banks of rather brittle clay. The lower part of its basin is called the Zor, the bottom of the valley of the Ghūr. It is fringed with trees and shrubs—poplar, tamarisk, rhododendron, agnus castus, apple of Sodom—and its waters contain a great many fish—various species of capoche, the barbarus canis, the cypripedium, and a kind of catfish (sitraus). Vipers, scorpions, porouscided jackals, wild sheep, goats, panteer, and a great variety of birds are found in the neighbouring thickets. A tropical temperature predominates. The water of the Jordan contains a saline residuum, chlorine, sodium, sulphuric acid, and magnesia. The floods of the river occur from February to May. Its width is very variable: at Ghūranieh scarcely more than twenty-seven yards; at the ford of el Henid as much as forty-five to fifty-five yards; at its mouth about eighty yards. The volume of water brought to the Dead Sea by the Jordan is calculated to be, on the average, 883 cubic feet per second.

F. M. ABEL.

JORDANIS or JORNANDES, historian, lived about the middle of the sixth century in the Eastern Roman Empire. His family was of high standing, "either Goth or Alanic, and his grandfather was notary to Candac, King of the Alani in Mesia. He himself held for a time the office of notary, though under what circumstances is not well known. He was later "converted", that is, he took orders. Everything else that is reported of his life rests on more or less plausible conjecture. It is not really proven, for example, that he bore "before his conversion" the martial name of Jornandes (i.e. bold as a bear). At Carthage he became a monk in Thrace or in Mesia. It is also uncertain whether he was Bishop of Croton, and whether the Vigilius, to whom he dedicated his second work, was Pope Viglius, who from 554 to 574 lived in exile, chiefly at Constantinople. The two of his historical works that are best known, and on which a history of the Goths, or, perhaps it would be better to say, of Mesia. It is now commonly entitled: "De origine actibusque Getarum",...
and is dedicated to his friend Castulus (Castalnis), at whose instance it was begun about 551. It is substantially an extract from the Gothic history of Cassiodorus Senator, which probably bore the same title. But as this latter work was a prosperous future was this excerpt becomes of almost inestimable value in determining a series of facts in the history of the Goths and of popular migrations. Naturally, Jordanis transplanted into his work the fundamental idea of Cassiodorus, namely the conviction that the only way to secure for the Goths was a prosperous future was to bring about its peaceful absorption into the Roman Empire as the centre of Catholicism and of civilization. The second of his works is sometimes called "De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum", sometimes "De regnorum et temporum successione". In the latter "Liber originum muni. et actibus Romanorum ceterarumque gentium", and again "De gestis Romanorum". Jordanis served as a source of information for the geographers of Ravenna, for Paul the Deacon, for Hermann Contractus, Hugh of Flavigny, and others. The following, among some forty editions, are worth noting: Augustin of Hambach (1570); Conrad Peutinger; Migne, P.L., LXXI; Mommsen in "Monumenta Germ. Auctores antiquissimi", V; Rûdiger in the "Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit"; V. Fr. tr. by Savagner (Paris, 1842 and 1883); Swedish translation by Peringskiöld (Stockholm, 1719).


PATRICK SCHLAGER

Jordanus von Giano (de Jano), Italian Minorite, b. at Giano in the Valley of Spoleto, c. 1195; d. after 1262. About the year 1220 he entered the Franciscan Order and a year later was sent to Germany with a few other members of his order under the leadership of Cesarino of Spoleto, the first Minorite provincial of Germany. In 1223 he was ordained priest, and in 1225 he became guardian at Mainz and custos of the Minorite house in Thuringia. He did much for the spread of his order in Northern Germany. In 1230, and again in 1238, he was sent to Italy on business related to his order. He was present at a chapter of German Franciscans held at Halberstadt in 1262. On this occasion he dictated the early memoirs of the Franciscans in Germany (De primitivorum Fratrum in Theutoniam missorum et conversatione et vita) to a certain Brother Baldwin of Brandenburg. The memoirs begin with the year 1207 and are one of the chief sources for Franciscan history in Germany. The extant manuscript breaks off abruptly at the year 1238, and has been carefully edited in "Analecta Franciscana", 1 (Quaracchi, 1885), 1-19. A German translation with many erroneous annotations was published by Voigt in "Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften", V (Leipzig, 1870).


MICHAEL OSPE

Jörg, Joseph Edmund, historian and politician, b. 23 Dec., 1819, at Immenstadt (Allgau); d. at Landshut, 18 Nov., 1901. The son of a subaltern, he first studied theology, then philology and history at Munich. He was a pupil of Dollinger, and was for years his collaborator in his "Geschichte der Reformation". In 1852 he was engaged in the Bavarian Record Office, and undertook in the same year the editorship of the "Historisch-politische Blätter", which he retained (from 1857 with Franz Binder) till a short time before his death. For decades his "Zeitläufer", which appeared in this periodical, attracted great attention. On account of his opposition to the Government, he was transferred to Neuburg on the Danube, but was elected in 1863 a substitute member of the Bavarian Lower House, to which he belonged till 1881. He was promoted in 1866 to the position of district archivist at Landshut; from 1885 to 1889 he was a member of the Zollparlament, and from 1874 to 1879 a member of the German Reichstag. His first work, "Deutschland in der Revolutionsperiode, 1722-26" (1851), a history of the German War of the Peace, was a remarkable display of the characteristics of the later books, "Geschichte des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwickelung" (1888) and "Die neue Aera in Preussen" (1869), are a collection of separate essays published in the paper "Historisch-politische Blätter". He was one of the first to realize the true meaning of the development of socialism, as early as 1867 his "Geschichte der sozialpolitischen Parteien in Deutschland" appeared, having originated in his "Aphorismen" on the socialist movement published in the "Historisch-politische Blätter". Jörg was a conservative, a 'Great German', a convinced Bavarian monarchist, and a devoted adherent of the Bavarian liberal party, and of the subordination of Bavaria to Prussia. The Bavarian "Volkspartei" (People's Party) grew with his cooperation in a few years from a modest group to a majority in the House (1869).

Under King Max II, Jordanis violently opposed to the ministry of von der Pfordten, as he was also to the alliance made with Prussia (22 August) after the unfortunate issue of the war of 1866. His address to the House in Jan., 1870, occasioned the resignation of Prince Hohenlohe with a part of his cabinet. But henceforth events took their course uninfluenced by Jordanis. At the outbreak of the Franco-German War he advocated the armed neutrality of Bavaria, but was deserted in the House by a number of his party; he was thus unable to prevent his country's participation in the war and the entrance of Bavaria, by the Treaty of Versailles, into the new German Empire. However, he afterwards loyally accepted the new order of things. In the Reichstag his proposal to call a meeting of the committee for foreign affairs under the presidency of Bavaria gave rise to a violent conflict with Bismarck on 4 December, 1874. His attack on the Luta ministry in 1875 failed because of the opposition of the archbishop. He left the Reichstag in the same year, later the Bavarian House, thereby ending his public life. The last twenty years of his life were passed on the Burg Traunstein near Landshut (whence he was known as the "Hermit of the Traunstein"). His remainder of his days was devoted to his journalistic work and his duties in the district archives of Landshut. A man of stainless honour, a Catholic of firm faith, a prominent politician, he was a strongly marked personality, and is acknowledged as such even by his opponents. Besides his above-named works his "Memoirs" also deserve attention. Obituary by Binder in Historisch-politische Blätter, CXXXVIII (1901), 773. For a list of the other scantly sources see Dibelius in Reallexikon u. deutscher Neuhochdeutsch, VI (1904); cf. Totenliste, ii., 53.

HELMUTH CARDANUS

Jornandes. See Jordanis.

Josaphat. See Barlaam and Josaphat.

Josaphat (Yosafat), fourth king of Juda after the schism of the Ten Tribes. He was the son and successor of Asa, whose virtuous reign had established good traditions to which the new king endeavoured to remain faithful. He ascended the throne at the age of thirty-five and reigned twenty-three years (914-899 b.c.; 877-53 according to the Assyrian chronology). His zeal in suppressing the idolatrous worship of the "high places" is commended (II Par., xvii, 6), but it was only partially
Josaphat (Jehoshaphat), Valley of, mentioned in only one passage of the Bible (Joel, iii—Heb. text, iv). In verse 2 we read: "I will gather together all nations, valley of judgment, and no more—for Josaphat signifies "Jahveh judges". This valley is, in fact, spoken of under the name of "valley of destruction" (A. V. "valley of decision") in verse 14 of the same chapter. According to the context, the Divine judgment will be pronounced upon the nations of the world, and Jerusalem at the time of the captivity and the return from exile.

In the fourth century, with the Pilgrim of Bordeaux, the Cedron takes the name of Valley of Josaphat. Eusebius and St. Jerome strengthen this view (Onomasticon, s. v.), while Cyril of Jerusalem appears to indicate a different place; early Jewish tradition denied the reality of this valley. Subsequently to the fourth century, Christians, Jews, and, later, Mussalmans regard Cedron as the place of the last judgment. What has lent colour to this popular belief is the fact that since the time of the kings of Judah, Cedron has been the principal necropolis of Jerusalem. Josias scattered upon the tombs of the children of Israel the ashes of the idol of Astarte which he burned in Cedron (IV Kings, xxiii, 4). It was in Cedron that the "hand" of Absalom was set up, and the monument of St. James, and there, too, may be seen, in our own day, the very ancient monolithic tomb said to be that of Pharaoh's daughter, and the sepulchres of certain priestly families now known as the tombs of Absalom, of St. James, and of St. Zachary. The ornamental façade of the tomb said to be that of Josaphat has been completely walled up by the Jews, who have their cemeteries on the flanks of the Valley of Cedron. They wish to stand in the first rank on the day when God shall appear in the Valley of Josaphat.

Josaphat Kuntsevič, Saint, martyr, b. in the little town of Volodymyr in Lithuania (1532) or—according to some writers—1554; d. at Vitebsk, Russia, 12 November, 1623. The saint's birth occurred in a gloomy period for the Ruthenian Church. Even as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century the Florentine Union had become a dead-letter; in the case of the Ruthenian Church, complete demoralisation followed in the wake of its severance from Rome, and the whole body of its clergy became notorious alike for their gross ignorance and the viciousness of their lives. After the Union of Berest in 1596 the Ruthenian Church was divided into two contending parties—the Uniates and those who persevered in schism—each with its own hierarchy. Among the leaders of the schismatic party, who laboured to enkindle popular hatred against the Uniates, Meletius Smotryckyj was conspicuous, and the most celebrated of his victims was Josaphat. Although of a noble Ruthenian stock, Josaphat's father had devoted himself to commercial pursuits, and held the office of town-councillor. Both parents contributed to implant the seeds of piety in the heart of their child. In the school at Volodymyr Josaphat—Johannes was the saint's baptismal name—gave evidence of unusual talent: he applied himself with the greatest zeal to the study of ecclesiastical Slav, and learned almost the entire Kasodow (breviary), which from this period he began to read daily. From this source he drew his early religious education, for the unlettered clergy seldom preached or gave catechetical instruction. Owing to the straitened circumstances of his parents, he was apprenticed to an merchant and apprenticed at Viena. In this town, remarkable for the corruption of its morals and the contentions of the various religious sects, he seemed specially guarded by Providence, and became acquainted with certain excellent men (e. g. Benjamin Rutski), under whose direction
Joseph, Saint, spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary and foster-father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The chief sources of information on the life of St. Joseph are the first chapters of our first and third Gospels; they are practically also the only reliable sources, for, whilst, on the holy patriarch's relations with Christ, we have no direct information, we do have a few very important facts connected with the Saviour's history which were left untouched by the canonical writings, the apocryphal literature is full of details, the non-admittance of these works into the Canon of the Sacred Books casts a strong suspicion upon their contents; and, even granted that some of the facts recorded by them may be founded on trustworthy traditions, it is in most instances next to impossible to discern and sift these portions of true history from the fancies with which they are associated. Among these apocryphal productions dealing more or less extensively with some episodes of St. Joseph's life may be noted the so-called "Gospel of James", the "Pseudo-Matthew", the "Gospel of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary", the "Story of Joseph the Carpenter" (in Tischendorf, "Evangelia Apocrypha", Leipzig, 1879), and the "Life of the Virgin and Death of Joseph" (also in Robinson, " Apocalypse Gospel", Cambden, 1863). St. Alphonsus Liguori (Ecclesiasticum Tryph., lxxviii, in P. G., VI, 888) and tradition has accepted this interpretation, which is followed in the English Bible. It is probably at Nazareth that Joseph betrothed and married her who was to become
the mother of God. When the marriage took place, whether before or after the Incarnation, is no easy matter to settle, and on this point the masters of exegesis have at all times been at variance. Most moderns (unaccountably, following the footsteps of St. Thomas, understand that, at the epoch of the Annunciation, the Blessed Virgin was only affianced to Joseph; as St. Thomas notices, this interpretation suits better all the evangelical data.

It will not be without interest to recall here, unreliable though it be, the legend of Joseph's marriage. St. Joseph's marriage contained in the apocryphal writings. When forty years of age, Joseph married a woman called Meleta or Eseba by some, Salome by others; they lived forty-nine years together and had six children, two daughters and four sons, the youngest of whom was James (the Less, "the Lord's brother"). A year after his wife's death, as the priests announced through Judea that they wished to find in the tribe of Judah a respectable man to espouse Mary, then twelve to fourteen years of age, Joseph, who was at the time ninety years old, went up to Jerusalem among the candidates; a miracle manifested the choice of God in favour of St. Joseph and in due time the Annunciation took place. These dreams, as St. Jerome styles them, from which many a Christian artist has drawn his inspiration (see, for instance, Raphael's "Espousals of the Virgin" in The Catholic Encyclopedia, V., 542), are void of authority; they never met with the approval of the church. nor is there any probability that he died and was buried at Nazareth.

Joseph was "a just man". This praise bestowed by the Holy Ghost, and the privilege of having been chosen by God to be the foster-father of Jesus and the Spouse of the Virgin Mother, are the foundations of the honour paid to Joseph. But Joseph was actually grounded are these foundations that it is not a little surprising that the cult of St. Joseph was so slow in winning recognition. Foremost among the causes of this is the fact that "during the first centuries of the Church's existence, it was only the martyrs who enjoyed religious veneration" (Kelner). Far from being ignored or passed over in silence during the early Christian ages, St. Joseph's prerogatives were occasionally descanted upon by the Fathers; even such eulogies as cannot be attributed to the writers among whose works they found admittance bear witness that the idea was not altogether unknown. The majority were familiar, not only to the theologians and great leaders of Christian thought, but to obscure preachers, and must have been readily welcomed by the people.

The earliest traces of public recognition of the sanctity of St. Joseph are to be found in the East. His feast, if we may trust the assertions of Paprocko, was kept by the Copts as early as the beginning of the fourth century. Nicephorus Callistus tells likewise—on what authority we do not know—that in the great basilica erected at Bethlehem by St. Helena, there was a gorgeous oratory dedicated to the honour of our saint. Certain it is, at all events, that "the Saint of the Carpenter" is entered on 20 July, in one of the old Coptic Calendars in our possession, as also in a Synaxarium of the eighth and ninth century published by Cardinal Mai (Script. Vet. Nova Coll., IV, 15 sqq.). Greek menologia of a later date at least mention St. Joseph on 25 or 26 December, and a twofold commemoration of him along with other saints was made on the two Sundays next before and after Christmas.

In the West the name of the foster-father of our Lord (Nutritor Domini) appears in local martyrologies of the ninth and tenth centuries, and we find in 1129, for the first time, a church dedicated to his honour at Bologna. The devotion, then merely private, as it seems, gained a great impetus owing to the influence and zeal of such saintly persons as St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Gertrude (d. 1310), and St.
Bridget of Sweden (d. 1373). According to Benedict XIV (De Serv. Dei beati, I, iv, n. 11; xx, n. 17), "the general opinion of the learned is that the Fathers of Carmel were the first to import from the East into the West the laudable practice of giving the fullest cultus to St. Joseph. His feast was placed towards the end of the fourteenth century into the Franciscan and, shortly afterwards, into the Dominican Calendar, gradually gained a foothold in various dioceses of Western Europe. Among the most zealous promoters of the devotion at that epoch, St. Vincent Ferrer (d. 1419), Peter d'Alilly (d. 1420), St. Bartholomew of Salerno (d. 1444), and Jean Chartier Gerson (d. 1429) deserve a special mention. Gerson, who had, in 1400, composed an Office of the Espousals of Joseph and Mary, displayed all his learning and influence, particularly at the Council of Constance (1414), in promoting the public recognition of the cult of St. Joseph. Only under the pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471-84), were the efforts of these holy men rewarded by the introduction of the feast of St. Joseph into the Roman Calendar (19 March). From that time the devotion acquired greater and greater popularity, the dignity of the feast keeping pace with this steady growth. At first it was only a fortress, simple, it was elevated to a double rite by Innocent VIII (1484-92), declared by Gregory XV, in 1621, a festival of obligation, at the instance of the Emperors Ferdinand III and Leopold I and of King Charles II of Spain, and raised to the rank of a double of the second class by Clement XI (1700-21). Further, Benedict XIII, in 1726, inserted the name into the Litany of the Saints.

One festival in the year, however, was not deemed enough to satisfy the piety of the people. The feast of the Espousals of the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, so strenuously advocated by Gerson, and permitted first by Paul III to the Franciscans, then to other religious orders and individual dioceses, was, in 1725, granted to all countries that solicited it, a proper Office, compiled by the Dominican Pietro Aurato, being assigned, and the day appointed being 23 January. Now was this all, for the reformed Order of Carmelites, into which St. Teresa had infused her great devotion to the foster-father of Jesus, chose him, in 1621, for their patron, and in 1689, were allowed to celebrate the feast of his Patronage on the third Sunday after Easter. This feast, soon adopted throughout the South American mission, was later extended to all dioceses and dioceses which asked for the privilege. No devotion, perhaps, who has grown so universal, none seems to have appealed so forcibly to the heart of the Christian people, and particularly of the labouring classes, during the nineteenth century, as that of St. Joseph.

This wonderful and unprecedented increase of popularity called for a new lustre to be added to the cult of the saint. Accordingly, one of the first acts of the pontificate of Pius IX, himself singularly devout to St. Joseph, was to extend to the whole Church the feast of St. Joseph (1845). It was added, according to the wishes of the bishops and of all the faithful, he solemnly declared the Holy Patriarch Joseph patron of the Catholic Church, and enjoined that his feast (19 March) should henceforth be celebrated as a double of the first class (but without octave, on account of Lent). Following in the footsteps of their predecessor, Leo XIII and Pius X have shown an equal desire to add their own jewel to the crown of St. Joseph: the former, by permitting on certain days the reading of the votive Office of the saint; and the latter by approving, on 18 March, 1909, a litany in honour of whom his name he received in baptism.


CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Joseph (mü); Sept. Ισαφ; Vulg., in Machabees: Josephus), the eleventh son of Jacob, the first-born of Rachel, and the immediate ancestor of the tribes of Manasses and Ephraim. His life is narrated in Gen., xx, 22-24; xxxvi, 29-39, wherein contemporary scholars distinguish three chief documents (J, E, P). (See ABRAHAM.) The date of his eventful career can be fixed only approximately at the present day, for the Biblical account of Joseph's life does not name the particular Pharaoh of his time, and the Egyptian customs and manners therein alluded to are not to be reduced to any special period of Egyptian history. His term of office in Egypt falls probably under one of the later Hyksos kings (see EGYPT). His name, either contracted from Jehoseph (Ps. xiii, 6, in the Heb.) or abbreviated from Joseph-Eti (cf. Karnak inscription of Thothmes III, no. 76), is distinctly connected in Gen., xxx, 23, 24, with the Hebrew structure and is interpreted: "may God add". He was born in Haran, of Rachel, Jacob's beloved and long-haired wife, and became the favourite son of the aged patriarch. After Jacob's return to Chanaan, various circumstances made Joseph the object of the mortal hatred of his brothers. He had witnessed some very wicked deed of several among them, and they knew that it had been reported to their father. Moreover, in his partiality to Joseph, Jacob gave him an ample garment of many colours, and this manifest proof of the patriarch's greater love for him aroused the jealousy of Joseph's brothers to such an extent that "they could not speak peaceably to him". Finally, with the imprudence of youth, Joseph told his brothers two dreams which clearly portended his future elevation over them all, but which, for the present, simply caused them to hate him all the more (Gen. xxxvii, 1-11). In this frame of mind, the youngest brother having the best opportunity to get rid of the one of whom they spoke as "the dreamer". As they fed their father's flocks in Dothan (now Tell Dothan, about fifteen miles north of Sichem), they saw from afar Joseph, who had been sent by Jacob to inquire about their welfare, coming to them, and they at once resolved to reduce to naught all his dreams of future greatness. At this point the narrative in Genesis combines two distinct accounts of the manner in which the brothers of Joseph actually carried out their intention of avenging themselves upon him. These accounts present slight variations, which are examined in detail by recent commentators on Genesis. A third零碎 is inserted into the text to form the historical character of the fact that, through the enmity of his brothers, Joseph was brought down to Egypt. To protect themselves they dipped Joseph's fine garment into the blood of a kid, and sent it to their father. At the sight of this blood-stained garment, Jacob naturally believed that a wild beast had devoured his beloved son, and he gave himself up to the most intense grief (xxxvii, 12-35).

While thus bewailed as dead by his father, Joseph was sold into Egypt, and treated with the utmost consideration and the greatest confidence by his Egyptian master, to whom Gen. xxxvii, 36, gives the name of Potiphar ("He whom Ra (the sun-god) gave") and whom it describes as Pharaoh's eunuch and as the captain of the royal body-guard (cf. xxxix, 1). Quick and trustworthy, Joseph soon became his master's
personal attendant. He was next entrusted with the superintendence of his master's house, a most extensive and responsible charge, such as was usual in large Egyptian households. With Yahweh's blessing, all things went well with him; and, prospering under Joseph's management that his master trusted him implicitly, and "knew not any other thing, save the bread which he ate." While thus discharging with perfect success his manifold duties of 

major-domo (Egypt. mer-per), Joseph was often brought in contact with the king and the wealthy of Egypt. There was as much free intercourse between men and women in Egypt as there is among us in the present day. Oftentimes she noticed the youthful and handsome Hebrew overseer, and carried away by passion, she repeatedly tempted him to commit adultery with her, till at length, resenting his virtuous conduct, she accused him of those very criminal solicitations wherewith she had herself pursued him. The credulous master believed the report of his wife, and in his wrath cast Joseph into prison. There also Yahweh was with His faithful servant: He gave him favour with the keeper of the prison, who soon placed in Joseph implied that his brothers might be released and the other prisoners (xxxix, 7-23). Shortly afterwards two of Pharaoh's officers, the chief butler and chief baker, having incurred the royal displeasure for some reason unknown to us, were put in ward in the house of the captain of the guard. They also were friends with Joseph, and, discovering his kindness in to them one morning, he noticed their unusual sadness. They could not catch the meaning of a dream which each had had during the night, and there was no professional interpreter of dreams near at hand. Then it was that Joseph interpreted their dreams correctly, bidding the chief butler to remember him when restored to his office, as indeed he was three days after, on Pharaoh's birthday (xi). Two years rolled by, after which the monarch himself had two dreams, the one of the fat and lean kine, and the other of the full and the withered ears. Great was Pharaoh's perplexity at these dreams, which no one in the realm could interpret. This occurrence naturally reminded the chief butler of Joseph's skill in interpreting dreams, and he mentioned to the king what had happened in his own case and in that of the chief baker. Summoned before Pharaoh, Joseph declared that both dreams were interpreted of the same things, and immediately be followed by seven years of famine, and further suggested that one-fifth of the produce of the years of plenty be laid by as a provision for the years of famine. Deeply impressed by the clear and plausible interpretation of his dreams, and recognizing in Joseph a wisdom more than human, the monarch entrusted to him the carrying out of the measure which he had suggested. For this purpose he raised him to the rank of keeper of the royal seal, invested him with an authority second only to that of the throne, bestowed on him the Egyptian name of Zaphenath-paneah ("God spoke, and he came into being.") (xiii). He also gave him the name of Putiphares, the priest of the great national sanctuary at On (or Heliopolis, seven miles north-east of the modern Cairo).

Soon the seven years of plenty predicted by Joseph set in, during which he stored up corn in each of the cities from which it was gathered, and his wife, Aseneth, bore him two sons whom he called Manasses and Ephram, from the favourable circumstances of the time of their birth. Next came the seven years of dearth, during which by his skilful management Joseph saved Egypt from the worst features of want and hunger, and not only Egypt, but also the various countries around, which had to suffer from the same grievous and protracted famine (xii). Among these neighbouring countries was counted the land of Canaan where Jacob had continued to dwell with Joseph's eleven brothers. Having heard that corn was sold in Egypt, the aged patriarch sent his sons thither to purchase some, keeping back, however, Rachel's second child, Benjamin, "lest perhaps he take harm in the journey." As befitted him in the presence of his brothers failed to recognize in the Egyptian grandee before them the lad whom they had so cruelly treated twenty years before. He roughly accused them of being spies sent to discover the undefended passes of the eastern frontier of Egypt, and when they volunteered information about their family, he, desirous of ascertaining the truth concerning Benjamin, restrained one of them as hostage in prison and sent the others home to bring back their youngest brother with them. On their return to their father, or at their first lodging-place on the way, they discovered the money which Joseph had ordered to be placed in their sacks. Great was their anxiety and that of Jacob, who for a time refused to allow his sons to return to Egypt in company with Benjamin. At length he yielded under the pressure of famine, sending, at the same time, a present to conciliate the favour of the Egyptian prime minister. At the sight of Benjamin Joseph undertook to delude them that he should make a feigned search for him first appearance before him, and he invited them to a feast in his own house. At the feast he caused them to be seated exactly according to their age, and he honoured Benjamin with "a greater mess," as a mark of distinction (xlii-xliii). Then they left for home, unsuspecting that at all events one of them had been hidden in Benjamin's sack. They were soon overtaken, charged with theft of that precious cup, which, upon search, was found in the sack where it had been hidden. In their dismay they returned in a body to Joseph's house, and offered to remain as his bondmen in Egypt, an offer which Joseph declined, declaring that he would only retain Benjamin. Whereupon Juda pleads most pathetically that, for the sake of his aged father, Benjamin be dismissed free, and that he be allowed to remain in his brother's place as Joseph's bondman. Then it was that Joseph disclosed himself to his brothers, calmed their fears, and sent them back with a pressing invitation to Jacob to come and settle in Egypt (xli-xlv, 24).

It was in the land of Gessen, a pastoral district about forty miles north-east of Cairo, that Joseph called his father and brothers to settle. There they lived as prosperous underway. But when the misery the Egyptians were gradually reduced to sell their lands to the Crown, in order to secure their subsistence from the all-powerful prime minister of Pharaoh. And so Joseph brought it to pass that the former owners of landed property— with the exception, however, of the priests—became simple tenants of the king and paid to the royal treasury, as it were, an annual rent of one-fifth of the produce of the soil (xlv, 28-xlvi, 26). During Jacob's last moments, Joseph promised his father that he would bury him in Canaan, and caused him to adopt his two sons, Manasses and Ephram (xlvii, 25-xlvi, 8). After his father's demise, he had them brought to him with great pomp in the Cave of Machpelah (i, 1-14). He also allayed the fears of his brothers who dreaded that he should now avenge their former ill-treatment of him. He died at the age of 110, and his body was embalmed and put in a coffin in Egypt (i, 15-29).

Ultimately, his remains were carried into Canaan and buried in Shechem (Exod., xiii, 19; Josue, xxxiv, 32).

Such, in substance, is the Biblical account of Joseph's career. In its wonderful simplicity, it sketches one of the most beautiful characters presented by Old Testament history. As a boy, Joseph has the most vivid horror for the evil done by some of his brothers; and as a youth, he resists with unflinching courage the repeated and pressing solicitations of his master's wife. Cast into prison, he displays great power of endurance, trusting to God for his justification. When
raised to the rank of viceroy of Egypt, he shows himself worthy of that exalted dignity by his skilful and energetic efforts to promote the welfare of his adopted country. His character is a masterful exemplification of the type of the ‘true and masterful shepherd.’

A character so beautiful made Joseph a most worthy type of Christ, the model of all perfection, and it is comparatively easy to point out some of the traits of resemblance between Jacob’s beloved son and the dearly beloved Son of God. Like Jesus, Joseph was hated and cast out by his brethren, and yet brought out their salvation through the sufferings they had brought upon him. Like Jesus, Joseph obtained his exaltation only after passing through the deepest and most undeserved humiliations; and, in the kingdom over which he ruled, he invited his brethren to join the kingdom of God he had looked upon as strangers, in order that they also might enjoy the blessings which he had stored up for them. Like the Saviour of the world, Joseph had but words of forgiveness and blessing for all who, recognising their misery, had recourse to his supreme power. It was to Joseph of old, as to Jesus, that all had to appeal for relief, offer homages of the deepest respect, and yield ready obedience in all things. Finally, to the Patriarch Joseph, as to Jesus, it was given to inaugurate a new order of things for the greater power and glory of the monarch to whom he owed his exaltation.

[The text continues, discussing the parallels and lessons from Joseph’s life to the life of Jesus, and the historical context of the Egyptian culture and its impact on religious and historical interpretations.]
the welfare of the people. French "enlightenment" also influenced him, especially in the persons of Voltaire and his royal adept, Frederick the Great. Joseph viewed with jealous discontent the intellectual supremacy of the Protestant North of Germany, then first dominant over the Catholic South: he also reflected with chafing impatience on Frederick's victories and talent for government, and thence conceived a definite aim in life. But when he ascended the throne, his plans failed utterly.

Joseph's father.—After 1765 Joseph acted as emperor and co-regent with his mother, but administered only the business routine and the military affairs of the empire. Finally, resenting the manner in which his hands were tied by his prudent parent, he took to travel in Italy, France, and the Crown Lands. Twice he met Frederick the Great, and in 1780 Catherine II of Russia. In the same year his mother, Empress Maria Theresa, died, and Joseph was free.

(a) In the Empire.—Joseph applied himself with the best intentions, among other matters, to the reform of imperial jurisprudence. But difficulties from within and without checked his fiery enthusiasm. Although a Liberal and an imperialist, whenever the interests of the Hapsburgs were in question, he allowed the imperial power to be lessened after the fashion of other German princes. Ecclesiastical politics also played a considerable rôle in the empire. Joseph tried to secure German ecclesiastical preferments for Austrian princes, urged obsolete imperial privileges, e.g. the so-called Pansabriege to provide for the support of his lay adherents in imperial monasteries. By cutting off the Austrian territory of such great metropolitan sees as Salzburg and Passau, he severed the last tie which united Austria with the empire. Though not in itself conflicting with German interests, his scheme of exchanging the Austrian Netherlands for the neighbouring Bavaria on the occasion of the impending change of dynasty, led to the Bavarian War of Succession. In 1785 the Revival of this scheme by forming the "League of Princes". Joseph now endeavoured to expand his dominions in the north and east, and to make Austria dominant in Central Europe. He obtained a considerable increase of territory in the First Partition of Poland (1773), and concluded a defensive alliance with Russia, which led to great schemes for a larger gain of territory in the east. In the Austro-Russian War against the Turks (1788), however, Joseph's army took Belgrade, Catherine obtained all the fruits of the campaign.

(b) In Austria.—In home affairs, Joseph sought to weld the fundamentally differing peoples of the Austrian empire—Germans, Hungarians, Belgians, Italians—into one compact nation. So he began to level and centralise great and small things in every direction and in the greatest haste. Frederick II said of Joseph: "He takes the second step before the first." Joseph's predecessor had not been heedless of the new territories. She had set the secularization in a modern groove. In church affairs she had resorted to strict measures to regulate disorders, but Joseph saw in these only "half measures and incon-sistencies", and, in the glow of conviction, "desired by hot-house methods to bring his mother's incipient reforms to maturity" (Krones). He united the administration of all the provinces in the central council at Vienna, of which he himself was the head. While he abolished their diets or paralysed them by the provincial executive authorities. Though a professod enemy of every irregularity, he often undertook to decide matters belonging to the central government at Vienna. German became the official language in all the countries subject to his rule: the laws of justice were independent and impartial to noble and peasant, Serfdom and the right of the landed nobles to punish their tenants ceased; the codification of the civil and criminal laws, begun in 1753, was furthered, and the death penalty was abolished. In his Ehepatent Joseph created the Austrian marriage law; he subjected the nobility and clergy to state taxation, and opened up new sources of revenue; he abolished the censorship and permitted freedom of speech, but which loosed a flood of pamphlets of the most pernicious kind, especially in ecclesiastical polemics.

III. ECCLESIASTICAL POLICY.—(a) Its Development.—Joseph was the father of Josephinism, which is nothing else than the highest development of the craving common among secular princes after an episcopal and territorial church. Its beginnings can be traced in Austria to the thirteenth century, and it became clearly marked in the sixteenth, especially so far as the administration of church property was concerned. It was fostered in the second half of the eighteenth century by the spread of Febronian and Jansenist ideas, based on Gallican principles. These notions united the empire with the empire. Though not in itself conflicting with German interests, his scheme of exchanging the Austrian Netherlands for the neighbouring Bavaria on the occasion of the impending change of dynasty, led to the Bavarian War of Succession. In 1785 the Revival of this scheme by forming the "League of Princes". Joseph now endeavored to expand his dominions in the north and east, and to make Austria dominant in Central Europe. He obtained a considerable increase of territory in the First Partition of Poland (1773), and concluded a defensive alliance with Russia, which led to great schemes for a larger gain of territory in the east. In the Austro-Russian War against the Turks (1788), however, Joseph's army took Belgrade, Catherine obtained all the fruits of the campaign.

(b) In Austria.—In home affairs, Joseph sought to weld the fundamentally differing peoples of the Austrian empire into one compact nation. So he began to level and centralise great and small things in every direction and in the greatest haste. Frederick II said of Joseph: "He takes the second step before the first." Joseph's predecessor had not been heedless of the new territories. She had set the secularization in a modern groove. In church affairs she had resorted to strict measures to regulate disorders, but Joseph saw in these only "half measures and inco-
to natural law, and therefore to the will of Christ; consequently the Church has no right to enact such laws, or can the State accept them. Kautzke reduced these principles to practice: "The supremacy of the State over the Church extends to all ecclesiastical laws and practices devised and established solely by man, and whatever else the Church owes to the consent and sanction of the secular power. Consequently, the State must have the power to limit, alter, or annul its former concessions, whenever reasons of state, abuses, or altered circumstances demand it." Joseph raised these propositions to principles of government, and treated ecclesiastical institutions as public departments of the State. Maria Theresa had been secretly opposed to Josephinism. Most of the measures that proscribed Josephinism in the latter part of her reign had not her approval. Joseph's entire policy was the embodiment of his idea of a centralized empire developing from within and in which all public affairs, political and ecclesiastical-political, were treated as an indivisible whole. His reforms, a medley of financial, social-reformatory, and ecclesiastico-reformatory ideas, have no solid foundation.

(b) The Reforms.—Bishops' religious orders, and benefices were limited by the Austrian boundary. No bishops were entitled to "ecclesiometry", which simplified the often very confused overlapping of diocesan authorities. The announcement of papal, in fact of all ecclesiastical, decrees, was made dependent on imperial approval (see Placeto); decisions on impediments to marriage were referred to the bishops; the communication of the bishops with Rome, and of the religious orders with their generals in foreign countries, was forbidden, partly from considerations of political economy. In 1783, while at Rome, Joseph personally threatened that he would establish an independent state-church; he abolished all exemptions from episcopal authority or from an obligatory oath brought the bishops into dependence on the State. The acceptance of papal titles and attendance at the German College in Rome were forbidden, and a German College was established at Pavia in opposition to the Roman institution. The Edict of Toleration of 1781 granted to all denominations the free exercise of their religion and religious rights; at the same time a series of petty regulations concerning Divine service prescribed the number of the candles, the length and style of the sermons, the prayers, and hymns. All superfluous altars and all gorgeous vestments and images were to be removed; various passages in the Bible and the Gospels were to be omitted; dramatic questions were excluded from the pulpit, from which, on the other hand, all government proclamations were to be announced. "Our Brother the Sacrister", as Frederick the Great named Joseph, sincerely believed that in doing this he was creating a purified Divine service and ever heeded the discontent of his people and the enmies of non-Catholics.

The fundamental idea underlying a state-church is that the State is the administrator of the temporal property of the Church. Joseph embodied this idea in a law merging the funds of all churches, religious houses, and endowments within his territories, into one great fund for the various requirements of public worship, called the Religiousfonds. This fund was the pivot measure around which all other reforms turned. Not only ecclesiastical property hitherto devoted to parochial uses, not only the property of the nunneries, of the monasteries, but all ecclesiastical property— the still remaining religious houses, chapels, confra-ternities, and benefices, and all existing religious endowments whatsoever—was held to be part of the new fund. The suppression of the religious houses in 1787, affected at first only the contemplative orders. The Religiousfonds, created out of the property of the monasteries, gave a new direction to Joseph's monastic policy. In the forementioned "the wall became the palace", which from 1783 were the chief object of his suppressions. The journey of Pius VI to Vienna was fruitless, and the laity reacted but feebly against the suppressions. Of the 915 monasteries (762 for men, and 153 for women) existing in 1780 in German Austria (including Bohemia, Moravia, and Galicia), 588 (280 for men, 108 for women) were closed in 1785, which are often greatly exaggerated. By these suppressions the "religious fund" reached 35,000,000 gulden ($14,000,000). Countless works of art were destroyed or found their way to second-hand dealers or the mint, numberless libraries were pitilessly scattered. The suppressed religious houses brought no increase to the fund, and the suppression of the confraternities (1783) was likewise a financial failure. They were looked upon as sources of superstition and religious fanaticism; half their property was allotted to educational purposes, the other half was given over, "with all their ecclesiastical privileges, indulgences, and graces", to a new "Single Charitable Association", which possessed the features of both a confraternity and a charitable institution, and was intended to end all social distress. But the people had little taste for this "enlightened confraternity", and the confraternities, for processions and pilgrimages, and for devotions no longer permitted in the new arrangement of Divine service, all went to the Religiousfonds, which undertook to satisfy the provisions for masses, wherever the fact of endowment could be proved. Joseph assigned a definite number as pensions for distributing among the religious clergy. Benefits without cure of souls, prebends in the larger churches, and all canontories above a fixed number, belonging to collegiate churches and cathedral chapters, were forfeited to the "religious fund", and the incumbents transferred to parochial positions. A maximum was fixed for the endowment of bishops, the surplus being then used as the "religious fund", as were also the incomes of livings during their vacancy.

The first duty of the "religious fund" was to provide for the ex-religious. Their number did not exceed ten thousand. They received a yearly salary of 1,000 to 1,200 gulden ($50 to $60). The remaining funds were transferred to parochial and scholastic work. The state-church reached its fullest expression in the parochial organization. The State undertook to train and remunerate the clergy, to present to livings, and to regulate Divine service. No parish church was to be over an hour's walk from any parsonage; and a church was to be provided for every 700 souls. The monasteries which still remained bore the main burden of the parochial organization, and their inmates, as well as the ex-monks, were required to pass a state concursus for the pastoral positions, while only in cases of extreme necessity did the "religious fund" furnish the means for the building of churches and rectories, for the care of cemeteries, and the equipment of churches. Naturally, the "religious fund" had to pay the costs of placing the clergy under state control, of the general seminaries and the support of the young clerics, who so assiduously depended on the Government, of the institutes for the practical education of the clergy, which were to be established in every diocese, and of the support of sick and aged priests after the incorporation of the "religious fund" of the funds created for superannuated priests (Emeritifonds) and to supply needed support (Deutscherfonds).

The academic reforms of Maria Theresa (Studien-
reform) and of Rutenbergstrach (Studienplan) in 1776, and the introduction of Rieger's "Manual of Canon Law," paved the way for the creation of the general theological seminaries. At Vienna, Graz, Prague, Olmütz, Presburg, Pesth, Innsbruck, Freiburg, Lemberg (for Galicia, Greek and Latin Rites), Louvain, and Pavia. In 1733 all the monastic schools and diocesan houses of study were suppressed. The 'general seminaries' were board-established across the (Kongress) states, brought together with the universities; some of them, however, had their own theological courses. Five years of study in the seminary were followed by one in the bishop's training-house (Friestehaus) or in a monastery. The principles of the seminary directors were Liberal, in keeping with the rationalistic theology of the State. Steadily, in the direction across the state, the ecclesiastical foundations (Stifte) and the monasteries. The novices, educated at their expense in the general seminaries, for the most part lost their monastic vocation. Some of the general seminaries were badly managed. At Innsbruck, Pavia, and Louvain, unsuitable directors were appointed; at Louvain the general seminary was eventually the cause of a civil war and of the revolt of Belgium. However, other seminaries sent forth efficient pastors and learned theologians (Freiburg). The fermentation within the ranks of the clergy of south-west Germany and Austria which was in a ferment with the bishops. Reform came from the Liberal ideas imbibed at this time.

The accounts of the deplorably deprived conditions in the general seminaries, which are met with in earlier Catholic literature (Theiner, S. Brunner, Brück, Stöckl) and occasionally repeated even now, are in part exaggerations of faults and blunders that were real enough; to a considerable extent, however, they are based on forgeries "invented for the purpose of stirring up the smouldering flames of the Belgian Revolution". Seminaries like those of Freiburg and Vienna were counted among the worst, though it has been since proved that they were among the best. The most appalling abuses were reported of a seminary at Rottenburg in the Tyrol, though there was never a seminary in the place. These accusations, true or false, but chiefly the exhaustion of the "religious fund", hastened their suppression in 1790. They became, however, the models of the actual theological Konsvit (Konservativen) and the classical instruction in a state gymnasium), and the programme of studies laid out by Rutenbergstrach is to this day the groundwork of the curriculum in the Catholic theological faculties of Germany and Austria. The vesting of all ecclesiastical property in a single treasury was adopted, and as practice, the pittance of monastic property it was capitalized at great loss. The capital of every church and foundation had to be described publicly, converted into national bonds, and invested in the "religious fund". In this way Joseph to a certain extent satisfied his distrust of the ecclesiastical administration of property, while the same was placed at the service of the heavily encumbered state treasury. But many of the enterprises formerly conducted by the religious foundations could be no longer carried on owing to the slender returns. Still greater was the damage done to the credit and the resources of entire provinces, for hitherto the ecclesiastical institutions (e.g. the confraternities, chapels and churches in the country districts had been the only moneylenders. Peasants, mechanics, and artisans were now placed at the mercy of usurping Jews and foreigners, while many were forthwith ruined by the sudden demands made on them. A tax levied on church property which had escaped complete secularization. From 1778 it was imposed on the still existing religious orders and on the secular clergy. This oppressively high income-tax was meant to divert into the coffers of the "religious fund" all revenues of the aforesaid institutions not absolutely necessary for the support of life.

(c) Historical Importance.—The Religiousfonds was not the magnanimous act in favour of the religious needs of the people that it is held to have been. Formed by consolidating almost the entire property of the Church, it undertook only such obligations as it was in any case the duty of the State to fulfil, especially after the suppression of institutions which had previously only of their own accord relieved the State of a portion of these burdens. Moreover the "religious fund" was from the first diverted to other reforms, e.g. in education; in time of war it was made to contribute heavy subsidies and suspended almost all its contributions for the religious needs of the people. We can thus easily understand how in the nineteenth century the "religious fund" came to need state aid, which indeed the State was in justice bound to give in view of the fact that the national bonds, in which the "religious fund" had been chiefly invested, had sunk to one-fifth of their face value. The secularization under Joseph, if less offensive than other well-known secularizations, is nevertheless reprehensible, since Joseph undertook his reforms with the best intentions, but left only vague and incomplete semblances of reform. After a reign of ten years and fully aware of his failure, he ended his unhappy and lonely existence (20 February, 1780), leaving even the monarchy itself in peril. Human life had been lost. Other provinces were in a state of violent discontent. But though in general the Josephinist system collapsed, its essential principles remain: the efforts for union among all the lands of Austria are one result of the system; another is the attitude of the nineteenth-century State towards the Church.
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H. FRANE.

Joseph, Sisters of Saint.—Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph, founded at Le Puy, in Velay, France, by the Rev. Jean-Paul Médaille of the Congregation of Jesus (b. at Carcassonne, 29 Jan., 1818; d. at Auch, 15 May, 1850). He was admitted into the Society in 1840, became noted as a teacher of rhetoric and philosophy before entering upon his career as a preacher, in which he distinguished himself by his great oratorical power, but most especially by his influence over the souls. For a few of his most fervent penitents to consecrate themselves to the service of God, and addressed himself to the Bishop of Le Puy, the Right Rev. Henri de Maupas, a friend and disciple of the great St. Vincent de Paul. The bishop invited the aspirants to assemble at Le Puy where seven young women were received into the order on charge of the orphan asylum for girls. On 15 October, 1850, he addressed them as a religious community, placed them under the protection of St. Joseph, and ordered that they should be called the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph. As their numbers increased,
be gave them rules for their guidance, and as the congregation had been established in the diocese for the Christian education of children, he recommended that the teachers fit themselves especially for this important work. He also prescribed as their religious dress a black habit and veil, a black cincture on which a large rosary is worn, a hooded white linen acumbens, a white linen collet fastened across the forehead, and a white linen gimp fastened under the chin. Later a white linen gimp was added. In regard to the spirit by which the sisters were to be animated, Bishop de Maupas writes: "As I have found in the Visitations Order a sort of blessed predilection for the exact observance of the holiest laws of humility and devotion, I have determined..." The Congregation of St. Joseph on the same model, and in the same spirit, as the Sisters of the Visitations before they adopted enclosure." The constitutions which Father Médaille wrote for the sisters are borrowed from the rules of St. Ignatius, the saintly founder adding observations from his own experience. According to the rule, each community was to consider as its superior the bishop of the diocese, who was to appoint a spiritual father to accompany him, or, in his absence, to preside at the election of superiors and perform such offices as the necessities of the community might require. He was, at least, for the probation time of a postulant, and four years for novitiate training, two years preparatory, and two years after the making of the vows, which are final. At her profession, the novice receives a brass crucifix, which the bishop presents with these words: "Receive, my child, the cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ, to which you are affixed by the three vows as by so many nails; wear it openly on your breast as a most sure defence against the enemy; endeavour especially to carry it faithfully in your heart, by loving it tenderly and by bearing with delight and humility this sweet burden. May it be a sign whereby the faithful may know you and by it may give you the love of the cross with Jesus, you may also triumph with Him in glory." The sisters devote three hours a day to their regular devotions. They recite the Office of the Blessed Virgin on Sundays and feasts of obligation. On other days, the Office of the Holy Ghost is substituted.

The successor of Bishop de Maupas, Bishop Armand de Béthune, approved the congregation, 23 September, 1655, and Louis XIV confirmed by letters patent the first establishments of the Sisters of St. Joseph in the cities of Le Puy, St-Dié, and several other places in Voltaire. The sisters later introduced their way of life into the kingdom of Clermont, Vienne, Lyon, Grenoble, Embrun, Gap, Sisteron, Vivier, Uges, and almost the whole of France. Foundations were made also in Savoy, Italy, and Corsica.

In 1793 the convents and chapels of the sisters were confiscated, their annals were destroyed, and the religious were obliged to join communities in other countries, or to return to their respective homes in the world. The congregation had its martyrs, three during the persecution in Dauphiné, for refusing to take the civil oath, and two in another persecution in Brittany. During the reign of terror, several Sisters of St. Joseph died for the Faith, and several others escaped the guillotine only by the fall of Robespierre. Among the latter was Mother St. John Fontbonne, who in her notebook records the names of four Sisters of St. Joseph imprisoned with her at St. Dié, and three in the dungeon of Four, and twenty in Clermont and other parts of France.

The first use Mother St. John made of her liberty was to try to reassemble her dispersed community. She applied in vain to the municipality for the restoration of the convent in which she had invested her dowry, and while awaiting the dawn of a brighter day, received a letter from the Rev. Claude Cholletan, invited Mother St. John to repair, in 1807, to Saint-Etienne to take charge of a little band of religious representing different communities which, like that of St. Joseph, had been disbanded during the Revolution. Other young women joined the little household, all of whom Mother St. John zealously trained according to the life and rules of the first Sisters of St. Joseph. The community prospered. In 1809 the Congregation approved of the return of the sisters to their long vacant convents, and in some cases Revolutionary proprietors sold back to the sisters the property which had been confiscated. On reopening the mission at Monistrol, Mother St. John expressed great joy and satisfaction. The work of the congregation continued, the increase in numbers keeping pace with demands made on every side for convents and Catholic schools. Wherever obedience directed, thither the missionaries fanned, till representatives of the community might be counted in nearly every country in Europe, on the distant shores of Asia, and in the fastnesses of Africa.

The recent upheaval in France is like history repeating itself in the spirit of the Revolution. Hundreds of convents, schools, and charitable institutions, belonging to the Sisters of St. Joseph, have been suppressed, and the religious have been obliged to seek safety and shelter in other lands. Consequently many new missions, in the new nations of the Americas, and in the United States, have been recently opened. In 1903 four sisters who fled from France at the beginning of the troubles there, sought and obtained hospitality at St. Joseph's Convent, Flushing. They remained nearly two years, or until they had sufficiently mastered the English language, and fitted themselves for educational work awaiting them in Minnesota, where they have since opened three little mission houses.

**Boston.**—In 1873 the Sisters of St. Joseph of Brooklyn opened their first school at Jamaica Plain, in the Archdiocese of Boston, and three years later established new missions in the United States, and successively to Cambridge (1885), Brighton, and Canton (1902). The mother-house is still at Brighton. The sisters were soon in demand throughout the archdiocese, and now (1910) number 300, in charge of an academy, 12 parochial schools, a school for the deaf, and an industrial home for girls. They have 700 children under their care.

**Brooklyn.**—In the spring of 1856 the Right Rev. John Loughlin, first Bishop of Brooklyn, applied to the mother-house at Philadelphia for sisters, and two religious were named for the new mission, joined during the same session in the Seminary of the Holy Ghost, and the latter transferred to the Institute of Our Lady. The Academy, Williamburg, was opened on 8 Sept., 1856, and in the following year a parochial school was inaugurated. In 1860 the mother-house, novitiate, and boarding school were removed to Flushing, Long Island, whence the activity of the sisters was gradually extended over the diocese. In 1863 the mother-house and novitiate were again transferred to Brentwood, New York, where an academy was opened the same year. The community, now (1910) numbering over 600 members, is represented in over 50 parishes of the diocese, in which the sisters preside over 8 academies, 50 parochial schools, 3 orphan asylums, a home for aged women, and 2 hospitals, having under their care 11,000 children, not including 1300 orphans. They teach Christian doctrine in many Sunday schools besides those attached to the schools under their charge. In nearly all the mission houses are evening classes for adults to whom the sisters give religious instruction. They also visit the sick in the parishes in which they reside.

**Buffalo.**—The Sisters of St. Joseph were introduced into the Diocese of Buffalo in 1854, when three sisters from Carondelet, St. Louis, made a foundation at Canandaigua, New York. Two years later one of these sisters was brought to Buffalo to assume charge of Our Lady of Lourdes Institution for the instruction of deaf mutes, which had lately
been established. The novitiate was removed from Canandaigua to Buffalo in 1861. The community developed rapidly and soon spread through different parts of the diocese. By 1868 the sisters were sufficiently strong to direct their own affairs, and elected their own superior, thus forming a new diocesan congregation. In 1891 the mother-house and novitiate were transferred to Buffalo, the charge of the outskirts,等工作, and the academy was erected. The congregation, which now (1910) numbers 285 members, also has charge of 28 parochial schools in the diocese, 3 orphan asylums, a working boys’ home, an infants’ asylum, and a home for women and working girls. The sisters have under their care 5000 children, not including 470 orphans and deaf mute and 600 inmates of their various homes.

*Erlington.* — In 1873 the Rev. Charles Boylan of Rutland, Vermont, petitioned the mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Flushing, Long Island, for sisters to take charge of his school. Several sisters were sent, and a novitiate was opened at Rutland, 15 October, 1875. The congregation now (1910) numbers 75 religious, in charge of an academy attached to the mother-house, 6 parochial schools, one in the Diocese of Pittsburgh, and a home for the aged, with 96 inmates. The total number of children under the care of the sisters is 740.

*Chicago.* — The Sisters of St. Joseph were established at La Grange, Illinois, 2 October, 1889, by two sisters under Mother Stanislaus Leary, formerly superior of the diocesan community at Rochester, New York. On 14 July, 1909, the corner-stone of the mother-house was laid. The sisters, who now (1910) number 65, are in charge of an academy with an attendance of 100 and a school for boys.

*Cleveland.* — The Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of Cleveland are chiefly engaged in the parochial schools. They number about 80 and have charge of an academy and 15 parish schools, with an attendance of 4500.

*Concordia.* — In 1883 four Sisters of St. Joseph arrived at Newton, Kansas, from Rochester, New York, and opened their first mission. After remaining there a year they located at Concordia, Kansas, in the fall of 1884, and established the first mother-house in the West, in what was then the Diocese of Leavenworth. The congregation now numbers 240, in charge of 3 academies, 2 hospitals, and 26 schools, in the Archdiocese of Chicago and the Dioceses of Marquette, Rockford, Kansas City, Omaha, Lincoln, and Concordia. The sisters have about 4000 children under their care.

*Detroit.* — In 1889 Sisters of St. Joseph from the Diocese of Ogdensburg established a new congregation at Kalamazoo, Michigan. The novitiate was transferred, in 1897, to Nazareth, a hamlet founded by the sisters on a four-hundred-acre farm. The congregation, which numbers 187, has charge of a hospital, training school for nurses, normal school, a home for feeble-minded children, an orphan asylum, and several other educational institutions, besides supplying teachers for 7 parish schools of the diocese. The sisters have about 1000 children under their care, including 200 orphans.

*Erie.* — This congregation was founded in 1860 by Mother Agnes Spencer of Carondelet, Missouri, who, with two other sisters, took charge of St. Ann’s Academy at Carnis, Pennsylvania, where postulants were admitted. In 1864 a hospital was opened at Erie, and the Sisters took charge of the parochial schools of that city. Later an orphan asylum, a hospital, and a home for the aged were erected in the city of Erie. Villa Maria Academy was opened in 1892 and in 1897 was made the novitiate and mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph in the Erie diocese. The congregation now numbers 210 members, in charge of 14 parochial schools, attended by 3900 children, in addition to the other institutions mentioned above.

*Fall River.* — In 1902 nine Sisters of St. Joseph from the mother-house at Le Puy took charge of the school in the French parish of St.-Roch, Fall River, Massachusetts. The accession of other members from the mother-house enabled the community to take charge of all the schools in the city attached to French parishes. In 1906 St. Therese’s Convent was formally opened as the provincial house of the community, which was legally incorporated in the same year, and a novitiate was established. The sisters now number 43, in charge of four parochial schools, with an attendance of 2475.

*Fort Wayne.* — The Sisters of St. Joseph, with their mother-house at Tipton, number 60, in charge of an academy and 5 parochial schools, with an attendance of 1000.

*Ogdensburg.* — In 1880 several sisters from the mother-house at Buffalo made a foundation at Watertown, New York, which was later strengthened by the accession of another sister from the Erie mother-house. From Watertown as a centre missions were opened in other parts of the diocese. The congregation, which now numbers about 75 members, has charge of several parish schools, the Immaculate Heart Academy at Watertown, which is the mother-house and a school for boys, having about 1100 children under its care. In 1907 the sisters established a mission at Braddock, Pennsylvania, for work in the parochial schools there.

*Philadelphia.* — In 1847 the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, in response to an appeal of Bishop Kenrick, sent four members of the community to Philadelphia to take charge of St. John’s Orphan Asylum, until that time under the Sisters of Charity.

The Know-Nothing spirit, which had but a short time previously led to the Philadelphia riots, to the burning and desecration of Catholic institutions, was still rampant, and the sisters had much to suffer from bigotry and difficulties of many kinds. Shortly afterwards they were given charge of several parochial schools, and thus entered on what was to be their chief work in the coming years. By the establishment, in October, 1855, under the patronage of Venerable Bishop Neuman, of a mother-house at Mount St. Joseph, Chestnut Hill, the congregation in Philadelphia began to take a more definite development. When, in 1865, the Sisters of St. Joseph of St. Louis formed a generalate, approved later by the Holy See, the congregation of Philadelphia, by the will of the bishop, preserved its autonomy. During the Civil War, detachments of sisters nursed the sick soldiers in Camp Curtin and the Church Hospital, Harrisburg; later, under Surgeon General Smith, they had more active duty in the floating hospitals which received the wounded from the southern battle-fields. When the number of religious increased to between three and four hundred, and the works entrusted to them became so numerous and varied as to necessitate an organization more detailed and definite, steps were undertaken to obtain the papal approbation, which was received in 1885. The Sisters of St. Joseph of Philadelphia now (1910) number 626 professed members, 64 novices, and 31 postulants, in charge of a collegiate institute for the higher education of women, an academy and boarding-school, 42 parish schools, and 2 high schools in the Archdioceses of Philadelphia and Baltimore, and in the Dioceses of Newark and Harrisburg, and 4 asylums and homes. The number of children under their care, including those in asylums, is nearly 26,000.

*Pittsburg.* — In 1869, at the petition of the pastor of Ebensburg, Pennsylvania, three sisters were sent there to open a day-school and a boarding-school for boys. The accession of new members and the sisters to meet the increasing demands made upon them, and
they now number 175, in charge of 23 schools in the Archdiocese of Baltimore and the Dioceses of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and Columbus, with an attendance of 6075; they also conduct a hospital and 2 boarding-schools. In 1801 the mother-house was transferred to Baden, Pennsylvania.

Rochester.—In 1864 four Sisters of St. Joseph from Buffalo opened an asylum for orphan boys at Rochester. Three years later the Diocese of Buffalo was divided and that of Rochester created, and the following year, 1868, the Rochester community dissolved its affiliation with the Buffalo mother-house and opened its own novitiate and mother-house at St. Mary’s Boys’ Orphan Asylum, later transferred to the Nazareth Academy, Rochester. The number of institutions now directed by the Sisters of St. Joseph of Rochester is not known. Each of the convocations of the province, in 1867, 1877, 1897, 1907, and 1917, held at Carondelet, was attended by representatives from all the houses of the congregation in America. The requirements of the new condition, was presented to the Holy See for approval. In September, 1863, Pope Pius IX issued the letter of commendation of the institute and its works, holding the constitutions for examination and revision by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. The final revision was made in 1877, and ten years later, 1887, a decree approving the institute and constitutions was issued by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. On 31 July, 1877, Pius VII, by special Brief, confirmed the institute and constitutions, and added the title of “Sisters of Charity” to the name of the congregation. The community numbers 430 members, in charge of 15,000 children.

St. Augustine.—In 1866 eight Sisters of St. Joseph from the mother-house at Le Puy were sent to St. Augustine, at the request of Bishop Verot, to teach the coloured people, recently liberated by the Civil War. In 1868 a novitiate was established, and about this time the missions of the Sisters of the Order of Mercy from the city, the training of the impoverished whites also devolved on the new community. In 1889 connexion with the mother-house in France was severed, and many of the French sisters returned to their native land. The sisters now number about 105, in charge of 6 academies, 3 4-day schools, and orphanages. They have under their charge about 1438 white and 240 colored children, and about 35 orphans. The mother-house of the Florida missions is at St. Augustine.

St. Louis.—In the year 1834 the Right Rev. Joseph Roest of St. Louis, Missouri, called at the mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Lyons and asked Mother St. John Fontbonne, the superior, to send a colony of her daughters to America. The financial aid necessary was obtained through the Countesse la Roche Jacquelin. Arrangements were soon perfected, and on 17 January, 1836, six sisters sailed from Liverpool for New Orleans, where they were met by the Bishop of St. Louis and Father Timon, afterwards Bishop of Buffalo. They arrived at St. Louis on 25 March. The house, a small log cabin, which was to be the central mother-house of the future congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet, was located at Carondelet, a small town six miles south of St. Louis. At the time the sisters arrived at St. Louis, this humble house was occupied by the Sisters of Charity, who cared for a few orphans soon after transferred to a new building. While waiting for their home, they received a call from St. Joseph, Illinois, where a zealous Vincentian missionary desired the help of the sisters in his labours among the French Creole population of that section. Three religious volunteered for this mission. The people among whom the sisters laboured in St. Louis were poor and rude, and apparently destitute of any taste for either religion or education. These obstacles seemed but to increase the zeal of the sisters, and by degrees postulants were received, parochial schools and orphanages opened, and new works begun in various parts of the diocese. As early as 1847 foundations were made in other sections of the United States; in July, 1842, the order, Ann Eliza Dillon, entered the novitiate, proving of great advantage to the struggling community, with her fluency in French and English. She died, however, four years later. The community increasing in proportion to its more extended field of labour, a commodious building was erected to answer the double purpose of novitiate and academy, the latter being incorporated in 1853 under the laws of the State of Missouri. Because of the rapid growth of the institute and the increasing demand for sisters from all parts of the United States, the superiors of the community were by 1860 forced to consider means best adapted to give stability and uniformity to the growing congregation. A general chapter was convened in May, 1860, to which representatives from every house of the congregation in America were called. At this meeting a plan for uniting all the communities under a general government was discussed and accepted by the sisters and afterwards by many of the bishops in whose dioceses the sisters were engaged. This plan, together with the concordat, which is the constitution of the community, and the requirements of the new condition, was presented to the Holy See for approval. In September, 1863, Pope Pius IX issued the letter of commendation of the institute and its works, holding the constitutions for examination and revision by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. The final revision was made in 1877, and ten years later, 1887, a decree approving the institute and constitutions was issued by the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. On 31 July, 1877, Pius IX, by special Brief, confirmed the institute and constitutions, and added the title of “Sisters of Charity” to the name of the congregation. The community numbers 1050 members, with 1802 sisters, in charge of 125 educational institutions, including colleges, seminaries, conservatories of music and art, and parochial schools, with an attendance of 40,948; 17 charitable educational institutions, including orphan asylums, Indiana.
coloured, and deaf-mute schools, with an attendance of 2121; and 10 hospitals, with an average of 8285 patients.

Savannah.—The Sisters of St. Joseph were established at Savannah in 1867, in charge of the boys' orphanage, and soon afterwards were constituted an independent diocesan congregation. In 1875 the orphanage was transferred to Washington, Georgia, and with it the mother-house of the congregation. The sisters now number about 65, in charge of an academy, 2 boarding-schools for small boys, and several parish schools, with a total attendance of over 5000.

Springfield.—In September, 1880, seven Sisters of St. Joseph were sent from Flushing, Long Island, to take charge of a parochial school at Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts. They were followed, two years later, by seven sisters for Webster, and in 1885 by twelve more for the cathedral parish, Springfield. In 1885 the Springfield mission was constituted the mother-house of an independent diocesan congregation. The sisters are in constant demand for parochial schools and now (1910), with a membership of 300, conduct 19, with an attendance of about 9000. In 1889 they took charge of the school at Windsor Locks in the Diocese of Hartford, from which they were later recalled to the Springfield diocese. The curriculum of their boarding-school at Chicopee embraces a normal course. They also visit the sick and take charge of Sunday-school classes. Since 1892 the sisters have devoted themselves particularly to the work of establishing Catholic high schools, and high-school courses are connected with practically all the parochial schools under their supervision.

Wheeling.—In 1853 seven sisters from Carondelet, Missouri, opened a private orphanage and hospital in Wheeling, and in 1856 took possession of a building and opened schools, an orphan asylum and a hospital. From 19 October, 1889, the community was independent of the St. Louis mother-house. During the Civil War the hospital was rented by the Government and the sisters enrolled in government service. After the war and the reorganization of the hospital on its present lines, the sisters extended their activities to various parts of the diocese; they now number over 100, in charge of 3 hospitals, 12 schools and academies, and 1 orphan asylum, with about 1700 children under their care.

Wichita.—In August, 1887, four Sisters of St. Joseph were commissioned to go from Concordia, Kansas, to Abilene, Kansas, at that time in the Diocese of Leavenworth. The following year the Right Rev. L. M. Fink, Bishop of Leavenworth, decided that those sisters should belong to his diocese exclusively, and in so doing they became the nucleus of a new diocesan community of the Sisters of St. Joseph, having as their mother house established at Abilene, under the title of Mount St. Joseph's Academy. The community increased in numbers and soon branched out, doing parochial school work throughout the diocese. In 1892 the name of the Diocese of Leavenworth was changed to Kansas City, Kansas, and for the time being the Sisters of St. Joseph were diocesan sisters of the Diocese of Kansas City. In 1896, when the diocese of the three Kansas dioceses, Concordia, Kansas City, and Wichita, was agitated, Bishop Fink of Kansas City, to keep the Sisters of St. Joseph of his diocese within the limit of his jurisdiction, moved the mother house to Parsons, Kansas. But after the division was made, the following year, Abilene was in the Concordia diocese, and Parsons was in the Wichita diocese, and the mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph being in Parsons, the community belonged to the Wichita diocese. By a mission-house in both the Diocese of Concordia and the Diocese of Kansas City. Since that time the name of the Diocese of Kansas City has been changed to its original name: Diocese of Leavenworth. In 1907 a colony of these sisters opened a sanitarium at Del Norte, Colorado, in the Diocese of Denver. At the present time (1910), the sisters, who number 200, have charge of 3 hospitals, all in the Diocese of Wichita, and 18 parochial schools, including one in the Diocese of Leavenworth, in the Diocese of Kansas City, Missouri, and 3 in connection with the sanitarium at Del Norte, Colorado.

Canada.—Hamilton.—In 1852 five sisters from the mother-house at Toronto established a foundation at Hamilton, where they at once opened an orphanage and began their work in the parochial schools of the diocese. During the cholera epidemic of 1866 they cared for those afflicted. On the erection of the Diocese of Hamilton in 1856, the community became a separate diocesan congregation, and a few months later a novitiate was established at Hamilton. By the passage of the Separate Schools Bill in 1856 the sisters were given control of the education of the Catholic children of the city. The congregation gradually extended its activities to other parts of the diocese and now (1910) numbers 155 religious in charge of 2 hospitals, 2 houses of providence, and 12 schools, with an attendance of 2300.

London.—The community of Sisters of St. Joseph at London was founded in 1868 by five sisters from the mother-house at Toronto, who opened an orphan asylum the following year. On 18 December, 1870, the congregation became independent, with a novitiate of its own, and on 15 February, 1871, the Sisters of St. Joseph of London, Ontario, were legally incorporated. Several missions were opened in various parts of the diocese, and in 1888 a hospital was established at London, to which was attached a training school for nurses. The sisters now (1910) number 131, in charge of 10 mission houses, including 2 hospitals, an orphan asylum, and 2 houses of refuge for the aged; they have about 2200 children under their care.

Peterborough.—In 1890 several sisters from the mother-house at Toronto established a house at Peterborough, which became in turn the nucleus of a new congregation. The community now (1910) numbers 300 sisters, in 14 houses, in charge of 1 hospital, 3 hospitals, 2 orphanages, a home for the aged, and 10 separate schools, in the Dioceses of Peterborough and Sault Ste Marie. They have over 1000 children under their care.

Toronto.—The mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Toronto was established from Le Puy, France, in 1851. The congregation now comprises 266 members, in charge of 3 academies, 1 high school, and 22 separate schools, with a total attendance of 5025; 5 charitable institutions, with 900 inmates; and 1 hospital, with an annual average of 2900.

The Sisters of St. Joseph.
native orphanage, a day-school, dispensary, and a novitiate for natives. In other parts of India the sisters conduct a primary school, a boarding- and day-school, an intermediate school for Hindus, with an attendance of 200, a home for Rajpoot widows and another home for widows, a workshop for widows and orphans, and 4 orphanages. At Falcanda are two sisters who were catechists and sacristans. In these missions the primary, secondary, and intermediate schools are under the Government. In some the orphanages are aided or wholly supported by the Government. Everywhere remedies are given to the sick natives, and the work of infant baptism of natives is continued. When the natives, after the death of the congregation, the noviceship is made apart from the Europeans, but they are treated in every way as members of the community. The work of the native novitiate is only in its infancy, and it is hoped that the native sisters will in the future be most useful with the native population. The Indian foundation was made in 1849.

FRANCESC M. STEELE.

Sisters of St. Joseph of Bourg.—In 1819 a foundation from the mother-house of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Lyons was made at Belley; a novitiate was opened, and houses were established in the other parts of the country. In 1823, at the desire of the Bishop of Belley, the sisters of the diocese were constituted an independent diocesan congregation. The mother-house was transferred to Ain, in 1825, whence houses were founded at Ferney, Gap, Grenoble, Bordeaux, and elsewhere. In 1928 and again in 1833, Bishop Devie obtained the approval of the French Government for the new congregation. By 1865 the number of members had reached 1700, and the congregation was established throughout France, the principal academies being at Bourg, Paris, Bourgogne-sur-SEine, and Marssac.

In 1854 the sisters were sent from Bourg to establish a house at Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, in the Diocese of Natchez. In 1863 a novitiate was opened at New Orleans, and later one was established at Cedar Point, Hamilton County, Ohio. The sisters are now in charge of 15 educational institutions, including several academies, as well as coloured and Indian schools, a home for working girls, and an industrial school, with about 1800 children and young women under their care.

The Sisters of St. Joseph were established at Superior, Wis., in 1867 by seven sisters from Cincinnati. There are now 21, in charge of 3 schools, with an attendance of 225.

In 1904 a colony of French sisters was sent out from Bourg, and schools have since been opened among the French Canadians in Minnesota and Wisconsin. In the Diocese of Duluth they have 2 academies with an attendance of 225.

Sisters of St. Joseph of Cambry.—After the reconstruction of the congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Lyons, by Mother St. John Fontbonne, a colony of sisters was sent to Cambry, in Savoy, in 1812. The tide of anarchy and revolution had wrought awful havoc in France, and the education of youth, especially the children of the working classes, was the special work devolving on the Sisters of St. Joseph. The works of charity, the care of the sick in hospitals, of the aged and orphans, and the visitation of the sick in their homes, were also carried on as prior to the Revolution. The original house was subsequently enlarged and became what it is now, in the French houses, consisting of a black dress, veil and underveil, wooden cincture, wooden beads strung on brass and fastened to the cincture, a brass crucifix on the breast, and a linen coronet, front, and gimp. In 1843 Mother St. John Marcoux, superior since 1812, resigned her office, which was assumed by Mother Félicité, under whom the congregation continued its extraordinary development. More than eighty houses rose beneath her hand, and when, in 1861, a state normal school was opened at Rumilly, Savoy, it was placed in charge of the sisters.

Meanwhile the Chambéry sisters had been constituted a diocesan congregation, but as years went on a stronger administration became necessary. The Congregation was made subject to the Bishop of Chambéry, and papal approbation was granted in 1794 by rescript of Pius IX. Under the new form of government the congregation is subject to a superior general, whose term of office is six years, and is divided into provinces, each possessing a novitiate. The novitiate of each province after the death of the congregation, for two years, after which they bind themselves by perpetual vows. The rule is based on that of St. Augustine.

The province of Denmark, whither the sisters were sent in 1856, has its seat at Copenhagen, and now numbers 400 members, in charge of flourishing parochial and private schools and a large hospital in the capital, with schools, orphan asylums, and hospitals, on a smaller scale, scattered all over the kingdom. From Copenhagen sisters were sent to Iceland, where they have a school, give religious instruction, visit the sick, and, during the proper seasons, repair to the fisheries on the coast of the Gulf. In 1901 this province opened a house at Brussels, where the sisters have a large public school under the Government.

The Brazilian province, founded in 1859, has several flourishing academies, besides day-schools for the upper classes, schools for negroes, hospitals, orphanages and foundling asylums, and one home for reapers. The sisters number about 250, under the provincial house at Itu. In 1862 sisters were sent to establish a school at Stockholm, and in 1876 to Gothenburg. The Norwegian province, dating from 1865, with seat at Christiania, has over 150 sisters. The province of Russia, founded in 1872, with novitiate at Tarnopol, Galicia, outside the frontier, has establishments at St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Odessa: two large academies, a day-school, an orphan asylum, a hospital, a home for the aged, etc. In 1876 the Sisters of St. Joseph of Rome, founded from Turin in 1859, were annexed to the Chambéry branch; the province now (1910) comprises 15 houses, mainly educational institutions. In Rome itself the sisters have an academy, with 100 pupils, 2 day-schools, and one poor school.

At the request of the Congregation of Propaganda, and with the approval of the Bishop of Springfield, five sisters were sent, in 1855, to Lee, Massachusetts, for work in the parochial schools. As their activities developed chiefly in the Diocese of Hartford, the novitiate, which had been temporarily established at Lee, was, in 1888, transferred to Hartford, Connecticut.

The number of religious is now 44, and in 1910 reached 155, in charge of 9 schools attended by 2100 pupils, 2 hospitals, with an annual average of 4200 patients. The sisters also instruct about 1000 children in Christian doctrine, and have the domestic care of the Hartford seminary and La Salle College in the same city.

In 1902 many French houses of the order were closed by the Government, in consequence of which a large number of sisters left for the foreign missions, chiefly Denmark and Russia. The province of Savoy, previously in charge of 52 establishments, has now but 14. The entire generalate comprises 1370 members.

Sisters of St. Joseph of St-Vallier.—In 1863, at the request of Mgr Jean-Baptiste de la Croix Chevrier, Count of St-Vallier, later Bishop of Quebec, two Sisters of St. Joseph from Le Puy took charge of a hospital recently founded by him at St-Vallier (Drôme). As the new community grew in numbers, it also devoted its attention to the education of youth.
1890 the approval of Pope Leo XIII was obtained for the rules of the congregation. When religious teaching was forbidden in France, the sisters, with the permission of Archbishop Begin of Quebec, took refuge in New York (1890), erected a small house at St. Jean, Port-Joli, where a boarding-school for girls was opened. The sisters now number about 50, in charge of a hospital, an academy, and 6 model elementary schools. In 1905 they were placed over a model school in the city of Quebec, where they opened a novitiate. The first reception taking place the following year. The sisters in France are still in charge of 3 hospitals.

**THE SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH.**

**LITTLE DAUGHTERS OF ST. JOSEPH,** established at 45 rue Notre-Dame de Lourdes, Montreal. After the blessing of the bishop of the diocese (Mgr Bourget) had been obtained, the institute was founded on 26 April—the feast of the Patronage of St. Joseph—1857, by the Sulpician father, Antoine Mercier. Its object is to aid the clergy in spiritual and temporal matters, both by the ministry of prayer and by discharging certain manual services, such as the manufacture of liturgical vestments and ornaments, and the manufacture, repair, and cleaning of the linen destined for the service of the altars of the various churches, etc. Missionaries without resources and poor seminarians are special objects of the charitable attentions of this community. Always under the direction of the Sulpicians, to whose assistance and devotion it is indebted for its prosperity, this little institute had the consolation of seeing its existence and regulations canonically approved by Mgr Bruchési, Archbishop of Montreal, on 20 September, 1897. The community is now composed of 63 professed sisters, 6 novices, and 5 postulants.

**LITTLE DAUGHTERS OF ST. JOSEPH.**

**POLISH FRANCISCAN SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH.**—In 1901 about forty sisters, all of Polish nationality, branched off from the School Sisters of St. Francis, whose mother-house is at Milwaukee, and after obtaining the necessary dispensation from the Holy See through the efforts of Archbishop Messmer, in April, 1902, organized themselves into the Polish Franciscan Sisters of St. Joseph, with their mother-house at St. Mary, Diocese of Green Bay, and have since increased to nearly two hundred members, in charge of ten schools. They live under the rule of the Third Order of St. Francis, and their particular object is the education of the young in Catholic schools.

**JOSEPH J. FOX.**

**SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH OF CLUNY,** founded in 1798, by Anne-Marie Javouhey at Seurre, in Burgundy. The foundress was born in 1779, at Chamblane, near Seurre, and though only ten years old, she frequently fetched priests to the dying, at the risk of her own life, in the Revolution of 1789. Nine years later she, with the help of a Trappist Father, founded a small congregation at Seurre, for the instruction of children and for nursing the sick and taking charge of orphans. The congregation was intended to be on the same lines as the third order (1904). In 1864 the habit was approved by Pius IX and henceforth the congregation was known as the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny. Mother Javouhey died in 1851. The sisters undertake all kinds of charitable works, but they devote themselves especially to missionary labours and the education of the young. Their rule was approved by Pius IX and confirmed by Leo XIII. The foundress was declared Venerable by the Holy See, 11 Feb., 1905. The sisters number about 4000, and are widely spread over the world. The mother-house is at St. Pierre de Cluny (France) and there are numerous houses of the congregation in various parts of France; there are houses also in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, England, Scotland, Ireland, Chili, Peru, the East and West Indies, India, and Ceylon. In 1861 the congregation spread to the East and West Coasts of Africa, New Caledonia, and Victoria (Australia). Altogether 45,000 children are being educated by the sisters, and 70,000 poor and sick are cared for by them in their various institutions, which now (1910) number 385. Thirty-one of the sisters perished in the terrible catastrophe at Martigny, in 1902, when the town of St-Pierre was wrecked by a volcanic eruption. In England the sisters have one house at Stafford, where there is a novitiate for the English-speaking subjects; there is a high-class day-school attached to the convent. There are three houses in Scotland, all in Ayrshire, with which are connected a boarding-school and 4 elementary schools, attended by 500 children. Total number 27.

In Paris the famous hospital of Pasteur is under the care of forty sisters of this congregation.

*Life of Rev. Mother Javouhey* (Dublin, 1903).

**FRANCESCA M. STEELE.**

**SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH OF PEACE.**—This institute, founded in the year 1884 at Nottingham, England, by the Right Reverend E. G. Bagshawe [then bishop of that diocese, now (1910) Archbishop of Selsey], with rules and constitutions under the authority of the Holy See, has for its special object the domestic and industrial training of girls (chiefly of the working class) with the view to promote peace and happiness in families, in union with and in imitation of the Holy Family of Nazareth. In addition to this, the sisters are employed in educating the young, instructing converts, visiting the sick poor, and caring for orphans, the blind, and the sick in hospitals. The administrative body is composed of a superior general and five councillors elected for six years. There are no lay sisters. The postulancy lasts for six months, and the novitiate for two years, after which vows are taken for three years, and then the Sisters take the habit, black, with a scapular of the same colour, a black veil, and white linen kerschief, bonnet and fore headband, a leather cincture, and a five decade rosary beads. A silver ring is given at the final profession. Novices wear a white veil during the novitiate. In March, 1903, the institute was submitted to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda by the founder, and in the September following the Decree "Lauda" was obtained. At present the institute has three houses in England: the mother-house situated at Nottingham, a house at Grimsby in the same diocese, and one at Hanwell in the Archdiocese of Westminster. The sisters teach in the parish elementary schools at Nottingham and Hanwell, and have a middle-class school attached to each convent. In Grimsby, besides a middle-class school, there is a girls' orphanage and a steam laundry, which is a means of maintenance as well as of training in that branch of household work. The younger children attend the parish school.

The first foundation in America was established in 1855 at the request of the Right Reverend Bishop Wigger of the Diocese of Newark, N. J., who became deeply interested in the work of the institute, and was convinced of the great need of its diffusion among a community devoted to the protection and training of poor girls for a life of usefulness in the world. The place selected for this object was in St. Peter's Parish, Jersey City, in charge of the Jesuit fathers, where the sisters met with a true friend and supporter in the
saintly Father McAtee, S.J. (d. 1904), to whose spiritual direction and kind encouragement were, by the Providence of God, due the successful labours of the young community. St. Joseph’s Home, Jersey City, an orphanage, is the principal home of the province, with its novitiate, at Englewood, N. J. Here they were in addition erected for the benefit of girls, where they could spend their summer holidays. It is beautifully situated on the Palisades overlooking the Hudson River. The blind were first taken in charge in a small building in Jersey City, on the site of which the present Institute of the Blind stands. The growing needs of this institution led the purchase of other property in the neighbourhood, and now men, women, and children, are cared for in separate buildings. In the school the children are taught by the improved methods of raised letters and the point system, while the older inmates are employed in various branches of industry. For greater facilities and the accommodation for girls a second house was opened in Jersey City, where industrial classes are held on four evenings in the week, and instruction given in plain sewing, dressmaking, millinery, and cooking. The "Orphans’ Messenger and Advocate of the Blind", a quarterly, published on the premises of St. Joseph’s Home, by the orphan boys, under the direction of a proficient master, is the chief source of maintenance for these charities, especially for the blind. It has a wide circulation in the United States and Canada. From this province houses were founded on the Pacific Coast, the first (St. Joseph’s Hospital) being established in 1890 at Bellingham, Washington (Diocese of Seattle). Later on other foundations were made in British Columbia (Diocese of New Westminster), namely a hospital at Rossland, another at Greenwood, and a day and boarding school at Nelson. Rectories were opened for girls at Seattle, Washington. The houses in the West form one province, which has its own novitiate.

E. G. BAGSHAWE.

SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH OF ST. HYacinthe, founded at St. Hyacinthe, Canada, 12 Sept., 1877, by the bishop of that diocese, Louis-Zéphirin Moreau, for the Christian instruction of children and the visitation and care of the sick. Civil incorporation was granted 30 June, 1881, and canonical institution 19 March, 1882. The activities of the congregation are confined to the Diocese of St. Hyacinthe, in which 150 sisters are engaged, and under 5000 children under their care.

Le Canada Ecclésiastique (Montreal, 1910).

SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH OF THE APPARITION, with mother-house at Marseilles, founded at Guillac, France, in 1830, by Mme Emilie de Viallard, for all kinds of charitable work. The institute sprang rapidly from the beginning, and although some of the houses in France were closed during the French Revolution, they now number over 100 in various parts of the world, with over 1000 sisters. The congregation received the approval of the Holy See, 31 March, 1832. The sisters have one house in England, at Whalley Park, Manchester, where 10 sisters devote themselves to the care of invalided ladies, for whom they opened a home there in 1905; they also nurse in private houses. They now have about 20 branch houses in the British colonies, in all principal towns in British Burma, Malaya, Ceylon, at Beira, and in India, of which all places there are high schools, homes for the aged, and orphanages under the charge of the sisters. There are other branch houses in Italy, Greece, South Africa, and the Holy Land. The number of sisters varies in each of the colonial houses from 15 to 30. At the request of the bishop of Port, the sisters opened their first house in Western Australia at Fremantle, in 1854, where also they later established a novitiate. They have now in Western Australia 6 communities, with 56 members, in charge of 6 schools, with a total attendance of 1100. The sisters also visit the poor.

STEELE, CONVENTIA OF GREAT BRITAIN (St. Louis, 1903); A us a t av e n a Catholic Directory for 1910 (Sydney).

SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH OF THE SACRED HEART, a newly Australian foundation, established at Penola, South Australia, in 1866, by Father John Terence Woods and Miss Mary Mackillop, in religion Mother Mary of the Cross (b. 1832; d. at Sydney, 8 Aug., 1909). Father Woods (d. 1886), a man of burning zeal and a pious director of souls, endeavoured to found two religious congregations, one for men, which failed, and one for women, which succeeded beyond his hopes. About 1886 he placed at the head of the latter Miss Mackillop, whom he sent to the Sisters of St. Joseph at Annecy, Savoy, to learn their rule. As much opposition was raised to his project, the founder went to Rome and obtained papal sanction. Since then the numerous communities of this congregation have been placed by the Holy See under the bishops of the dioceses in which they work. Most of the young men who have risen to parliamentary fame owe their early education to these sisters. Their schools receive no government grant, in spite of which they are superior to the free secular schools. The activities of two or three, did the pioneer work in the mission field of Australia, seconding the labours of the clergy so ably that there have been few defections from the Faith. They are the mainstay of missions visited by a priest only once a month or once in three months. In cases where a visit of a priest, the sisters have tolerated, keeping up the day-school and on Sundays gathering the children for catechism and the rosary, and the people for the reading of a sermon, thus preparing them to receive the sacraments on the arrival of a priest. The mother-house of the congregation is at South Wales. The sisters number 650, in charge of 117 schools, with an attendance of 12,500, and 12 charitable institutions, including orphanages and refuges, an industrial home, a girls’ reformatory, etc. The work of the sisters extends over the Archdioceses of Sydney, Adelaide, Melbourne, and Wellington, the Dioceses of Armidale, Wollongong, Port Augustus, Bendigo, Sale, Auckland, Christchurch, Dunedin, and Rockhampton, and the Abbey Nullius of New Norcia. The Sisters of St. Joseph of the Sacred Heart of the Diocese of Bathurst, who have their own constitutions, number 250 in 64 houses.

FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

Joseph Calasanzius, Saint, called in religion "a Matre Dei", founder of the Piarists, b. 11 Sept., 1556, at the castle of Calasanza near Petralia de la Sal in Aragon; d. 25 Aug., 1614, at Rome; feast 27 Aug. His parents, Don Pedro Calasanz and Donna Maria Gastonia, gave Joseph, the youngest of five children, a good education at home and then at the school of Petralia. After his classical studies at Estadilla he took up philosophy and jurisprudence at Lerida and received the degree of Doctor of Laws, and then with honours completed his theological course at Valencia and Alcalá de Henares. His mother and brother having died, Don Pedro wanted Joseph to marry and perpetuate the family. God interfered by sending a sickness in 1582 which soon brought Joseph to the brink of the grave. The parish priest 17 Dec., 1583, by Hugo Ambroscio de Moncada, Bishop of Urgel. Joseph began his labours as priest in the Diocese of Albañacín, where Bishop della Figuera appointed him his theologian and confessor, synodal examiner and procurator, and when the bishop was one for women, which succeeded beyond his hopes. He was sent as Apostolic visitor to the Abbey of Montserrat, and Joseph accompanied him as secretary.
The bishop died the following year and Joseph left, though urgent requests to remain. He hurried to Calais only to work off charity death of his father. He was then called by his Bishop of Urgel to act as vicar-general for the district of Trempe. In 1592 he embarked for Rome, where he found a protector in Cardinal Marcardonio Colonna who chose him as his theologian and instructor to his nephew. Rome offered a suitable field for works of charity, especially for the instruction of neglected and homelees children, many of whom had lost their parents. Joseph joined a Confraternity of Christian Doctrine and gathered the boys and girls from the streets and brought them to school. The teachers, being poorly paid, refused to accept the additional labour without remuneration. The pastor of S. Dorotea, Anthony Brendani, offered him two rooms and promised assistance in teaching, and when two other priests promised similar help, Joseph, in November, 1597, opened the first public free school in Europe. Pope Clement VIII gave an annual contribution to the undenied scholars for good work, so that in a short time Joseph had about a thousand children under his charge. In 1602 he rented a house at S. Andrea della Valle and commenced a community life with his assistants and laid the foundation of the Order of Piarists. Much envy and hostility was excited against him by other teachers but all were overcome in time. In 1612 the school was transferred to the Torres palace adjoining S. Pantaleone. Here Joseph spent the remaining years of his life in his chosen calling. He lived and died a faithful son of the Church, a true friend of orphans and children. His body reposes at Christian donors, and his canonisation was solemnised on 3 Aug, 1748, and his canonisation by Clement XIII, 16 July, 1767.

The Life of St. Joseph Calasanz has been written by—
DAMASUS (1843); HURMÉ (1856); TOMARE (Rome, 1898); HEIDENREICH (1907). Cf. Hist. polit. Blüter, CXX, 901; FEHR in Kirchenlexicon, v. 9.

FRANCIS MERRIMAN.

Joseph Calasanz, Pious Workers of Saint Joseph, of the Mother of God, founded at Vienna, 24 November, 1899, by Father Anton Maria Schwartz for all women of charity, but especially in apostolate in the workingmen. The members of the congregation, who comprise both priests and lay brothers, follow the Rule of the Piarists, modified in some particulars.

The mother-house is the College of Mary Help of Christians at Vienna, which is connected a children's home. The Pious Workers teach Christian doctrine in schools, establish elementary and trade schools, build homes for apprentices and all workmen, open oratories, form associations of working-men, and promote the diffusion of good literature. At Vienna, which has been so far the chief scene of their activity, in addition to undertaking the works already mentioned, they have taken charge of the reformatory (1904), opened a public library, and have founded among other associations a Guard of Honour of the Most Blessed Sacrament. They have three colleges at Vienna, and other foundations at Deutsch-Goriz in Styria and Wolfgang from the Austrian Alps. The prayer-book for working-men compiled by Father Schwartz has already gone through five editions. Other fathers of the society have published dramas for presentation by clubs under their charge, a book of recitations, and a number of biographies. The organ of the congregation is "St. Calasanzianus-Blätter", a monthly issued at Vienna since 1888.

HEINRICH. Order und Kongregatioen, III (Paderborn, 1906), 524 unc.; SIMAN, Die Konr. der fester Arbeiter (Vienna, 1894).

F. M. RUDGE.

Josephine, Empress. See NAPOLEON I.

Josephinum. See Joseph II.

Josephinum, Pontifical College. See Pontifical Colleges.

Josephites (Sons of St. Joseph), a congregation devoted to the Christian education of youth, founded in the Diocese of Ghent (Belgium) by Joseph van Crombrughe, in 1817. Father van Crombrughe was at that time a simple village priest acting as curate at Heusden, when he made the acquaintance of a young man named van den Bossche, of remarkable talent and great piety. Together they conceived the idea of forming a body of men, under the patronage of St. Joseph, to work among the poor. Father Crombrughe drew up a few rules, which were the basis of the future constitutions, and the first community of Josephites opened at Grammont, 1 May, 1817, a house known as Jerusalem. This was the year of famine, and the poor suffered severely. As the Josephites were able to relieve in great measure by giving them employment and teaching them to weave, so many now flocked to their protection that on 2 November they rented a part of the old Carmelite monastery. The next year the founder gave a constitution to his religious, and the first Josephites bound themselves by the three customary vows. In 1819 a school for paying students was started next to the free school, but, by order of the Government, the day-school was closed because the congregation was not yet recognized. In 1823, in spite of the proscription, the Josephites began to form their first religious habit, but in 1826 were ordered by the Government to close their church, and the following year all religious and novices admitted since 1823 were obliged to leave the community. During the first thirteen years of its existence, between three and four thousand boys had been indebted to it for their education. In 1830, when the Belgians threw off the yoke of Holland, and the National Congress placed liberty of instruction in the new constitution, the Josephites began to take an active part in the work of education. Bishop van de Velde of Ghent approved their rules, and Father Ignatius van den Bossche became the first superior general. On all sides the Sons of St. Joseph were in demand for the direction of schools and colleges, so that the original object of the institute, which had been the instruction of the poor, was gradually modified. The house of Grammont remained the mother-house, appointed as such by the Holy See. A thorough course of professional studies was organized, in accordance with the official government programme, and later on a school of agriculture was added. This latter obtained such success in numerous exhibitions that it was granted the support and recognition of the State.

Under the generalship of Father Ignatius, many new houses were opened, the two most important being those at Melle and Louvain. The college of Melle is established in a former priory of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, founded in 1431. These canons had a college at Melle in the seventeenth century, but this was closed by order of Joseph II. After passing through several hands, the property at length came into the possession of M. van Wymelbeke, the brother-in-law of Father Crombrughe, and in 1837 was given over to the Josephites. Here they established for the first time a complete course of commercial education, which course was afterwards adopted in all the higher schools of commerce. Their museum of commercial products and merchandise has a European reputation. By a royal decree of 11 May, 1901, the Higher School of Commerce of Melle was given the right to confer the degree of Doctor of Commerce. In 1900 the college of Melle founded a school of industries, with a maritime and a colonial section for the benefit of students who do not intend to pursue university studies. The new University of Louvain was opened by the Belgian bishops in 1835, and seven years later, at the request of the government, the Josephites established a course of classical and professional studies at Holy Trinity College, founded by
the old university in 1657. Under the direction of Father Remy de Sadeleer, the congregation made great progress and, on 23 Sept., 1863, obtained a laudatory Brief from the Holy See. In 1869 the father general sent a few members of the congregation to England, where they opened a large college at Croydon. On 21 Sept. of the same year, Father Felix Campe and another superior general for twelve years and, in accordance with the general desire of the members of the congregation, set to work to obtain from Rome the honour of the priesthood for his spiritual sons. Re-elected in 1881, Father Campe, in 1884, bought from Lord Crewe a forty-four-acre estate at Weybridge, in the County of Surrey; St. George's College, Croydon, too small for the ever-increasing number of boys, was sold, and the students transferred to Weybridge.

The congregation was declared secularized in March, 1897, by Leo XIII, who appointed Cardinal Stampa protector of the institute. The sixth superior general, Father Felix de Vlieghe, named in January, 1899, opened at the mother-house a "little novitiate," for the training of boys from the age of fourteen, who feel themselves called to the religious life. On 9 July, 1901, Leo XIII solemnly approved of the institute, and in a letter Cardinal Mellery del Val was named protector of the congregation.

J. O. TURNER.

Joseph of Arimatha.-All that is known for certain concerning him is derived from the canonical Gospels. He was born at Arimathaea—hence his surname—"a city of Judea" (Luke, xxiii, 51), which is very likely identical with Ramatha, the birthplace of the Prophet Samuel, although several scholars prefer to identify it with the town of Ramleh. He was a wealthy Israelite (Matt., xxvii, 57), "a good and a just man, he was not less than a hundred in his age (Luke, xxiii, 50), looking for the kingdom of God" (Mark, xv, 43). He is also called by St. Mark and by St. Luke a βουκέαρχη, literally a "senator," whereby is meant a member of the Sanhedrin or supreme council of the Jews. He was a disciple of Jesus, probably after since Christ's first preaching in Judea (John, ii, 23), but he did not declare himself as such "for fear of the Jews" (John, xix, 38). On account of this secret allegiance to Jesus, he did not consent to His condemnation by the Sanhedrin (Luke, xxiii, 51), and was most likely absent from the meeting which sentenced Jesus to death (cf. Mark, xvi, 11). The Crucifixion of the Master quickened Joseph's faith and love, and suggested to him that he should provide for Christ's burial before the Sabbath began. Unmindful therefore of all personal danger, a danger which was indeed considerable under the circumstances, he boldly requested from Pilate the Body of Jesus, and was successful in his request (Mark, xv, 43-45). Once in possession of this sacred treasure, he—together with Nicodemus, whom his courage had likewise emboldened, and who brought abundant spices—wrapped up Christ's Body in fine linen, put it on the bands, laid it in his own tomb, new and yet unused, and hewn out of a rock in a neighbouring garden, and withdrew after rolling a great stone to the opening of the sepulchre (Matt., xxvii, 59, 60; Mark, xv, 46; Luke, xxii, 53; John, xix, 38-42). Thus was fulfilled Isaiah's prediction that the grave would be blest; the rich man in its dust shall be in dust; the Greek Church celebrates the feast of Joseph of Arimatha on 31 July, and the Roman Church on 17 March. The additional details which are found concerning him in the apocryphal "Acta Pilati," are unworthy of credence. Likewise fabulous is the tradition which tells him to be the founder of the Cistercian Order, and thence to Great Britain, where he is supposed to have founded the earliest Christian oratory at Glastonbury. Finally, the story of the translation of the body of Joseph of Arimatha from Jerusalem to Moyenonostre (Diocese of Toul) originated late and is unreliable.


FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Joseph of Cupertino, SAINTE, mystic, born 17 June, 1603; died at Osimo 18 Sept., 1663, feast, 18 Sept. Joseph received his surname from Cupertino, a small village in the Diocese of Naples, and was canonized at Osimo in the Kingdom of Naples. His father Felice Dea, a poor carpenter, died before Joseph was born and left some debts, in consequence of which the creditors drove the mother, Francesca Panara, from her home, and she was obliged to give birth to her child in a stable. In his eighth year Joseph had an ecstatic vision while at school and this was renewed several times; so that the children, seeing him gape and stare on such occasions, lost to all things about him, gave him the sobriquet "Bocca Aperta." At the same time he had a hot and irascible temper which his strict mother strove hard to overcome, but which was confirmed to a certain extent by the fact that at the age of seventeen he tried to be admitted to the Friars Minor Conventuals and was refused on account of his ignorance. He then applied to the Capuchins at Martino near Taranto, where he was accepted as a lay-brother in 1620, but his continual ecstasies unfitted him for work and he was dismissed. His mother and his uncle abused him as a good-for-nothing, but Joseph did not lose hope. By his continued prayers and tears he succeeded in obtaining permission to work in the stable as lay help or oblate at the Franciscan convent of La Grotella near Cupertino. He now gave evidence of the greatest virtues, humility at times being heavier than his pride was to such an extent that he was admitted to the clerical state in 1625, and three years later, on 28 March he was raised to the priesthood. Joseph was but little versed in human knowledge, for his biographers relate that he was able to read but poorly, yet by infused knowledge and supernatural light he not only surpassed all ordinary men in the learning of the schools but could solve the most intricate questions.

His life was now one long succession of visions and other heavenly favours. Everything that in any way had reference to God or holy things would bring on an ecstatic state: the mention of the name of God or of the Blessed Virgin or of a saint, any event in the life of Christ, the sacred Passion, a holy picture, the thought of the glory in heaven, all would put Joseph into contemplation. Neither dragging him about, buffeting, piercing with needles, nor even burning his flesh with candles would have any effect on him—only the voice of his superior would make him obey. These conditions would occur at any time or place, especially at Mass or during Divine Service. Frequently he would be raised from his feet and remain suspended in the air. Besides being at times heir heavenly intelligence. Since such occurrences in public caused much admiration and also disturbance in a community, Joseph for thirty-five years was not allowed to attend choir, go to the common refectory, walk in procession or say Mass in church, but was ordered to remain in his room, where a private chapel was prepared for him. Evil-minded and envious men even brought him before the Inquisition, and he was sent from one lonely house of the Capuchins or Franciscaans to another, but Joseph retained his resigned and joyous spirit, submitting confidently to Divine Providence. He practised mortification and fasting and fasting to the point of seven Lents of forty days each year, and during many of them tasted no food except on Thursdays and Sundays. His body is in the church at Osimo. He was
JOSEPH bestrayed by Benedict XIV in 1753, and canonized 16 July 1767 by Clement XIII; Clement XIV extended his office to the entire Church. His life was written by Robert Nolli (Palermo, 1678). Angelo Pastrovich wrote anotations in 1776, and this is used by the Benedictines as their Acta SS. V. See J. 962.


Joseph of Exeter (Josephus Iscanus), a twelfth-century Latin poet; b. at Exeter, England. About 1135 he became a monk at Guibert, and his lifelong intimacy with Guibert, afterwards Abbot of Florennes. Portions of their correspondence have been preserved. In the succeeding years he wrote his most celebrated poem De bello Trojanico in six books. Much of this must have been written before 1153, as he refers to the young King Henry II (who predeceased his father Henry II in that year) as still living. But the work must have been completed after 1154 as it is dedicated to his friend Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, who did not succeed to the primacy till that year. When the archbishop set out on the crusade to the Holy Land he induced Joseph to accompany him, but on Baldwin's death in 1190 the poet returned home, commemorating the crusade in verse in his Antiochensis, a work of which only fragments have been preserved (see Camden's Remains, 339-39). The poem on the Trojan war was printed in a very corrupt and mutilated form under the name of Cornelius Nepos (Bazel, 1553; 1583; Antwerp, 1608; Milan, 1669), and in a somewhat more critical edition by Samuel Dresemius (Frankfort, 1620; 1623). English editions were published in London in 1675 (by J. More) and in 1825. Some other poems now lost have been attributed to him on the basis of no valid authority. Nothing further is known of his life or death.

JUBERLAND, De Josepho Exonicensi et Iscano Thesius (Paris, 1877); SAMADIN, De Josepho Isaico, beli Tironi, 11th post Christianas (Venice, 1878); HENRY, Catalogue de la Bibliothèque nationale, 2nd (London, 1865). 559-60; KINDEBURG, in Dict. Nat. Biog., s. v.; see CHEVALIER, Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge (Paris, 1805) for list of earlier sources.

EDWIN BURTON.

Joseph of Leonessa, Saint, in the world named Eufanaro Desiderio, b. in 1556 at Leonessa in Umbria; d. 4 Feb., 1612. From his infancy he showed a remarkably religious bent of mind; he used to erect little altars and spend much time in prayer before them, and often he would gather his companions and induce them to pray with him. Whilst yet a boy he was taken to the discipline on Fridays in company with the confraternity of St. Saviour. He was educated by his uncle, who had planned a suitable marriage for him, but in his sixteenth year he fell sick of a fever, and on his recovery, without consulting his relatives, he joined the Capuchin reform of the Franciscan Order. He made his novitiate in the convent of the Carcerelle near Assisi. As a religious he was remarkable for his great abstinence. "Brother Ass," he would say to his body, "there is no need to feed thee as a noble horse would be fed: thou must be content to be a poor ass."

In 1599, the year before the Jubilee year, he fasted the whole year in preparation for gaining the indulgence. In 1657 he was sent by the Superior General of his order to Constantinople to minister to the Christians held captive there. Arrived there he and his companions lodged in a ducal house of Benedictine monks. The poverty in which the friars lived attracted the attention of the Turks, who went in number to Joseph's Miisielle, and they were solicitous in ministering to the captive Christians in the galleys. Every day he went into the city to preach, and he was at length thrown into prison and only released at the intervention of the Venetian agent.

Urged on by zeal he at last sought to enter the palace to preach before the Sultan, but he was seized and condemned to death. For three days he hung on the gallows, held up by two hooks driven through his right hand and right foot; the rope was tied round him. Returning to Italy, he took with him a Greek archbishop who had apostatized, and who was reconciled to the Church on their arrival in Rome. Joseph now took up the work of home missions in his native province, sometimes preaching six or seven times a day. In the Jubilee year of 1600 he preached at Lent at Orvieto, a town which had been the starting point of the pilgrims passed on their way to Rome. Many of them being very poor, Joseph supplied them with food; he also washed their clothes and cut their hair. At Todi he cultivated with his own hands a garden, the produce of which was for the poor. His feast is kept on 4 Feb. throughout the whole Franciscan Order. He was canonized by Benedict XIV.


F. CUTHBERT.

Joseph's, Saint, Society for Coloured Missions, began its labours in 1871, when four young priests from Mill Hill were put in charge of St. Francis Xavier's church, with a large number of black Catholics, in Baltimore. Other negro missions were soon begun at Louisville, Charleston, Washington, Richmond, Norfolk, and other places in the South. The society in the United States increased so rapidly and its missions were so successful that in 1892 it was made independent of Mill Hill and established its headquarters at Baltimore. At present it has 49 priests who have charge of 35 missions in the Archdioceses of Baltimore and New Orleans and in the Dioceses of Covington, Dallas, Galveston, Little Rock, Mobile, Nashville, Natches, Richmond, Wilmington, and San Antonio. The society moreover conducts four educational institutions, viz., the St. Joseph's Seminary in Baltimore, where missionaries for the coloured missions are trained; Epiphany Apostolic College, Wallbrook, Baltimore, which is a preparatory school for St. Joseph's Seminary; St. Joseph's Catechetical College near Montgomery, Alabama, where young coloured men are trained to become catechists and teachers among their people; and St. Joseph's Industrial School at Clayton, Delaware, which is an agricultural and trade school for coloured boys.

M. C. HARVEY, quarterly organ of the society in the United States (Baltimore, 1886—). The Josephite, quarterly organ of St. Joseph's College for negro catechists (Montgomery, Alabama, 1859—).

MICHAEL OTT.

Joseph's, Saint, Society for Foreign Missions (Mill Hill, London, N. W.), a society of priests and laymen whose object is to labour for the conversion of heathens in foreign countries. It owes its origin to Cardinal Vaughan (d. 1693) who when still a priest, founded in 1866 St. Joseph's Missionary College in a villa near Mill Hill, about ten miles north of London. It was the purpose of this college to train missionaries to propagate the Gospel among heathen races beyond Europe, especially the negroes of Africa and the United States of America. On the death of the founder in 1871, the college was transferred to a larger building erected for the purpose at Mill Hill, and in 1884 St. Peter's School was founded at Freshfield near Liverpool, to serve as a preparatory school to the college at Mill Hill. There are two other branch colleges: St. Joseph's Missionary College, founded at Abingdon, in 1890; and St. Joseph's Missionshaus, at Brixen, Tyrol, erected in 1891. St. Joseph's Society, Mill Hill, is under the direction of the superior general, Very Rev. Francis Henry, and comprises at present about 200
priests and 10 lay brothers. About 170 of these priests are engaged as missionaries, the others as teachers in the above named colleges. The following ecclesiastics are under the care of the society: the Telugu Mission in the Archdiocese of Madras in British India, since 1875; the Prefecture Apostolic of Labuan and North Borneo, since 1881; the Mauri Mission in the Diocese of Auckland, New Zealand, since 1886; the Apostolic Prefecture of Rasul and Kaspar in the northwest part of India, since 1887; the Vicariate Apostolic of the Upper Nile or Uganda in British East Africa, since 1894; a few stations in the Belgian Congo, since 1903; and in the Diocese of Jaro, in the Philippines, since 1906, there are about thirty priests of the society. Theological and constitutional questions in the Vatican were decided by the final definitive approval of the Holy See on April 25, 1908.

Sisters of St. Joseph's Society for Foreign Missions, of the Third Order Regular of St. Francis, founded in 1883 by Cardinal Vaughan and Mother Mary Francis Ingham, to co-operate in the work of the Mill Hill Fathers. The Cardinal's idea was that the society should stand in the same relation to the fathers of the society as the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul to the Lazarist Fathers. They undertake any work, at home or abroad, indicated for them by the superior general or the bishop of the diocese. There are no lay sisters. The novitiate is at Patricraft, near Lancaster, where there are twelve boys and six girls, with about 200 children under 40 sisters. In addition to their establishments at Mill Hill and Manchester, the congregation has a branch house at Blackburn with boarding-schools for boys and girls of the middle class and an orphanage for children of the poorer class, with 10 sisters in charge of 70 to 80 children; at Blackburn the sisters teach in 3 elementary schools. They have branches also at Freshfield (Liverpool), at Waterford and Cork in Ireland, and at Rosendal in Holland. In Borneo there are 17 sisters at various mission stations. The total number of professed sisters in the congregation is 120.


Michael Ott.

Josephus, Flavius. Jewish historian, b. A.D. 37, at Jerusalem; d. about 101. He belonged to a distinguished priestly family, whose paternal ancestors he himself traces back five generations; his mother's family claimed descent from the Machabees. He received his early training in the study of the sacred writings. He is considered the most learned scholar of his time, more especially his memory and power of judgment. He also made himself fully acquainted with and tried the leading political-religious Jewish parties of his age—the Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. Impressed by the outward prosperity and the consequent influence of the priestly order, he attached himself to that party at the age of nineteen, although he shared neither their religious nor political views. He went to Rome in the 64th year with the object of procuring from Nero the release of some imprisoned Jewish priests, who were friends of his. He succeeded in winning the favour of Poppaea Sabina, the emperor's consort, and through her influence gained his cause. But he was so dazzled by the brilliant court life in the metropolis of the world, that he became ever more estranged from the spirit of strict Judaism, considering its struggle against paganism as useless. He left Rome after the return of the emperor with the Jewish revolt broke out in the year 66. Like most of the aristocratic Jews, Josephus at first disdained the rebellion of his countrymen, goaded into activity by their enslaved condition and outraged religious sentiments; when, however, fortune seemed to favour the insurgents, Josephus like the rest of the priestly nobility joined them, and was chosen by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem to be commander-in-chief in Galilee. As such commanding no other body of Roman cavalry, he advanced with the main army from Antioch to Galilee, burning and murdering, the insurgents either fled or sought shelter in their fortresses. For six weeks Josephus and the boldest spirits among the insurgents defended themselves in the almost impregnable fortress of Jotapata, but their supplies being now exhausted from lack of water and other necessaries, the Romans stormed the citadel; most of the patriots were put to the sword, but Josephus escaped the massacre by hiding in an inaccessible cistern, and emerged only after receiving an assurance that his life would be spared. Brought before the victorious general, he sought with great shrewdness to ingratiate himself with Vespasian, foretelling his elevation, as well as that of his son Titus, to the imperial dignity. Vespasian, however, kept him near him as a prisoner, and it was only in the year 69, after he had actually become emperor, that he received to Josephus honor and freedom.

As a freedman of Vespasian, Josephus assumed in accordance with the Roman custom the former's family name of Flavianus. He accompanied the emperor as far as Egypt, when the latter had handed over to his son the prosecution of the Jewish War, but then joined the retinue of Titus, and was an eyewitness of the destruction of the Holy City and her Temple. At his personal risk he had tried to persuade the Jews to surrender. After the fall of the city he went to Rome with Titus, and took part in the latter's triumph. But these scenes did not trouble Josephus's sense of national honour; on the contrary, he accepted the privilege of Roman citizenship in recognition of his services, and was granted a yearly stipend and also lands in Judea. The succeeding emperors, Titus and his cruel brother Domitian, also showed themselves kindly disposed towards Josephus, and conferred on him many marks of distinction. At court he was allowed to devote himself un molested to his literary work until his death, which occurred in the reign of Trajan (probably in 101). In his life, as in his writings, he pursued a policy midway between Jewish and pagan culture, for which he was accused by his Jewish countrymen of apostasy. It was not so much his works—except with the exception of the "Jewish War", which was first written in Hebrew and thence translated—were written in elegant Greek, to influence the educated class of his time, and free them from various prejudices against Judaism.

The first work of Josephus known by the "Jewish War" (Πολέμου Ἰουδαϊκοῦ εἰς Ρώμας ἐπανδρωτοῦ) in seven books. This is mainly based on his memoranda made during the war of independence (66-73), on the memoirs of Vespasian, and on letters of King Agrippa. While his story of warlike events is reliable, the account of his own doings is strongly tinted with foolish self-adulation. This work furnishes the historical background for numerous historical romances, among those of modern times "Lucius Flavius" by J. Spillmann, S.J., and "The End of Judah" by Anton de Waal.

Josephus's second work, the "Jewish Antiquities" (Ἰσραηλίτου ἱστορίας), contains in twenty books the complete history of the Jews and the break of the revolt in a. d. 66. Books I-XI are based on the text of the Septuagint, though at times he also repeats traditional explanations current among the Jews in later times. He also quotes numerous passages from Greek authors whose writings are now lost. On the other hand he made allowance for the tastes
of his Gentile contemporaries by arbitrary omissions as well as by the free embellishment of certain scenes. Books XII—XX, in which he speaks of the times preceding the coming of Christ and the foundation of Christianity, are our only sources for many historical events. In these the value of the statements is eminently contingent on the discovery of other, otherwise wanting, and by the citation of authentic documents which confirm and supplement the Biblical narrative. The story of Herod the Great is contained in books XV—XVII. Book XVIII contains in chapter iii the celebrated passage in which mention is made of the Residency in the following words: "About this time lived Jesus, a man full of wisdom, if indeed one may call Him a man. For He was the doer of incredible things, and the teacher of such as gladly received the truth. He thus attracted to Himself many Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. On the accusation of the leading men of our people, Pilate condemned Him to death upon the cross; nevertheless those who had previously loved Him still remained faithful to Him. For on the third day He again appeared to them living, just as, in addition to a thousand other marvellous things, prophets sent by God had foretold. And to the present day the race of those who call themselves Christian Communities has not ceased." Attempts have been made to refute the objections brought against this passage both for internal and external reasons, but the difficulty has not been definitively settled. The passage seems to suffer from repeated interpolations. The fact that the "Antiquities" testifies to the truth of Divine Revelation among the Jews as among the Christians, and confirms the historical facts related in the Bible by the incontrovertible testimony of pagan authors, renders this work of Josephus of extreme value for the history of the chosen people. The accounts which he gives of their monarchs and their mutual relations of the different Jewish sects, which are so important in the history and sufferings of the Saviour; his information regarding the corruption of the ancient Jewish customs and institutions; his statement concerning the internal conflicts of the Jews, and lastly his account of the last war with the Romans, which put an end to the national independence of the Jews, are of prime importance as historical sources.

In his "Autobiography" (Φανοκός Ἱσοφρέν φῦατος), written A.D. 90, Josephus seeks, not without attempts at self-gloration, to justify his position at the beginning of his career and to explain any language of the book is probably influenced by the writings of Nicholas of Damascus, which Josephus had also used in the "Antiquities". His work entitled "Against Apion" (Κατὰ Αἰπιόν), divided in two books, is a defence of the great antiquity of the Jews and a refutation of the charges which had been brought against them by the grammarian Apion of Alexandria on the occasion of an embassy to the Emperor Caligula.

The early Christians were zealous readers of Josephus's "History of the Jews", and the Fathers of the Church, such as Jerome and Ambrose, as well as the early ecclesiastical historians like Eusebius, are fond of quoting him in their works. St. Chrysostom calls him a useful expounder of the historical books of the Old Testament. The works of Josephus were translated into Latin at an early date. After the art of printing had been discovered, they were circulated in all languages. The first German translation was executed by the Reverend Professor 1531, and a French translation was issued by Burg going in Lyons in 1588. Among the best-known translations in English is that by Whiston (London, 1737), revised by Shilleto (5 vols., London, 1888-9). In the middle of the nineteenth century the interest in the "Antiquities" was revived by a translation which the Society of St. Charles Borromeo induced Professor Konrad Martin, afterwards Bishop of Paderborn, to undertake in collaboration with Frans Kaulen (1st ed., Cologne, 1852-3; 2nd and 3rd ed. by Kaulen, 1883 and 1892). The text of Josephus's works has been published by Dindorf in Greek and Latin (2 vols., Paris, 1845-7) and Bekker (6 vols., Leipzig, 1855-6). There are critical editions by Naber, Leipzig, 1888-91 (below). There are only 6 vols., Berlin, 1887-95, text only. For fuller bibliography see K. HOBER.

Josephus Icanaus. See JOSPH OF EXETER.

Joshua. See JOSUDE.

Josias (Yahweh supports). Sept. Iosias), a pious King of Judah (630-608 B.C.), who ascended the throne when he was only eight years of age. He was the son of Amon and the grandson of Manasses. His mother's name is given as Idida, the daughter of Hadadia IV (II) Kings, xxii, 1). Of the actual influences under which he grew up nothing is known for certain. His reign is usually divided into two periods of thirty years each, 621-598, and 598-560 B.C., and slightly divergent accounts of IV (II) Kings, xxii—xxiii, 30, and II Paralipomenon (Chronicles), xxxiv—xxxv. The following is a summary of Josiah's public acts as they are set forth in the former of these accounts. In the eighteenth year of his rule, the Jewish king undertook to repair the Temple with the help of the high-priest Heleias. During the course of this work, Heleias found "the Book of the Law", and handed it to the royal scribe, Saphan, who read it to Josias. The threats made therein against the transgressors of its contents frightened Josiah, who ordered the Law to be read to the people, and then asked the prophetess Huldah for a fortune. Josiah found this sort of law in the temple, and then in the distance portion of its territory. The work of reform was concluded by a magnificent celebration of the Pasch. Of the thirteen years of Josias's reign which followed this important reformation, nothing is said in the narrative of the Fourth Book of Kings. We are simply told of the monarch's exceeding piety towards Yahweh and of his death on the battle-field of Megiddo, where he perished fighting against the Egyptian Pharaoh, Neocho II, who was then on his way to the Euphrates against the Assyrians. Whoever compares carefully and impartially with this first account of Josias's reign the second one given in II Par., xxxiv—xxxv, cannot help being struck with their wonderful substantial agreement. Both Biblical records agree perfectly as to the age of the king at his accession and as to the length of his reign. Like the narrative of Kings, that of Paralipomenon refers to the eighteenth year. The discovery of the "Book of the Law", relates the same circumstances as attending that event, speaks of a work of religious reform as carried out throughout all Israel on account of the contents of that book, and praises the magnificence of the solemn Pasch celebrated in harmony with it. Now, like the narrative of Kings, too, that of Paralipomenon appreciates in the most favourable manner the king's
Josquinus Pratensis. See Depres, Josquin.

Josue, the name of eight persons in the Old Testament, and of one of the Sacred Books.

I. Josue (יושע, יְושֵׁע), a Bethsames in whose field the ark stood on its way back from the land of the Philistines to Juda (1 Kings, vi, 14, 15).

II. Josue (יושע, יָשָע), governor of Jerusalem, whose name is given to the sons of King Josias during the latter's attempts to undo the evil wrought by his father Amon and grandfather Manasseh (IV Kings, xxiii, 8).

III. Josue (יושע, יָשֹע), Agg., i, 12, 14; ii, 3, 5; Zach., iii, i, 3, 6, 8, 9; vi, 11; יִשֹׁע in I and II Esd.; Sept., יָשָע, the son of Josdecd and the high-priest who returned with Zorobabel from the Babylonian Captivity to Jerusalem (I Esd., ii, 2; II Esd., vii, 2, xii, 1). In I and II Esd. the Vulgate calls him Josue; in Agg. and Zach., Jesus. He assisted Zorobabel in rebuilding the Temple, and was most zealous for the restoration of the religion of Israel (I Esd., iii, 2, 8; iv, 3, 5; v, 2). It was he whom Zacharias saw in vision stripping of filthy garments and dressed in clean robes and mitre, while the angel of the Lord proclaimed the high-priest the type of the coming Messias (Zach., iii).

IV. Josue (יושע, יְשֹע, יַשֹּע), a head of the family of Phahath Moab, one of the families named in the list of Israelites that returned from the Babylonian Exile (I Esd., ii, 6; II Esd., vii, 11).

V. Josuc (יוֹשֵׁע, יְשֹע), a head of the priestly family of Idaia, maybe the high-priest Josue mentioned above (I Esd., ii, 36; II Esd., vii, 39).

VI. Josue (יוֹשֵׁע, יְשֹע, יָשָע), the name of a probably Jewish person descended from Onia, as also of various heads of that family after the Exile (I Esd., ii, 40; iii, 9; viii, 33; II Esd., ii, 19; vii, 43; viiii, 7; ix, 4, 5; xii, 8, Vulg. Jesus; xii, 24).

VII. Josue (יוֹשֵׁע, יָשָע), one of the sons of Herem who were ordered to put away their wives taken from the land of the stranger (1 Esd., x, 31).

VIII. Josue (יוֹשֵׁע, יָשָע, יַשֹּע, יְשֹע), twice יָשָע—Deut., iii, 21, and Judges, ii, 7; first called Osee, יִשֹּע, Sept. יָשֹע, first אָשָׂא), the son of Nun; the genealogy of the family is given in I Par., vii, 20-27; it belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. Josue commanded the army of Israel, after the Exodus, in its battle with Amalec (Ex., xvii, 9-12), was called by the libertine of Ephraim. Josue commanded the army of Israel, after the Exodus, in its battle with Amalec (Ex., xvii, 9-12), was called by the minister of Moses (xxv, 13), accompanied the great lawgiver to and from Mount Sinai (xxxii, 17) and into the tabernacle of the covenant (xxxiii, 11), and acted as one of twelve spies whom Moses sent to view the land of Canaan (Num., xiii, 3). Moses changed his servant's name from Osee to Josue (Num., xiii, 17). The new name most likely means "Jahweh is salvation". Josue and Caleb alone spoke well of the land, even though the people wished to stone them for not murmuring, and these two lived on (Num., xxxii, 20). Josue, the son of Nun, succeeded Moses. The words of the choice show the character of the chosen (Num., xxxvii, 17-18). Before Eleazar and all the assembly of the people Moses laid hands on Josue. Later this soldier was proposed by Moses to the people to lead them into the land beyond the Jordan (Deut., xxxii, 3), and was ordered by the Lord to do so (xxxii, 23). After the death of Moses, Josue was filled with the spirit of wisdom and was obeyed by the children of Israel (Deut., xxxii, 25). After the rest of the story of Josue's time ends. With regard to the exact extent and the Mosaic origin of the "Book of the Law", discovered under Josias, see PENTATEUCH.

For works on Biblical history, see bibliography to ISAAC. References on PENTATEUCH are by CLARKE (Paris, 1880); OTHELLO (Munich, 1889); BENNET (New York, 1894); BARrows, Encyclopedia Spec. Biblica (London, 1899); BASILITZ (Frankfort, 1901); KIRTL (Gottingen, 1902). Names of Catholic authors are marked with an asterisk.

Francis E. Gigot.

Josue, the sixth book of the Old Testament; in the plan of the critics, the last book of the Hexateuch (see PENTATEUCH). In the Fathers, the book is often called "Jehus Nave". The name dates from the time of Origen, who translated the book as "sacrum manu", and named the Nave as a type of a ship; hence in the name Jesus Nave many of the Fathers see the type of Jesus, the Ship wherein the world is saved.

(1) Contents.—The Book of Josue contains two parts: the conquest of the promised land and the division thereof.—(a) The Conquest (i—xii).—Josue enters the land of promise, after being assured by spies that the way is safe. It is the tenth day of the first month, forty-one years since the Exodus. The channel of the Jordan is dry during the passage of Israel (i—iii). A monument is erected in the midst of the Jordan, and city of Galgal, to commemorate the fact. Josue camps at Galgal (iv). The Israelites born during the wandering are circumcised; the pasch is eaten the first time in the land of promise; the manna ceases to fall; Josue is strengthened by the vision of an angel (v). The walls of Jericho fall without a blow; the city is sacked; its inhabitants are put to death; only the family of Rahab is spared (vi). Israel goes up against Hai. The crime of Achan causes defeat. Josue punishes that crime and takes Hai (vii—viii, 29); sets up an altar on Mount Hebal; subjugates the Gabaonites (viii, 30—40), defeats the kings of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jericho, Lachish, Eglon, Gezer, Horab, and the South even to Gaza; marches North and defeats the combined forces of the kings at the waters of Merom (x—xii). (b) The Division of the Land among the Tribes of Israel (xiii—xxii). Epilogue: last message and death of Josue (xxxiii and xxiv).

(2) Canonicity.—(a) In the Jewish canon Josue is among the Early Prophets—Josue, Judges, and the four Books of Kings. It was not grouped with the Pentateuch, chiefly because, unlike Exodus and Leviticus, it contained no Torah, or law; also because the five books of the Torah were assigned to Moses (see above). Later, in the Christian Church, the Book has ever held the same place as in the Jewish canon.

(3) Unity.—Non-Catholics have almost all followed the critics in the question of the "Hexateuch"; even the conservative Hasting, "Dict. of the Bible", ed. 1909, takes it for granted that Josue (Joshua) is a post-exilic patchwork. The first part (i—xii) is made up of two documents, probably J and E (Jehovistic and Elohist elements), put together by J E and later revised by the Deuteronomic editor (D); to this latter is assigned all of the first chapter. Very little of this portion is the work of P (the compiler of the Priestly Code). In the second part (xii—xxii) the critics are uncertain as to whether the last editing was the work of the Deuteronomic or the Priestly editor; they agree in this that the same hands—those of J, E, D, and P—are at work in both parts, and that the portions which must be assigned to P have characteristics which are not at all found (N. xxv, thirteen). On this view the final redaction is post-Exilic—a work done about 400—400 B. C. Such in brief is the theory of the critics, who differ here as elsewhere in the matter of the details assigned to the various writers and the order of the editing, which all assume was certainly done. (See G. A. Smith and J. F. Hasell in Hastings, "Dict. of the Bible", large and small editions respectively, s. v. "Josua"; Moore in Cheyne, "Encyc. Bib."); Wellhausen, "Die Bibel", s. v. "Joshua";...
portion was delayed (xvii, 16); on the other hand, we are told not only the portion of land allotted to Juda and Benjamin, but the cities they had captured (xy, 1 sqq.; xviii, 11 sqq.); as for the other tribes, the progress they had made in winning the cities of their lot is told us with an accuracy which could not be otherwise explained were we to admit that the narrative is post-Exilic in its final redaction. Only the inadmissible bungling of the uncritical D' or D" will serve to explain away this argument. (c) The question remains: Did Josue write all the epilogue? Catholics are divided. Most of the Fathers seem to have taken it for granted that the author is Josue; still there have ever been Catholics who assigned the work to some one shortly after the death of the great leader. Theodoret (In Jos., q. xiv), Pseudo-Athanasius (Synopsis Sacr. Scrip.), Tostatus (In Jos. i, q. xiii; xiv), Maes ("Josue Imperatorius Historia", Antwerp, 1574), Haneberg ("Gesch. der bibl. Offenbarung", Ratisbon, 1863, 202), Danko ("Hist. Rev. Div. V. T.", Vienna, 1862, 200), Meignan ("De Moisès à David". Paris, 1896. 335).

**Apparition of the Angel to Josue**

(Jos. v, 13-15—Cod. Grae. 405, Vatican Library)

and many other Catholic authors admit that the Book of Josue contains signs of later editing; but all insist that this editing was done before the Exile.

(5) Historicity.—The Biblical Commission (15 Feb., 1909) has decreed the historicity of the primitive narrative of Gen., i-iii; a fortiori it will not tolerate that a Catholic deny the historicity of Josue. The chief objection of rationalists to the historicity of the book is the almost overwhelming force of the miraculous therein; this objection has no worth to the Catholic exegete. Other objections are forestalled in the treatment of the authenticity of the work. Full answer to the rationalistic objections will be found in the standard works of Catholics on introduction. Saints Paul (Heb., xi, 30; 31; xiii, 5), James (ii, 25), and Stephen (Acts, vii, 43), the tradition of the Synagogue and of the Church accept the Book of Josue as historical. To the Fathers Josue is an historical person and a type of the Messiah. As an antidote to accusations that Josue was cruel and murderous, etc., one should read the Assyrian and Egyptian accounts of the almost contemporary treatment of the vanquished. St. Augustine solved the rationalistic difficulty by saying that the abominations of the Chanaanites merited the punishment which God, as Master of the world, meted out to them by the hand of Israel (In
Hept., III, 56; P. L., XXXIV, 702, 816. These abominations of phallic worship and infant sacrifice have been proven by the excavations of the Palestine Exploration Fund at Gazer.

(6) Text.—The Septuagint is preserved in two different recensions at the Alexandrian (A) and Vatican (B)—and varies considerably from the Masorah: the Vulgate often differs from all three (iii; 4; iv, 3, 13; v, 6). The Samaritan Josue, recently discovered, resembles the Sept. more closely than the Masorah.

WALTER DRUM.

Joubert, Joseph, French philosopher; b. at Martinique (Dordogne), May 1754; d. at Villeneuve-le-Roi (Yonne), May 4, 1824. At the age of fourteen, having finished his studies in his native town, he was sent to Toulouse to study law, but after a few months joined the Doctrinaires, a teaching order, and was entrusted with the instruction of lower classes. In 1778 he left the order and went to Paris, where he associated with the most famous literary men of the time, Marmontel, Diderot, and d'Alembert, with whose sentiments he was for some time in sympathy. The French Revolution opened his eyes and made him a strong opponent of the doctrines of the eighteenth century. In 1790 he was elected by his countrymen justice of the peace of the canton of Martinique. When his biennial term expired, he refused to accept re-election and returned to Paris, where in the following year (June, 1793) he married Mlle Moreau. Disgusted with the tyranny of the Revolutionists, he retired to Villeneuve-le-Roi. Even when he decided to return to Paris, he preferred to live there rather than in Paris. Chateaubrandon, Mme de Beaumont, Fontaines, Molé, and Chéneddolle were his frequent visitors. In 1805 he was appointed by Fontaines Inspector General of the University of France, and in spite of his poor health fulfilled his duties with the greatest zeal. When he was compelled to give up his inspectorship, he devoted his time to the education of his son and to his literary works. He was one of the first to understand the movement of the Romanticists and to encourage it. Owing to his kind disposition and his delicate taste, as well as his friendly and chivalrous dispositions, he had a strong influence over many young men gathered around him. Aiming at what was perfect in literature, he wrote very little and never published anything. He spent his leisure in thinking, and putting down his thoughts for himself. His aim was to note in verse and clear sentences the necessity, utility, and beauty of virtue. From his death, all these papiers de la malle (scrapes of paper), as he called them, aroused the interest and admiration of Chateaubrandon, who published a short selection of them for private circulation, under the title of "Revue des Pensées de M. Joubert" (Paris, 1838). This book was re-edited with many additions by Paulignan, a nephew of the author, under the new title of "Pensées, Essais, Maximes et Correspondance de J. Joubert" (Paris, 1842). Many other editions have since been published.

Jouffroy, Claude-François-Dorothee de, Marquis d'Abbeville, mechanic, b. at Abbeville, near Besançon, 30 Sept., 1751; d. at Paris, 18 July, 1832. He was educated by the Dominicans of Quiney in philosophy and literature, but showed a leaning towards the exact sciences and the mechanical arts. At the age of twenty he was enlisted in the infantry regiment of Bourbon, but numerous infirmations of discipline brought upon him in 1772 the punishment of confinement at the prison of Orleans. At the expiration of his sentence, he began the study of the problems of steam navigation, suggested by the sight of the convicts rowing the galleys. In 1775 he went to Paris to study the Watt steam-engine. He discussed with Périer the application of steam to the propulsion of vessels, and opposed his views. Finally he consented to build a steamboat, and ran it on the River Doubs during June and July, 1776. The system he used then was the palmipede, or web-foot, which proved unsatisfactory. In 1781, being promised the help of the Government, he began the construction of his pyroscapha at Lyons. This vessel was about 140 feet long, 5 feet wide, 3 feet in draught, and 150 tons in displacement. A horizontal steam-engine moved a double rack to and fro; this rack geared with ratchet-wheels on the shaft carrying the paddle wheels. The wheels were thus turned continuously in the same direction.

On a public trial, 15 July, 1786, the Jouffroy ran up the Saône at Lyons against the current with a speed of six miles per hour, in the presence of representative scientific men and thousands of enthusiastic spectators. This steamboat continued to run on the river during sixteen months. In spite of the very favourable report the French Academy had given it, Jouffroy, having as an excuse the fact that the experiment had not been made at Paris. Jouffroy, having already spent a fortune, was too poor to continue the struggle, and the guaranteed monopoly was not confirmed. The Revolution setting in, all work was abandoned until the restoration and after the change of the Government. A boat was launched and run on the Seine 20 August, 1816, and at last the patent was granted. Still Jouffroy was oppressed and failed to get the necessary financial support. At length in 1831, utterly discouraged and poor, he retired to the Invalides, the home of old soldiers, where he died of cholera. He was admitted to the home without difficulty, being chevalier of the Orders of Military Merit, of Saint-George, and of Saint-Louis, and having served eighteen years and during eleven campaigns. Claude de Jouffroy fought constantly on the side of the legitimists and opposed Bonaparte, who as soon as he came to power, gave him an opportunity to make his invention. His religious sentiments are evident from the fact that he entrusted his son to the care of the Abbé Blond. He himself was comforted to the last moment by the presence of a priest. A century later, in 1884, France recognized the originality of the inventor by subscribing to the statue of Jouffroy erected at Besançon. Robert Fulton himself had testified that "if the glory (of imagining the first pyroscapha) belongs to any one man, it belongs to the author of the experiments made on the River Saône at Lyons in 1775." William Fox.
Through the intervention of the Duke of Burgundy, Jouffroy had tried to obtain the cardinalate, and he soon found an opportunity of attaining this end. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), besides asserting the superiority of councils over the Roman pontiff, had lessened the freedom and independence of the Church in France, and had, to a great extent, withdrawn from the pope's eminence, yet Dauphin, Louis XI had pledged himself to abolish the Pragmatic Sanction in the event of his succession to the throne. Upon his becoming king (1461), negotiations were opened by Pius II, who appointed Jouffroy as his legate. The king showed himself favorably disposed, and in March 1462 the pope would change his Neapolitan policy, cease to support Ferrante, and recognize John of Calabria as King of Naples. At Rome, however, Jouffroy made no mention of this fact, and simply announced the king's intention of repealing the Pragmatic Sanction. In fact Louis himself wrote to the pope (27 Nov., 1461): "As you require, we set aside and proscribe the Pragmatic Sanction in our whole kingdom, in Dauphiné, and all our dominions, in which henceforth your jurisdiction shall be unquestioned." Louis had expressed the desire that Jouffroy be made a cardinal. Notwithstanding the opposition of Cardinal Godin, the pope consented, and on 18 Dec., 1461, Jouffroy was one of the seven newly appointed cardinals. In the beginning of January, 1462, Jouffroy made known to the pope the king's demands concerning Naples. In his memoirs Pius II complains that "after Jouffroy had entered the sure haven of the cardinals, he brought forward that which he had hitherto concealed, namely, that the Pragmatic Sanction would certainly be repealed only when the king's wishes regarding Naples had been complied with." For some time the pope seemed to be in doubt as to whether it would not be better to reserve the matter for negotiation, but Jouffroy refused, and Louis XI, disappointed in his hopes and anticipations, became enraged against the pontiff, Jouffroy himself encouraging him in his opposition. The consequence was that, without directly re-establishing the Pragmatic Sanction, the king issued many decrees which practically did away with the concessions made by its revocation. Jouffroy used all the whole affair is its from praiseworthy, and, in his memoirs, the pope accuses him of deception, false representations, and treachery. Pastor's judgment seems to be fully justified: "King Louis and Cardinal Jouffroy were a well-matched pair." Jouffroy became Bishop of Albi (10 Dec., 1462) and Abbé of St.-Denis (1464). Several times he was sent by the king as ambassador to Rome and to Spain. He accompanied the expedition against the Duke of Armagnac besieged in Lectoure, but it is not certain that he took any part in the murder of the duke. Fallig sick, he stopped at Roussillon where he died. Jouffroy was a good orator, and his sermons were published in D'Achéry's "Spiciegium" (Paris, 1666). He was also a shrewd diplomat, but was not free from selfishness and ambition, which led him to use unfair means in the pursuit of his own ends.

Jouin, Louis, linguist, philosopher, author, b. at Berlin, 14 June, 1818; d. at New York, 10 June, 1899. He was descended from a French Huguenot family, which had been forced by the Edict of Nantes to take refuge in Prussia. After spending some time in a French school he went to Poland, where he entered the Catholic Church, and determined to embrace the religious life. With the intention of securing his release from military service, he renounced allegiance to the land of his birth, and made his way to Rome. He was admitted into the Jesuit Order, entering the novitiate of San Andrea, 20 Aug., 1841. He studied philosophy for three years in the famous Jesuit college, called the Roman College, and laboured for a time at Reggio, at which place he was ordained priest on 30 April, 1845, but was forced by the Revolution to flee the country. Accordingly in October of the same year he came to the United States. He remained in New York City till 1852, studied theology at Fordham, 1852-56, taught in Fordham College until 1859, and spent the following year at Sault-au-Récollet, Canada. Returning to Fordham in 1860, he taught theology in the scholasticate (1860-3), and later (1866-72) filled various positions in the college. After a visit to England in 1872, he went to Guelph, Canada, and remained at this place till 1875. During 1875-6 he was in Montreal and during 1876-9 at St. Francis Xavier's, New York. In 1879 he returned to Fordham, where he remained until his death.

As a teacher he occupied in Italy, Canada, and the United States the chairs of science, mathematics, and theology; but it was to philosophy that he gave the best part of the fifty-eight years he spent in the Society of Jesus, teaching it year after year, especially to young men. He had a keen consciousness and clearness. Indeed it may be said that his life-work consisted in sowing the seeds of truth in the minds of American youth, and thus guarding them against the insidious errors of the times. For the use of his scholars, he prepared, either in lithograph or in print, various treatises on philosophical and scientific subjects. Unfortunately, only a few of these were given to the public. His published works are: "Elementa Logicae et Metaphysicae" (4th ed., New York, 1884); "Elementa Philosophiae Moralis" (New York, 1889); "Evidences of the Religion" (1854); and "What Christ Revealed". Father Jouin was an accomplished linguist, speaking with fluency German, French, Italian, Spanish, English, Polish, and Latin, besides being well versed in Greek, Hebrew, and Gaelic. He was a skilled moralist, and for many years presided over the theological conferences of the Archdiocese of New York. He was of practical piety, acquaintance with ascetic literature, and deep knowledge of men caused him to be much sought after as a spiritual director and as a preacher of retreats.

Woodstock Letters, XXIX, 75.

Jouin, Henry. See Jaffna, Diocese of.

Jouvançay, Joseph de (Joseph-Juvenicius), poet, pedagogue, philologist, and historian, b. at Paris, 14 September, 1843; d. at Rome, 29 May, 1719. At the age of sixteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and after completing his studies he taught grammar at the college at Compiègne, and rhetoric at Caen and La Flèche. He made his profession at the latter place in 1677 and was afterwards appointed professor at the College Louis-le-Grand at Paris. In 1699 he was called by his superiors to Rome to continue the history of the Society of Jesus begun by Orlandini, and was engaged on this work until his death. Jouvançay wrote largely upon those topics which engaged his attention as a member of the order. He composed about ten tragedies, all of which were published at Paris, and several of which were frequently acted. It is not certain, however, that all that was attributed to Jouvançay were written by him, for some of them are also attributed to other members of the order. Jouvançay also wrote many poems in Latin and Greek for special occasions. He had a masterly knowledge of classical Latin and procured the translation into Latin of many works during his French advocacy over Prince Henri de Bourbon, oldest son of Louis XIV, delivered in December, 1683, at Paris by
the celebrated pulpit orator Bourdaloue; "Cleander et Eudoxius", a translation of the "Entretiens de Cleandre et d'Eudoxe" of Father Daniel. This latter work is a refutation of the accusations brought against the Society of Jesus by its enemies; in 1703 it was put on the Index. The translation of the theological letters of Father Daniel to the Dominicans Alexander Natalis containing part of the history of the settings of St. Thomas and of the theologians of the Society of Jesus concerning Probabilism and its relation to Divine grace. In 1704 appeared Jouvenay's "Appen- dix de Diis et heroibus poeticae", a widely read work which was a translation of Father Gautренue's "Histoire de l'intelligence des chefs & ancianciers". Jouvenay also translated into Latin epigrams, written by other Jesuits, of the saints of the order, St. Stanislaus Kostka and St. John Francis Regis.

Jouvenay edited a large number of school editions of Latin authors. The text was always revised suitably to school use, was altered in many places with classical elegance, and supplied with learned footnotes, partly explanatory of the details given by the author, partly on the style and grammatical construction; these editions were frequently reissued both in France and other countries. In some of the later editions translations were added. Worthy of special praise were the editions of the "Comedies" of Terence, the "Odys" and "Libre de arte poetica" of Horace, the "Epigrams" of Martial, the "Metamorphoses" of Ovid, the philosophical writings of Cicero, as "De officiis", "Cato Major", and "Laelius". Jouvenay's "Institutiones poeticae", published in 1718 and often reprinted, was another work intended for use in teaching. A number of editions also appeared of his "Novus apparatus graecolatinus, cum interprettatione gyllacio". This work, based on Isocrates, Demosthenes, and other Greek and Roman authors, is by many considered to be far superior to the lexica then used, but was also intended to encourage the cultivation of the mother tongue, as well as the study of the two classical languages. Jouvenay also delivered many orations and eulogies, for example on Louis XIV, his family, and his government, in externals so brilliant for France, on the churches of Paris and the French nation. These were published in two volumes and from 1701 frequently reprinted.

A work of special importance was Jouvenay's "Christianis litterarum magistas de ratione discendi et docendi" (1701). At the request of the Fourteenth Congregation of the Society to adapt this work as a guide and method for the classical studies of the members of the Society. After careful examination of the manuscript by a commission of the order, it was published at Florence in 1703 as an official textbook under the title: "Magistrae scholarum inferiorum Societatis Jesu de ratione discendi et docendi". This edition was the basis of all later ones. In this pioneer work Jouvenay took the first steps in the method for the study of philology which was developed by the great investigators of antiquity. Latin is and remains the central point of instruction, even though Greek and the historical branches are not neglected. The art of the teacher may be separated into two main divisions: by the example of his own piety and virtue the teacher is to lead the pupil to the knowledge and service of the Creator; his task is to bring the pupil to apply himself to his actual studies by fear of humiliation and an honourable spirit of competition. The principles of the "De ratione discendi et docendi" were used as a standard in all the Jesuit colleges of the German association. After he was called to Rome, Jouvenay laboured on the Rota, was promotor for the Society of Jesus, which embraced the period 1591-1616. The work was forbidden in France by decree of Parliament of 22 February and 24 March, 1715, because it expressed opinions contravening the royal rights of sovereigns, that is, opposing the royal absolutism of the Bourbons. In Rome as well the work was placed in part on the Index by decree of 29 July, 1722, because in some passages it contradicted the papal decree "De Gratissimum Sinensibus" quibus de liberam perniciem (whereby destroying the book is permitted). According to documents in the archives of the order this part of Jouvenay's book was written before the publication of the papal decree (Reussch, "Index der verbotenen Bücher", 2 vols., I, Bonn, 1885, 772 sq.).

Jean Jouvenay, Jean, named the great French painter, b. at Rouen in 1644; d. at Paris, 5 April, 1717. In his family, of Italian extraction, the painting instinct was hereditary. Noël Jouvenay, his grandfather, who had settled in Normandy, is believed to have been the teacher of Poussin, while to Laurent Jouvenay, his father, Jean owed his early instruction in art. In 1660, before he was sent by his godfather to Paris, that time the goldsmiths' guild in the city planted a tree each year on 1 May in the enclosure of Notre-Dame, and presented a painting for the altar of Our Lady. The greatest artists of the age painted some of these works, which were known as nusis. Jouvenay executed the painting for the year 1673, the subject being the "Cure of the Parish". His performance attracted the attention of Lebrun, who enrolled the author in the group of artists then engaged in decorating the palace of Versailles, under the direction of the "premier peintre". Jouvenay was elected to the Academy in 1676, and in 1681 he was nominated for the chair of painting. However it was not till some time later, after the death of Lebrun (1692), that he came into prominence. In truth, French painting hitherto almost completely under the influence of the Italian schools, and following under Lebrun the tradition of Rome and Bologna, was just commencing to free itself. A new tradition, traceable to Rubens, who had in 1628 painted in the Palais du Luxembourg (the famous Galerie de Médicis, now in the Louvre), was daily gaining strength. Artists were divided into "Rubenistes" and "Poussinistes", the partic- ular forms of which are known as colorists and line-artists. The artistic strife continued during the whole of the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV. Jouvenay played a decisive part in the struggle. Never having been in Italy, he could form an impartial judgment of the merits and claims of the Roman school. With La Fosse and Antoine Coypel, he was one of those who contributed most to the work of transformation, which resulted in the rise of the eighteenth-century school of artists.

Jouvenay's paintings for the Salons of 1699 and 1704 were the manifesto of the new school. The most important of them are preserved in the cathedral of Antwerp. The first is the famous "Descent from the Cross" (1697), which hangs in the Salon Carré—a free translation of Rubens' masterpiece in the cathedral of Antwerp. Eloquent and impressive, distinguished by a sentiment of massiveness and colour, and by its tonality at once low and elaborate, it was deeply influential on the next. With the painting by P. Largilière in St-Etienne du Mont (1696), it occupies a most important place in the history of French painting, in which it is one of the principal dates. In the Salon of 1704 Jouvenay presented the four works, each twenty feet long, intended for the chuck of the Church of St-Martin des Champs (as he knew it), "The Raising of the House of Simon", "The Expulsion of the Sellers from the Temple", and especially the "Raising of
Lazarus" and the "Miraculous Draught of Fishes". Attention has often been called to the fact that the artist went to Dieppe expressly to prepare himself to execute this last-named picture. We might point out also that it is strongly reminiscent of the Rubens preserved in Mechlin. Louis XIV was so delighted with this work that he had it traced off in tapestry by the Gobelins, and it was this tapestry that impressed Teri Peter the Great so much in 1717, that he wished to take it away with him, believing it to be the greatest of masterpieces. Meanwhile Jouvenet, who was now the recognised head of the new school, was selected for work at the two grand processions that expressed most accurately the characteristics of the new tradition: the dome of the Hôtel des Invalides (1700–6) and the chapel of Versailles (1709). For the former he painted twelve colossal figures of the Apostles, and for the latter, over the royal tribune, a "Descent of the Holy Ghost".

Jouvenet was director of the Academy from 1705 till 1708. In 1713 he was stricken with apoplexy and his right hand became paralysed. Far from being discouraged by this, he actually acquired, though now seventy years of age, a facility for painting with his left hand, and the kinship worked in the ceiling of the Palais de Justice at Rouen (it has now perished; there remains only a sketch of it preserved in the Louvre) and the "Magnificat" in the choir of Notre-Dame. Jouvenet is far from being a great master, but he is a striking personality in the realism of art. His works, religious and often declamatory, but honest and powerful, do not excite emotion, though one can still easily understand their great historic importance. They taught painting to the French school which had forgotten it. The whole body of great decorators in the eighteenth century — men like Béjot, Restout, Vaut, Loo, and Doyen—follow in his footsteps and Ingres was mistaken in grouping them under the title of the "School of Jouvenet". His chief paintings outside the Louvre are in the galleries of Amiens, Rouen, Nancy, Grenoble, Nantes, Rennes, and Toulouse. We have here some admirable portraits by him, as that of Fagon, physician to Louis XIV (in the Louvre) and that of Bourdaloue—now only known by the engraving, which has given rise to so much discussion as to whether the great orator preached with his eyes closed.

Jovellanos (also written Jove-I-Llanos), Gaspar Melchor de, Spanish statesman and man of letters. b. at Gijon, Asturias, 5 Jan., 1744; d. at Puerto de Vega on the borders of Asturias, 27 Nov., 1811. Intended at first for the Church, he received his preliminary training at the University of Oviedo, where he passed to the University of Avila and later to that of Alcalá. In the latter institution he spent two years, continuing his study of canon law. His uncle, the Duke of Losada, did not look with favour on the idea of the young man devoting himself to an ecclesiastical career, and persuaded him to obtain a licence in law. After a year of study under the Jessens of the University of Salamanca, he embarked for France. Although he had given up his ecclesiastical studies, he continued his studies in French law and, in 1772, was awarded the degree of Doctor of Laws. In 1773, he was appointed by the French government to work on the codification of Spanish law.

Jovianus, Flavius Claudius, Roman Emperor, 363–4. After the death of Julian the Apostate (26 June, 363), the army making war on Persia and then in retreat from Azeria proclaimed Jovianus emperor, after the prefect of the guard, Sallustius, a confidant of Julian, had refused the dignity on account of his advanced age. Jovianus was a son of the distinguished Constans (VIII). Varro's account of his early life is sketchy. Though at that time less than thirty-three, he held the rank of captain in the imperial bodyguard. His election was hailed with joy by the Christians, since from him they could expect religious toleration. Although Jovianus had a warlike appearance, he lacked the energy and decision of his predecessor. He was a pacifist and agreed to the conditions of the treaty offered by Shapur (Sapor), the crafty Persian king, and agreed to restore the boundaries of the empire as they
JOVINIUS

 existed before the peace with Diocletian in 297. The four satrapies east of the Tigris, with the fortified cities of Nisibis and Singara, were relinquished contrary to the wishes of the inhabitants, who were hostile to Persia, and the ancient connexion between the Roman and Aramaeia was severed. In return, the Roman army was permitted to retreat to the right bank of the Tigris without molestation. This weak agreement destroyed at one blow the Roman supremacy over the country about the Euphrates and Armenia, and Persia henceforth dominated the hither Orient. Under similar difficulties marched with the army from Mesopotamia to Antioch and thence to Tarsus, where he caused the mausoleum of his predecessor to be adorned. On 16 February, 364, during the march to Constantinople, the emperor was overtaken by a sudden death in the Bithynian frontier town of Dadaстанa, having been suffocated by coal gas in his bed-chamber, though possibly assassinated (Socrates, III, xx-xxv; VI, iii-vi). His body was brought to Constantinople and buried in the church of the Apostles beside that of Constantine. Jovinus was a zealous and orthodox Christian. He restored to the Church the treasures granted by Constantine, and withdrawn by Julian. Athanasius, then seventy, was permitted to return from exile to Alexandria. In a general edict of toleration, he established freedom for all forms of worship, even paganism, but forbade magical sacrifices, reintroducing the religious toleration proclaimed by Julian in his Milan Edict of 333.

JOVINIUS, an opponent of Christian asceticism in the fourth century, condemned as a heretic (390). Our information about him is derived principally from his work of St. Jerome in two books, "Adversus Joviniunum." He was a monk at one time in his life, but subsequently an advocate of anti-ascetical tendencies. He became the head of a party, and in the act condemning him Auxentius, Genialis, Germintor, Felix, Frontinus, Martinian, Januarius and Ingeniosus: and it is alleged as his disciple. His views were embodied in writings which were condemned at a synod held in Rome under Pope Siricius, and subsequently at a synod convened at Milan by St. Ambrose. The writings of Jovinus were sent to St. Jerome by his friend Pammachius; Jerome replied to them in a long treatise written in 393. From this work it would appear that Jovinus maintained (1) that a virgin as such is no better in the sight of God than a wife; (2) continence is no better than the partaking of food in the right disposition; (3) a person baptized with the Spirit as well as water cannot sin; (4) all sins are equal; (5) there is but one grade of punishment and one of reward in the future state.

From a letter of the synod at Milan to Pope Siricius (Ambrose, Ep. xlii) and from St. Augustine (lib. contra Julian., ii) it is clear that Jovinus denied also the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The reply of St. Jerome was couched in language that terrified Pammachius, who found fault with it because it was excessive in praise of virginity and in depreciation of marriage. The efforts to suppress it failed and St. Jerome's work obtained a wide circulation. Nothing is known of the later career of Jovinus. As a work in St. Jerome's work against Vigilantius, written in 409, that he "amidst pheasants and pork rather belched out than breathed out his life," it is inferred that he was then dead.

JOYEUSE

JOVIVUS (Giovio), Paulus, historian: b. at Como, Italy, 9 April, 1453; d. at Florence, 11 Dec., 1552. Having completed his medical studies at Padua and received the degree of doctor, he was attracted by the princely liberality of Pope Leo X, and betook himself to Rome. Here he practised his profession, but also devoted himself to historical studies, particularly as to his own time. Knowing how to turn to account all sources of information, he resolved to utilize his extensive materials in a comprehensive work, which would embrace all the countries of Europe, beginning with the expedition of Charles VIII of France into Italy and the conquest of Naples. Having completed the first part, he managed to obtain permission to read it to the Holy Father. The latter was so struck by the elegance of the language and the skill of the narration that he conferred knighthood on Jovius, and appointed him professor of rhetoric at the Roman University. Adrian VI made him a canon of the cathedral of Como, and elevation VII appointed him Bishop of Noeora in 1528 to complete the substantial loss which he had sustained in consequence of the capture of Rome. He sought under Paul III to be transferred to the See of Como; and, as his efforts to this end remained unavailing, he gave up Noeora in 1546 from sheer vexation, and went to Como, whence in 1550 he made his way to Florence.

He was, as his writings show, a child of his own time. He led a life of pleasure little in accord with Christian precepts, was in active touch with the leading humanists, and was a zealous collector of works of art—especially of portraits, which he brought together in a considerable museum. This did not, however, prevent him from labouring steadily on his main work and completing it with new material. Despite all urgings, he did not begin to print it until 1550, but completed this task very shortly before his death. Under the title, "Historiarum sui temporis libri XLI," the work appeared in two volumes at Florence, and later at Basle (1560), an Italian translation also appearing in Florence (1551-3). He gives us here a very clear recital of events from 1494 to 1544, and, while he does not always succeed in unveiling the hidden and interwoven causes and effects of things, he shows himself a true historian. Naturally, works of his have been formed of his work. It has been at times sharply criticized, chiefly because Jovius is too enamoured of himself, and does not hesitate to declare openly that he will dress up a character in gold, brocade, or common cloth, according to the fee which such portrayal may yield him. However, it is certain that he does not always follow so reprehensible a principle, for he is infrequently tells the bluntest truths to his own greatest benefactors. Of his other works we should mention: "Vite virorum illustrium (7 vols., Florence, 1549-57); "Elogia virorum bellissima virtute illustratum, 1549; "Hispanica, 1549-59; "Historia Cardinale, 1550; "Historia de"
brother of the Admiral Anne de Joyeuse and of the prelate François de Joyeuse. As a young man, when he was known as the Comte de Bouchage, he felt attracted to the religious life and confided this desire to the guardian of the Cordeliers of Toulouse. But yield of the other had died, and a few years later, 4 September, 1587, Joyeuse received the habit in the convent of the Capuchins in the Rue Saint-Honoré, Paris, from the hands of Father Bernard Dosimo, taking the name of Père Ange. This step occasioned great stir. The "Venerable" P. Honoré of Paris (Charles Bochart de Champigny) owed the example of Joyeuse the impulse which caused him to enter the cloister. When in October, 1587, two brothers of Joyeuse were killed at Coutras, he overcame the strong temptation he felt to become a soldier again in order to avenge them. When, after the Day of Barresades (see Guise, House of), 12 May, 1588, the borders of Paris were wished to recover, the good graces of Henry III, who had sought refuge at the bastards, they sent as a first embassy a procession of Capuchins, at whose head was Père Ange bearing a cross and flogged by two other monks, while the people implored mercy. On 18 August, 1588, P. Ange, in conformity with the Franciscan rule, drew up his will, which was afterwards ratified on the morrow by Henry III, and which Father Ubal (d'Alençon) has recently recovered and published. This formality finished he was able to make his profession in December, 1588. He was sent to Italy to study theology.

In 1592 he was guardian of the Capuchins of Arles and on his way to Toulouse when his younger brother, Scipio de Joyeuse, drowned himself in the Tarn after the defeat of Villemur. The Cardinal de Joyeuse, the Parlement, and the clergy all thought of placing P. Ange in command of the troops against the Huguenots as Governor of Languedoc. The pope released him from his vows. The Capuchins who had once more become a soldier fought valiantly, and then assembled the States of Languedoc at Carcassonne to take measures for bringing about peace. He agreed with the Duke of Montmorency, his godfather, a truce of three years, which was soon followed by a general peace owing to the abjuration of Henry IV. Henry IV named him marshal of France, grand master of the wardrobe, and Governor of Languedoc.

But after he had married his daughter to the Duc de Montpensier, recalling the counsel given him in July, 1595, by his dying mother, and sensitive to the words of Henry IV who had called him an "unfrocked Capuchin", Joyeuse joined (8 February, 1599) the Capuchins in the Rue Saint-Honoré. In 1600 he preached again at Paris, notably in Saint-Jean-de-Montmartre, before the king and the court. There he discussed the relationship in the pulpits between Père Brulart de Sillery and Père Ange de Joyeuse on the ineligibility of marriage, drew upon the Capuchins the displeasure of Henry IV, who had dissolved his marriage with Queen Margaret. In turn guardian of the convent of Toulouse, provincial of the order, founder of the Capuchin convents, he was guardian of the convent in the rue Saint-Honoré (1606) he went to Rome, in 1608, to attend the general chapter of his order. Here he was made definitor-general and, through the intervention of Cardinal de Givry, obtained permission to leave Rome, which he wished to retain. Having set out 10 August, 1608, he was attacked by fever at Rivoli. He was buried in the church of the Capuchins in the Rue Saint-Honoré. His biographer Jacques Brousse has preserved some fragments of his sermons. Bernard of Bologna, in the "Bibliotheca script. Cap." (1747), mentions one of his works entitled "Flamma divini amoris", which seems to have been lost. The plenipotentiaries of Voltaire's Henriade are with regard to this work, which have caused the actual facts to be forgotten and have inflicted on an ardent and pious friar an obloquy not sustained by historical truth.


GEORGES GOUyon.

Juan Bautista de Toledo, an eminent Spanish sculptor and architect; b. at Madrid (date not known); d. there 19 May, 1567. In 1547 he went to Rome and studied under the influence of Michelangelo Buonarroti. Afterwards he went to Naples, having been sent for by the Viceroy, Don Pietro de Toledo, who engaged him as architect to the emperor, Charles V. He designed and superintended many important works in that capital. Among others, the Strada di Toledo (since 1870 called Strada di Roma), the church of Santiago and S. Giacomo degli Spagnuoli; the square of the Castell de Castello Nuovo, and the square of the Poselipo, or Pauselipo, and a number of fountains. In 1559, at the summons of Philip II, he went to Madrid and was appointed architect-in-chief of the royal works in Spain. His yearly salary as architect to the Crown was at first not more than 220 ducats, Philip's policy, with his Spanish artists at least, being to assign them moderate allowances until he had tested their abilities. At Madrid he designed the Casa de la Misericordia and the façade of the church of las Descaicas Reales; works at Acesa; at the palace of Aranjuez; at Martininos de las Losadas, the palace of Cardenal Espinosa, and a villa at Esteban de Amiran for the secretary D. de Vargas. Toledo soon began his plan for the Escorial, of which he saw the first stone laid on 23 April, 1563, and he superintended the work till his death. He was generally considered an architect of much merit, well-versed in philosophy, mathematics, and the belles-lettres, and to those qualities which Vitruvius considers necessary to form a good architect.


THOMAS H. POOLE.

Jubilate Sunday, the third Sunday after Easter, being so named from the first word of the Introit at Mass—"Jubilate Deo omnis terra" (ps. lxv). In the liturgy for this and the two following Sundays, the Church continues her song of rejoicing in the Resurrection. Throughout the whole of Paschaltide both Office and Mass are expressive of Easter joy, Alleluia being added to every antiphon, responsory, and versicle, and repeated several times in the Alleluias and other parts of the Mass. The Introit for this day is an invitation to universal joy; the Epistle exhorts all, especially penitents and the newly baptized, to obey loyally the powers that be and to show themselves worthy disciples of the Risen Christ; and the Gospel given at Mass exhorts, encouraging us to bear patiently the trials of this life in view of the heavenly joys that are to come hereafter.

DURAND. Rationale Divini Officii (Venice, 1568); MARTINÉZ, De Antiqu. Mon. Ritusbus (Lyons, 1557); LANGLOIS, M étiers Liturgiques, tr. Shepherd (Dublin, 1867); LEROY, Hist. Symbolisme de la Liturgie (Paris, 1889).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Jubilee, Holy Year of.—The ultimate derivation of the word jubilee is disputed, but it is most prob-
able that the Hebrew word jobel (יוֹבֵל), to which it is traced, meant "a ram’s horn", and that from this instrument, used in proclaiming the celebration, a certain idea of rejoicing was derived. Further, passing from the second meaning, the word became confused with the Latin jubilo, which means "to shout", and has given us the forms jubilatio and jubilæum, now adopted in most European languages.

For the Israelites, the year of Jubilee was in any case pre-eminently a time of joy, the year of remission or jubilee, that pardon (Jos 21:45) shalt sanctify the fiftieth year," we read in Leviticus, xxv, 10, "and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of thy land: for it is the year of jubilee." Every seventh year, like every seventh day, was always accounted holy and set aside for rest, but the year which followed seventh year, which was always accounted holy, and the institution evidences a close analogy with the feast of Pentecost, which was the closing day after seven weeks of harvest. In any case it is certain that the Jubilee period, as it was generally understood and adopted afterwards in the Christian Church, meant fifty and not forty-nine years; but at the same time the number fifty was not originally arrived at because it represented half a century, but because it was the number which followed seven cycles of seven.

It was, then, part of the legislation of the Old Law, whether practically adhered to or not, that each fiftieth year was to be celebrated as a jubilee year, and that at this season every household should recover its absent members, the land return to its former owners, the Hebrew slaves be set free, and debts be remitted. The same conception, spiritualized and developed in the Jubilee, though it is difficult to judge how far any sort of continuity can have existed between the two. It is commonly stated that Pope Boniface VIII instituted the first Christian Jubilee in the year 1300, and it is certain that this is the first celebration of which we have any notice recorded. It is certain that the idea of solemnizing a fiftieth anniversary was familiar to medieval writers, no doubt through their knowledge of the Bible, long before that date. The jubilee of a monk’s religious profession was often kept, and probably some vague memory of the Holy Land, which are commemorated in the "Carmen Seculare" of Horace, even though this last was commonly associated with a period of a hundred years rather than any lesser interval. But what is most noteworthy, the number fifty was specially associated with the early thirteenth century with the idea of remission. The translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury took place in the year 1220, fifty years after his martyrdom. The sermon on that occasion was preached by Cardinal Stephen Langton, who told his hearers that this accident was meant by Providence to recall "the number of the remission of the number of the sacred page is aware, is the number of remission" (P. L., CXV, 421). We might be tempted to regard this discourse as a fabrication of later date, were it not for the fact that a Latin hymn directed against the Albigenses, and certainly belonging to the early thirteenth century, speaks in exactly similar terms. The first stanza runs thus:—

Anni favor jubilei
Pomarum laxat debitum,
Nec teadum, nec etiam
Et cessandi propoetem.
Querrunt passim omnes rei.
Pro mercede regnum Dei
Levi petat exposatum.

(See Drees, "Analecta Hymnica", XXI, 166.)

In the light of the explicit mention of the jubilee with great remissions of the penalties of sin to be obtained by full confession and purpose of amendment, it seems difficult to reject the statement of Cardinal Stefaneschi, the contemporary and counsellor of Boniface VIII, and author of a treatise on the first Jubilee. ("De jubilæis Patrum", VI, 536), that the proclamation of the Jubilee owed its origin to the statements of certain aged pilgrims who persuaded Boniface that great indulgences had been granted to all pilgrims to Rome about a hundred years before. It is also noteworthy that in the Chronicle of Alaric of the Fountains, under the year 1208 (not, be it noted, 1200), we find this brief entry: "It is said that this year was celebrated as the fiftieth year, or the year of jubilee and remission, in the Roman Court." (Perts, Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script., XXIII, 889). It is beyond the period of our inquiry, 1336, but in 1336 Pope Benoît XI published the Bull "Antiquorum fida relatio", in which, appealing vaguely to the precedent of past ages, he declares that he grants aflat and renews certain "great remissions and indulgences for sins" which are to be obtained "by visiting the city of Rome and the venerable basilica of the Prince of the Apostles". Coming to more precise details, he specifies that he concedes "not only full and copious, but the most full, pardon of all their sins", to those who fulfill certain conditions. These are, first, that being truly penitent they confess their sins, and secondly, that they visit the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome, at least once a day for a specified time—in the case of the inhabitants for thirty days, in the case of strangers for fifteen. No explicit mention is made of Communion, nor does the word jubilei occur in the Bull—indeed the pope speaks rather of a celebration which is to occur 'every hundred years'. The Benedictine "Liber Cordanis et Romanus..." describes this year as annus jubileus, and the name jubilei (though others, such as "the holy year" or the "golden year" have been used as well) has been applied to such celebrations ever since.

Dante, who is himself supposed by some to have visited Rome, refers to it under the name Giubileo in the Inferno (xvii, 29) and indirectly bears witness to the enormous concourse of pilgrims by comparing the sinners passing along one of the bridges of Malebolge in opposite directions, to the throngs crossing the bridge of the Castle Sant' Angelo on their way to and from St. Peter's. Similarly, the chronicler Villani was so impressed on this occasion by the sight of the monuments of Rome and the people who flocked thither that he then and there formed the resolution of writing his great chronicle, in the course of which he gives a remarkable account of what he witnessed. He describes the indulgence as a full and entire remission of all sins di culpa et di pena, and he dwells upon the great contentment and good order of the people, despite the fact that during the greater part of that year there were two hundred thou pilgrims on which, as every reader of the sacred page is aware, is the number of remission" (P. L., CXV, 421).
indulgence”. It implied, however, that any approved Roman confessor had faculties to absolve from reserved cases, and that the liberty thus virtually accorded of selecting a confessor was regarded as a privilege. The phraseology and the decide were not, and was never claimed by any power of absolving in grievous matters apart from these. “All theologians”, remarks Maldonatus with truth, “unanimously without a single exception, reply that an indulgence is not a remission of guilt but of the penalty.” (See finally the Zefianus f. , a terrible accident, 1899, 49 sqq., 423 sqq., 743 sqq., and “Dublin Review”, Jan., 1900, pp. 1 sqq.)

As we have seen, Boniface VIII had intended that the Jubilee should be celebrated only once in a hundred years, but some time before the middle of the fourteenth century, great instances, in which St. Bridget of Sweden and the poet Petrarch amongst others had some share, were made to Pope Clement VI, then residing at Avignon, to anticipate this term, particularly on the ground that the average span of human life was so short as otherwise to render it impossible for men to spend at the shrine in their own generation. Clement VI assented, and in 1350 accordingly, though the pope did not return to Rome himself, Cardinal Gaetani Ceccano was dispatched thither to represent His Holiness at the Jubilee. On this occasion daily visits to the church of St. John Lateran were enjoined, besides those to the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul without the walls, while at the next Jubilee, St. Mary Major was added to the list. The visit to these four churches has remained unchanged ever since as one of the primary conditions for gaining the Roman Jubilee. The celebration next following was held in 1390, and in virtue of an ordinance of Urban VI, it was proposed to hold a Jubilee every thirty-three years as representing the period of the sojourn of Christ upon earth and also the average span of human life. Another Jubilee was accordingly proclaimed by Martin V in 1423 (see Pastor, “Ge- schichte der Päpste”, 3rd ed., I, 798-880), but Nich- olaus of this description at the present day, while Paul II decreed that the Jubilee should be celebrated every twenty-five years, and this has been the normal rule ever since.

The Jubilee of 1430 and 1475 were attended by vast crowds of pilgrims, and that of 1450 was unfortunate in the sense that the basilicas were crowded beyond capacity, which nearly two hundred persons were trampled to death in a panic which occurred on the bridge of Sant’ Angelo. But even this disaster had its good effects in the pains taken afterwards to widen the thoroughfares and to provide for the entertainment and comfort of the pilgrims, by the erection of the Archeofraternity of the Holy Trinity, founded by St. Philip Neri, which has been blessed. On the other hand, it is impossible to doubt the evidence of innumerable witnesses as to the great moral renovation produced by these celebrations. The testimony comes in many cases from the most unexceptionable sources, and it extends from the days of Boniface VIII to the striking account given by Cardinal Wisse- man (“Last Four Popes”, pp. 270, 271) of the only Jubilee held in the nineteenth century, that of 1825. The omission of the Jubilee of 1800, 1850, and 1875 was partly due to the existing circumstances, and in the absence of such exceptions the celebration has been uniformly maintained every twenty-five years from 1450 until the present time. The Jubilee of 1900, though shorn of much of its splendour by the confinement of the Holy Father within the limits of the Vatican, was, nevertheless, carried out by Pope Leo XIII with all the solemnity that was possible.

CEREMONIAL OF THE JUBILEE. The most distinctive feature in the ceremonial of the Jubilee is the un- ceasing and the peculiar way of the “holy door” in each of the four great basilicas which the pilgrims are required to visit. It was formerly supposed that this rite was instituted by Alexander VI in the Jubilee of 1500, but this is certainly a mistake. Not to speak of a supposed vision of Clement VI as early as 1350, who is said to have ordered the doors to be left open, we have several references to the “holy door” or the “golden gate” in connexion with the Jubilee long before the year 1475. The earliest ac- count seems to be that of the Spanish pilgrim, Pero Tafur, c. 1457. He connects the Jubilee indulgence with the right of access to the holy door and insists in pagan times for all who crossed the threshold of the puerta tarpea upon the site of the Lateran. He goes on to say that, at the request of Constantine, Pope Sylvester published a Bull proclaiming the same immunity from punishment for Christian sinners who took sanctuary there. The privilege, however, was grossly abused and the popes consequently ordered the door to be walled up at all seasons save certain times of special grace. Formerly the door was un- walled only once in a hundred years, this was afterwards reduced to fifty, and now, says Tafur, “it is usually open.” (Pero Tafur, p. 37). However legendary all this may be, it is hardly possible that the story could have been quite recently fabricated at the time Tafur recorded it. Moreover, a number of witnesses allude to the un- walling of the holy door in connexion with the Jubilee of 1450. One of the Franciscan merchant Gio- vanni Russell, speaks of the doors of the Lateran basilica, “one of which is always walled up except during the Jubilee year, when it is broken down at Christ- mas when the Jubilee commences. The devotion which the populace has for the bricks and mortar of which it is composed is such that at the unwalling, the fragments are immediately carried off by the crowd, and the foreigners [glt olremontani] take them home as so many sacred relics. . . . Out of devotion every one who gains the indulgence passes through that door, which is walled up again as soon as the Jubilee is ended” (Archivio di Storia Patria, IV, 86-970). But this description has been long since abandoned to the present day, and which has nearly always sup- plied the principal subject depicted upon the long series of Jubilee medals issued by the various popes who have opened and closed the holy door at the be- ginning and end of each Jubilee year. Each of the four basilicas has been honoured in this way, and at St. Peter’s it was opened on the Christmas Eve preceding the anno santo by the pontiff in person, and it is closed by him on the Christmas Eve following. The pope knocks upon the door three times with a silver hammer, singing the versicle “Open unto me the gates of justice”. The procession has been well described by the idea of the exclusion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, and the expulsion and reconciliation of penitents according to the ritual provided in the Pontifical. But it may also have been influenced by the old idea of seeking sanctuary, as Tafur and Russell suggest. The sanctuary with the holy door is always intended to remain as a reminder of the important part which this institution played in the life of our forefathers.

THE JUBILEE INDULGENCE.—This is a plenary in- dulgence which, as stated by Boniface VIII in Con- sistory, it is the intention of the Holy See to grant
in the most ample manner possible. Of course, when first conceded, such an indulgence, and also the privi-
lege annexed of choosing a confessor who had power
to absolve from any sin, was a very great spiritual boon than it has since become. So pre-
minent was the favour then regarded that the cus-
tom arose of suspending all other indulgences during the Jubilee year, a practice which, with certain
modifications, still obtains at the present day. The
precise condition for gaining each jubilee is deter-
ded by the Roman pontiff, and they are usually
announced in a special Bull, distinct from that which
it is customary to issue on the preceding feast of the
Ascension giving notice of the forthcoming celebra-
tion. The main conditions, however, which do not
usually vary are these: confession, Communion, visits
to the four basilicas during a certain specified
period. The statement made by writers like the
late Dr. H. C. Lea, that the Jubilee indulgence, being
a coipa et a pennis, did not of old presuppose either
confession or repentance, is absolutely without
foundation, and is contradicted by every official
document preserved to us. Besides the ordinary
Jubilee indulgence, to be gained only by pilgrims
who pay a visit to Rome, or through special conces-
sion by certain privileged religious confined within
their monasteries, it has long been customary to ex-
tend this indulgence the following year to the faithful
throughout the world. For this fresh conditions are
appointed, usually including a certain number of
visits to local churches and sometimes fasting or
other works of charity. Further, the popes have
constantly exercised their prerogative of conceding
to all the faithful indulgences ad instar jubilaei (after
the model of a jubilee) which are commonly known
as extraordinary Jubilees. On these occasions, as
at the Jubilee itself, special faculties are usually
accorded for absolution from reserved cases, though,
on the other hand, the great indulgence is only to be
gained by the performance of conditions much
more onerous than those required for an ordinary
plenary indulgence. Such extraordinary Jubilees are
generally granted by a newly elected pontiff at his
accession or on occasions of some unwonted celebra-
tion, as was done, for example, at the convening of
the Vatican Council, or again at times of great
catastrophe.

STRECKER in Kirchenlexikon, s. v.; BERINGER, Les Indulgences, Fr. trans. (Paris, 1850), 470-94; PRANDIVAILL, Oni Ann Santi (Rome, 1907); DASSAUN, Tratado de San Santo (Madrid, 1901); THURSTON, The Holy Year of Jubilees (London, 1900); DE WAILLY, Le Jubilé (Rome, 1900); CAMMOD, Il Giubileo
dell' Anno Santo, in Vaticana (Rome, 1900), 17-377; Das Anno Santo, in Abhandlungen, II (Berlin, 1901), 217-387; originally, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift. There are also many older books, e.g., those of MANNI and ZACCARIA.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Jubilee, Year of (Hebrew)—According to the
Pentateuchal legislation contained in Leviticus, a Ju-
bilees is the year that follows immediately seven
successive Sabbath years (the Sabbath year being the
seventh year of a seven-year cycle). Accordingly, the
Jubilee year takes place at the end of seven years
seven years, i.e., at the end of every forty-nine years, or the
fifthieth. Hence, the institution of the Jubilee year
system is but an extension or the working out of the
Sabbatical-year legislation, viz., that as at the end of
every six years there succeeds a Sabbath year, so at
the end of each seven Sabbath years there succeeds a
Jubilee year. Arguing from the analogous Pentateuc-
tal system, it is evident that the actual year in which
the jubilee occurs is not the seventh, or even the
Sabbatic cycle (i.e., the forty-ninth year), but the year
following, namely, the fifthieth. Hence, at the end of
each forty-eight years there occur two consecutive fol-
lowing, viz., the forty-ninth, or the Sabbath year
of the seventh Sabbath cycle, and the fifthieth, or the
Jubilee year. From the nature and purpose of the
Jubilees legislation, it is also evident that the Jubilee
year is to be reckoned with in itself absolutely, and
not in relation to the length of time, or duration, of
which particular event constituted it, for example,
the year 1950 is Jubilee year, and an Israelite
became a slave in the year 1930, this slave is to be set
free not in 1990, but in 1950, which is the appointed
year of Jubilee.

The term Jubilee year (Heb., נִיוֹם יְמֵי נַעֲרָיָה, or simply, יְמֵי נַעֲרָיָה; Vulg., annum
jubileum, or simply, jubileum of Hebrew origin, the
etymological meaning of which is, in all probability, "ram",
which etymonomically stands for "the horn of a ram"
(בָּשָׁם). Thus the name "the year of the blow-
ing of the ram's horn" (יְמֵי נַעֲרָיָה) exactly corresponds to "the day of the blowing of the horn"
(יִקְרָאת הַרְוָא), or the "feast of the new year" and it was, like the
latter, announced to the people by the blowing of the
horn. In Ezekiel (xvi, 17) the Jubilee year is called
"the year of release" (יָרָאת הַיֵּשָׁה; cf. above); hence some com-
mentators have derived the word יָרָאת (Jubilee) from the
stem יָרָא, which means "to emit", "to liberate".
The first derivation, however, is more acceptable.
The legislation concerning the year of Jubilee is
found in Leviticus, xxv, 8-54, and xxvii, 16-24. It
consists of three main enactments: (1) the set aside (2)
revision of landed property to its original owner who
had been driven by poverty to sell it; and (3) the freeing
or manumission of those Israelites who, through poverty
or otherwise, had become the slaves of their brethren.
The first enactment (contained in Leviticus, xxv,
11-12) enjoins that as in the case of each Sabbath year,
so also each Jubilee year there is to be rest, and that
there is to be no tillage nor harvest, but that what the
land produces spontaneously and of its own accord is
free to be utilized by all Israelites, including, of course,
the landlord himself, but only for their own actual and
immediate use and maintenance, and, consequently,
not to be stored by anyone for any time for any
other purpose. The object of this law, as well as of the two
following, is most commendable, as by it the poor and
all those who, mainly on account of poverty, do not ac-
tually own any land, are hereby provided for, not only
for a whole year every seven years, but also in every
fifthieth year.

The second enactment, contained in Leviticus, xxv,
13-34, and xxvii, 16-24, enjoins that any owner of
landed property, who, for reason of poverty or other-
wise, has been compelled to part with his land, has the
right to receive his property back free in the Jubilee
year, or to redeem it even before the Jubilee year, if
he has either his own financial circumstances have improved,
or if his next of kin will redeem it for him by paying
back according to the price which regulated the pur-
chase. Hence, among the ancient Hebrews, the trans-
fer of property was not, properly speaking, the sale of
the land but of its produce for a certain number of
years, and the price was fixed according to the number
of years which intervened between the year of the sale
and that of the next year of jubilee. Accordingly,
the right of possession of real estate was inalienable.
Whether a landowner was ever allowed to part perma-
nently with his property for speculation, or for any
purpose other than poverty, is not clear. In fact, al-
though according to later rabbinical interpretation,
this was considered as legally unlawful. Real estate
in walled towns was made an exception to this law.
An owner who had sold was permitted to redeem his
property, provided he did so within a year, but not
afterwards. Levitical cities, on the other hand, are
under the provisions of the general law, reverting back to their original
owners in the year of jubilee. Land in the suburbs of such
cities could not be disposed of, or traded with in any
manner. In case a man dedicated property to the
Lord, he was permitted to redeem it, provided he
added to it one-fifth of its value as reckoned by the
number of crops it would produce before the year of Jubilee, and provided, also, he redeemed it before that period. If not reclaimed then or before that period, it was understood to be devoted forever. The details of these exchanges of property probably varied at different times. Josephus informs us that the temporary proprietor of a piece of land made a settlement with its owner at the year of Jubilee on the following terms: after making a statement of the value of the crops he had obtained from the land, and of what he had expended upon it, if his receipts exceeded the expenses, the owner got nothing; but if the reverse was true, the latter was expected to make good the loss (Bissell, "Biblical Antiquities", 231).

The third enactment (contained in Leviticus, xxv, 37-42, 48, 54) was a provision to prevent that poverty has sold themselves as slaves to their fellow-Israelites or to foreigners resident among them, and who, up to the time of the Jubilee year, have neither completed their six years of servitude, nor redeemed themselves, nor been redeemed by their relatives, are to be set free in the Jubilee year to return with their children to their family and to the patrimony of their fathers. Exception, of course, is made in the case of those slaves who refuse to become free at the expiration of the appointed six years' servitude. In this case they are allowed to become slaves forever and, in order to indicate their consent to this, they are required to sing a song of their origin (Ex. xxi, 6). This exception, of course, is in no way in contradiction with the Jubilee-year's enactment. It is not necessary, therefore, in order to explain this apparent contradiction, to maintain that the two legislations belong to two distinct periods, or, still less, to maintain that the two legislations are conflicting, as some modern critics have maintained. It is important, however, to remark that the legislation concerning the various enactments of the Jubilee year contained in Leviticus, is not sufficiently expanded so as to cover all possible hypotheses and cases. This want has been more or less consistently remedied by later Talmudic and rabbinical enactments and legislations.

The design and importance of the Jubilee-year legislation, in both its social and economic aspects, has been well pointed out by Dr. Ginsburg, as follows: "The design of this institution is that those of the people of God who, through poverty or other adverse circumstances, had forfeited their personal liberty or property to their fellow-brethren, should have their debts forgiven by their co-religionists every half century, on the great day of atonement, and be restored to their liberty and inheritance; that the God on that very day forgave the debts of his people and restored them to perfect fellowship with himself, so that the whole community, having forgiven each other and being forgiven by God, might return to the original order which had been disturbed in the lapse of time, and being freed from the bondage of one another, might unreservedly be the servants of him who is their redeemer. The aim of the jubilee, therefore, is to preserve unimpaired the essential character of the theocracy, to the end that there be no poor among the people of God (Deut. xv, 4). Hence God, who redeemed Israel from the bondage of Egypt to be his peculiar people, and allotted them to the promised land, will not suffer any one to usurp his title as Lord over those whom he owns as his own. It is the idea of grace for all the suffering children of man, bringing freedom to the captive and rest to the weary as well as to the earth, which made the year of jubilee the symbol of the Christian year (Is., lix, 2), when all the conflicts in the universe shall be restored to their original harmony, and when not only we, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, but the whole creation, which groaneth and travailleth in pain together until now, shall be restored into the glorious liberty of the sons of God (comp. Is. lx., 1-3; Luke, iv, 21; Rom. viii., 18-23; Heb. iv., 9)."

The importance of this institution will be apparent if it is considered that moral and social advantages would accrue to the community from the sacred observance of it. 1. It would prevent the accumulation of land on the part of a few to the detriment of the community at large. 2. It would render it impossible for any one to be born to absolute poverty, since every one had his hereditary L. A. D. 3. It would produce those inequalities which are produced by extremes of riches and poverty, and which make one man domineer over another. 4. It would utterly do away with slavery. 5. It would afford a fresh opportunity to those who were reduced by adverse circumstances to servitude again to win back all to the community in the property which they had temporarily forfeited. 6. It would periodically rectify the disorders which creep into the state in the course of time, preclude the division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and preserve the theocracy inviolate (C. D. Ginsburg in Kitto, "Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature", s. v. "Jubilee, The Year of").

JUBILEES, Book of (נֶפֶש הַיָּדוֹת).—An apocryphal writing, so called from the fact that the narratives and stories contained in it are arranged throughout in a fanciful chronological system of jubilees—periods of forty-nine years each; each event is recorded as having taken place in such a week of such a month of such a jubilee year. The author assumes an impossible solar year of 364 days (i.e. twelve months of thirty days each, and four intercalary days) to which the Jewish ecclesiastical year of thirteen months of twenty-eight days each exactly corresponds. The whole chronology, for which the author claims heavenly authority, is based upon the number seven. Thus the week had 7 days; the month 4 x 7 = 28; the year 52 x 7 = 364; the year week 7 years; and the Jubilee 7 x 7 = 49. It is also called "Little Genesis" (בַּשֵּׁם יָרֵא), or "Lepto-Genesis", not on account of its size, for it is considerably larger than the Canonical Genesis, but according to its minor or inferior relation as compared with the latter. It is also called "Apocalypse of Moses", "The Life of Adam", and in Ethiopic it is called "Kufafel". In the "Decretum Galasianum" concerning the canonical and apocryphal books of Scripture, we find among the apocryphas a work entitled "Liber de filiabus et filiis Adam" (i.e. the daughters of Adam Little Genesis), which is probably a combination of two titles belonging to two separate works. The book is also mentioned by Jerome, in his Epistle "ad Fabiolam", in connection with the name of a place called Ressa νῦν (Num., xxxii, 21), and by Epiphanius and by Didymus of Alexandria, which shows that it was well known both in the East and in the West.

The Book of Jubilees was originally written in Hebrew, and, according to Charles ("Book of Jubilees", London, 1902), partly in verse; but it has come down to us in its complete form only in Ethiopic, and also in various fragments, Greek and Latin. The Ethiopic text was first edited by Dillmann in 1850 ("Kufafelive Liber Jubileorum, æthiopic ad duorum libros manuscriptorum fidem, primum edidit Dillmann", Kiel, 1859), who in 1850-81 had already published an abridged German version of it in "Entwurff der Biblischen Wissenschaft", vol. II., 1850, pp. 230-256; vol. III., 1851, pp. 1-96. The incomplete Latin version was first discovered and edited in 1861, by the late Monsignor Ceriani, prefect of the Ambrosians, in his "Monumenta Sacra et Profana".
vol. I, fasc. 1, pp. 15–54. The Greek fragments are scattered in the writings of various Byzantine chroni-
eliers such as Syncellus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, and Oly-
cus. The oldest Latin version, which lies in
Ethiopic was made from the Greek, was re-edited
in 1874 by Rönsch, accompanied with a Latin render-
ing by Dillman of the corresponding portion in
the Ethiopic version, with a very valuable commen-
tary and several excursus ("Das Buch der Judäer
oder die kleine Geschichte", 1874). In 1900 Dr. Littmann published a newer German
version of the Ethiopic text in Kautzsch's "APO-
274 sqq., and, in 1885, Dr. Scholz published the
first English version of the book ("The Book of Jubilees", Oxford, 1885). In 1893 the Ethiopic text was
re-edited in a revised form by Charles, and by him translated into English in 1893–5 in the "Jewish
Quarterly Review" (Oct., 1893, July, 1894, January, 1895), and subsequently in a separate volume with many addi-
tional notes and discussions ("The Book of Jubilees";
London, 1902). A French translation is promised by
the Abbé F. Martin, professor of Semitic litera-
guages at the Catholic Institute of Paris, in his val-
uable collection entitled "Documents pour l'Etude de la Bible".

The contents of the Book of Jubilees deal with the facts and events stated in the Biblical Books of Genesis, enriched by a wealth of legends and stories
which had arisen in the course of centuries in the pop-
ular imagination of the Jewish people, and written from
the rigid Pharisaic point of view of the author and
of his age; and as the author seeks to reproduce the
history of primitive times in the spirit of his own
day, he deals with the Biblical text in a very free fash-
ion. According to him, Hebrew was the language originally spoken by all creatures, animals and man,
and is the language of Heaven. After the destruction
of the tower of Babel, it was forgotten until Abraham
was taught it by angels. Henoch was the first
man initiated by the angels in the art of writing, and
wrote down, accordingly, all the secrets of astronomy,
of chronology, and of the world's epochs. Four
classes of angels are mentioned, viz. angels of the
presence, angels of sanctifications, guardian angels
over individuals, and angels presiding over the phe-
nomenon of the ages. As regards the order of the
author's position is largely that of the New Testament and
of the Old Testament apocryphal writings.

All these legendary details, it claims, were re-
vealed by God to Moses through the angel of the pre-
seence (probably Michael) together with the Law, all of
which are considered to have been written in the Lat-
in. As regards the names of the Testament patriarchs, such as Henoch, Methusala,
Noe, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Levi. It
is somewhat difficult to determine the particular Juda-
istic school its author belonged to; he openly denies the resurrection of the body; he does not believe in the
written tradition; he does not regard animal sacri-
fices, etc. . . . and the fact that he wrote in Hebrew
excludes the hypothesis of his Hellenistic tendencies.
Equally untenable is the hypothesis advanced by
Beer, that he was a Samaritan, for he excludes Mount Garizim, the sacred mount of the Samarians from
the list of the four places of God upon earth, viz. the
Garden of Eden, the Mount of the East, Mount Sinai,
and Mount Sion. If the author belonged to any par-
ticular school he must have been in all probability a Pharisee (Hasidean) of the most rigid type of the
time of John Hyrcanus, in whose reign scholars gener-
ally and in later tradition is written (155–105 B.C.). Dr.
Headlam suggests that the author was a fervent
opponent of the Christian Faith (see Hastings, "Di-
cionary of the Bible"). But if the author, as it is
suggested in this rather improbable hypothesis, lived in early Christian times, he must have written his
book after the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction
of the Temple, since the latter is assumed throughout
to be still in existence as the great centre of Jewish
worship.

Under the literature mentioned in the body of the
article, see the various articles on the subject in the
Dictionary of the Bible, and especially Broders' History of the Jewish People in
the Time of Christ, tr. v, 154-141. GABRIEL OUBRANT.

Juda (יוּדָה), the name of one of the Patriarchs, the
title of the tribe reputed to be descended from him,
the name of the territory occupied by the same, and
also the name of several persons mentioned in the Old
Testament.

I. Juda the Patriarch, the son of Jacob by Lia, whose
exclamation on the occasion of his birth: "Now will I
praise the Lord" is given as the etymological reason
for the name of "Juda", which is derived from the He-
brew verb "to praise" (Gen., xxix, 35). It was Juda
who interceded with his brethren to save the life of
Joseph, proposing that he be sold to the Ishmaelites
(Gen., xxxvi, 26, 27). Though not the eldest son
of Jacob, he is represented as assuming an important
and predominating rôle in the family affairs. It is he
who, on the occasion of the second journey to Egypt,
persuades the afflicted Jacob to consent to the depar-
ture of Benjamin (Gen., xlii, 3–10), for whom he pleads
most touchingly before Joseph after the incident of
the cup, offering himself to be retained as a slave in
his stead (Gen., xli, 14 sqq.). This last plea deter-
mines Joseph to disclose his identity to his brethren
(Gen., xlv, 1 sqq.). Juda is the one chosen by Jacob
to precede him into Egypt and announce his coming
(Gen., xlii, 28), and his prestige is further emphasised
in the famous prophecy enunciated by Jacob (Gen.,
xliii, 8–12). To Juda were born five sons, viz., Her-
onan, and Sela by the daughter of Sue, and Phares and
Zara by Thammar (Gen., xxxviii). It is through
Phares, according to the First Gospel, that the Mes-
siastic lineagem is traced (Matt., i, 3).

II. Juda, a tribe of Israel, named after the son of
Jacob. The unquestioned predominance and provi-
dential mission of this tribe, foreshadowed in Gen.,
xlii, 8–10, appear from the time of the Exodus and
throughout the subsequent Israelitic history. From
the beginning Juda predominated in point of numbers.
When the first census was taken after the departure
from Egypt it numbered 74,600 fighting men, while
the next largest, the smallest, Manasses, only 32,200.
The chief of the tribe during the period of the wanderings was Nahas-
sen, son of Aminadab. Among the spies sent to
explore the Land of Canaan, the tribe of Juda was
represented by Caleb, son of Jephone (Num., xiii, 7).
According to few of the tribes was there a
name on the plains of Moab, Juda numbered 76,500 fighting
men. The names of the principal families of the tribe are
given in Num., xxxvi, 19–21, and more fully in I Par., ii.
Caleb was one of the chiefs selected to settle
the division of the land among the tribes, and on the
occasion of the passing of the Jordan the tribe of Juda,
together with those of Simeon, Levi, Issachar, Eph-
raim and Manasses, was designated to "bless the
people" from the top of Mount Garizim (Deut., xxvii, 12).
After the death of Josue the tribe of Juda was
chosen to be the vanguard in the war against the
Chanaanites. This honour was probably less a recogni-
tion of the numerical strength of the tribe than of the
promises it had received (Gen., xlii, 8–10) and the
hopes for its glorious destiny founded on these promi-
ences (Judges, i, 1–2). Juda was again chosen by the
Divine oracle to head the attack against Gabaa and
Gibees (Judges, xx, 18). The natural ramparts surrounding their country saved the tribe from
many of the invasions that troubled their northern brethren;
but the children of Ammon, passing over the Jordan,
wasted Juda, and the mountains proved ineffectual in
keeping off the Philistines (Judg., x, 9; I Kings,
xxvi, 1). In the persecution of David by Saul the tribe
of Judah showed great loyalty to the former, and soon after the death of Saul David was enthusiastically crowned at Hebron (II Kings, ii, 4, 7, 10) where he reigned seven years (II Kings, v, 5). When the unfortunate schism took place under Roboam only the tribe of Judah and of Benjamin remained faithful to the House of David. The kingdom of the Ten Tribes or Hebrew Northern Kingdom was known as that of Juda. After the Captivity the members of Juda were among the first to return to Jerusalem and begin the reconstruction of the Temple (I Esd., i, 5; iii, 9: in fine, the name ‘Jews’ (Judæi), by which the post-Exilic Israelites and their descendants are generally designated, is, of course, derived from Juda). Thus the history of the Chosen People is to a great extent the story of the varying vicissitudes of the dominant tribe of Juda. Its military ascendency and glory reached its height in the person of David, the ‘lion of Juda’. But the true lion of the tribe of Juda is Christ the Son of David (Apoc., v, 5).

III. Juda, Territory of.—The tribe of Juda occupied a rather extensive territory in the southern part of Palestine. It was bounded on the north by Dan and Benjamin, on the east by the Dead Sea, on the south by Edom, and on the west by the Sephela or plain of the Philistines. The principal cities of Juda were enumerated in Josue (xv, 21–62). The sacred writer divides the cities into four groups, viz., those of the south on the boundary of Idumea, those of the western plain, those of the mountain, and finally those of the desert. In all, mention is made of 194 towns, about one-half of which have not been identified or located with a fair degree of certitude. The recently built railroad from Jaffa to Jerusalem passes through a corner of the territory of Juda, the general aspect of which is a series of hills covered in the spring-time with grass and flowers, but bare and arid during the rest of the year. A notable feature is the string of lakes which lies in a fertile valley between two ranges of green hills. Here and there cultivated fields greet the eye. The slopes of the hills are dotted with terraced gardens and vineyards, among which are to be found grotozes and labyrinths which formerly served as hiding-places. The Kingdom of Juda, dating from the beginning of the reign of Roboam, was thus called in opposition to the Northern Kingdom of Israel. The capital, Jerusalem, was situated on the boundary line between Juda and Benjamin.

JEWISH AND JUDAIC.

Judaism. See Jews and Judaism.

Judaizers (from Greek Ἰουδαίας, to adopt Jewish customs—Esth., viii, 17; Gal., ii, 14), a party of Jewish Christians in the Early Church, who either held that circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law were necessary for salvation and in consequence wished to impose them on the Gentile converts, or who at least considered them as still obligatory on the Jewish Christians. Although the Apostles had received the command to announce the Gospel to all the nations, they interpreted it as referring to Gentiles who addressed themselves at first only to Jews, converts to Judaism, and Samaritans, that is to those who were circumcised and observed the Law of Moses. The converts, and the Apostles with them, continued to conform to Jewish customs: they observed the Sabbath, the Laws of Food, refused to eat with Gentiles or to enter their houses, etc. (Acts, x, 14, 28; xi, 3). At Jerusalem they frequented the Temple and took part in Jewish religious life as of old (Acts, ii, 46; hi, i, 20–26), so that, judged from external appearances, they seemed to be better distinguished by the union and charity existing among its members than by any other defect. The Mosaic ceremonial law was not to be permanent indeed, but the time had not yet come for abolishing its observance. The intense attachment which the Jews had for it, amounting to fanaticism in the case of the Pharisees, would have forbidden such a step, had the Apostles contemplated it, as it would have been tantamount to shutting the door of the Church to the Jews.

But sooner or later the Gospel was to reach the Gentiles, and then the delicate question must immediately arise: What was their position with respect to the Law? Were they bound to observe it? And if not, what conduct should the Jews hold towards them? Should the Jews waive such points of the Law as were of less religious importance to the Gentile and Jew? To the mind of most Palestinian Jews, and especially of the zealots, only two solutions would present themselves as possible. Either the Gentile converts must accept the Law, or its provisions must be enforced against them as against the other uncircumcised. But national sentiment, as well as love for the Law, would impel them to prefer the first. And yet neither solution was admissible, if the Church was to embrace all nations and not remain a national institution. The Gentiles would never have accepted circumcision with the heavy yoke of Mosaicism nor would they have been willing to occupy an inferior position with regard to the Jews, as they necessarily must, if these regarded them as unclean and declined to eat with them or even to enter their houses. Under such conditions it was easy to foresee that the admission of the Gentiles must provoke a crisis, which would clear the situation. When the brethren at Jerusalem, among whom probably were already converts of the sect of the Pharisees, learned that Peter had admitted Cornelius and his household to baptism without subjecting them to circumcision, they loudly expostulated with him (Acts, xi, 1–6). The cause assigned for their complaints is to that extent that Cornelius “had been circumcised and had eaten with them”, but the underlying reason was that he had dispensed with circumcision. However, as the case was an exceptional one, where the will of God was manifested by miraculous circumstances, Peter found little difficulty in quieting the dissatisfaction (Acts, xi, 4–18). But new conversions soon gave rise to far more serious trouble, which for a time threatened to produce a schism in the Church.

COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM (A.D. 50 or 51).—The persecution that broke out at the time of St. Stephen’s martyrdom providentially hindered the dissemination of the Gospel to be preached also to the Gentiles. Some natives of Cyprus and Cyrene, driven from Jerusalem by the persecution, went to Antioch, and there began to preach not only to the Jews, but also to the Greeks. Their action was probably prompted by the example set by Peter at Cesarea, which their more liberal views, as Hellenists would naturally dispose them to follow. With the help of Barnabas, whom the Apostles sent on hearing that a great number of Gentiles were converted to the Lord at Antioch, and of the former persecutor Saul, a flourishing church, largely Gentile, was established there (Acts, x, 20 sqq.). Having met in the house of Simon, between the years 45 and 46, Saul, now called Paul, and Barnabas founded the South Galatian churches of Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Derbe, and Perge, thus increasing the Gentile converts (Acts, xiii, 13—xiv, 24). Seeing the Gentile element growing so large and threatening at times to outnumber the Hebrew nation, the Church from the first was alarmed. Both their national pride and their religious sentiments were shocked. They welcomed the accession of the Gentiles, but the Jewish complexion of the Church must be maintained, the Law and the Gospel must go hand in hand, and the new converts must be Jews as well as Gentiles. The Church at Antioch and Jerusalem, and even later the Church in Asia and Galatia, were therefore at variance with each other. The Hellenistic Church of Antioch and the Galatian Churches of the east, which had already turned into a more Gentile Church, were in that respect entirely in the wrong.
Mosaic prescriptions, they could not be saved (Acts, xv, 1). As these men appealed to the authority of the Apostle, and in the spirit of their views, a delegation including Paul, Barnabas, and Titus, was sent to Jerusalem to lay the matter before the Apostles, that their decision might set at rest the disquieted minds of the Christians at Antioch (Acts, xv, 2).

In a private interview which he had with Peter, James (the brother of the Lord), and John, the Apostles then present at Jerusalem, they approved his teaching and recognized his special mission to the Gentiles (Gal., ii, 1-9). But to still the clamours of the converts from Pharisaism who demanded that the Gentile converts "must be circumcised and be commanded to observe the law of Moses", the matter was referred to the delegates of the Jerusalem council. Peter arose and after recalling how Cornelius and his household, though uncircumcised, had received the Holy Ghost as well as they themselves, declared that as salvation is by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the yoke of the Law, which even the Jews found exceedingly heavy, should not be imposed on the Gentile converts. James after him voiced the same sentiment, but asked that the Gentiles should observe these four points, namely "that they refrain themselves from the pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood", for "these things are a stumbling block to the Gentiles", and, with a slight change in the wording, incorporated in the decree which "the apostles and ancients, with the whole church" sent to the churches of Syria and Cilicia through two delegates, Judas and Silas, who were to accompany Paul and Barnabas on their return. "Forasmuch as we have heard," so ran the decree, "that some going out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls: to whom we gave no commandment; . . . it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things: that you abstain from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication (by which marriages within certain degrees of kindred are probably meant); from which things keeping yourselves you shall do well" (Acts, xv, 5-29). These four prohibitions were imposed for the sake of charity and union. As they forbade practices which are held in universal abhorrence by all the Jews, their observance was necessary to avoid shocking the Jewish brethren and to make free intercourse between the two classes of Christians possible. This is the drift of the somewhat obscure reason which St. James adduced in favor of the resolution: "For since in every city they meet him in the synagogues, where he is read every sabbath." The four things forbidden are severely prohibited in Lev., xvii, xviii, not only to the Israelites, but also to the Gentiles living among them. Hence the Jewish Christians, who heard these injunctions read in the synagogues, would be scandalized if they were not observed by the Gentile brethren. By the decree of the Apostles the cause of Christian liberty was won against the narrow Judaisers, and the way smoothed for the conversion of the nations. The victory was emphasized by St. Paul's refutation to allow Titus be circumcised (Gal., ii, 1). But this was not done in fear of offending the Jews, for if the Jews were implicitly forced to keep the Mosaic Law it would have been a concession to the extreme views of Gal., ii, 1-5).

The Incident at Antioch.—The decision of Jerusalem regarded the Gentiles alone, since the only question before the council was whether circumcision and the observance of the Mosaic Law were to be imposed on the Gentiles or not. Nothing was decided with regard to the observance of the Law by the Jews, and they were implicitly forced to keep it in their own communities. For, if the legal observances were not necessary for salvation, the Jew was no more bound by them than the Gentile. Nor was anything explicitly decided as to the relations which were to subsist between the Jews and the Gentiles. Such a decision was not demanded by the circumstances, since at Antioch the two classes lived together in harmony before the return of the mischief-maker. The Jews of the Dispersion were less particular than those of Palestine, and very likely some arrangement had been reached by which the Jewish Christians could without scruple eat with their Gentile brethren at the agape. However, the promulgation of the four prohibitions, which were intended to facilitate relations between the Jews and Gentile could freely meet. Hence when Peter came to Antioch shortly after the council, he, no less than Paul and Barnabas and the others, "did eat with the Gentiles" (Gal., ii, 12). But the absence of any explicit declaration gave the Judaisers an opportunity to begin a new agitation, which, if successful, would probably lead to the return of the Dispensation. Foiled in their first attempt, they now insisted that the law of not eating with the Gentiles be strictly observed by all Jews. They very likely expected to reach by indirect methods, what they could not obtain directly. Some seclots came from Jerusalem to Antioch. Nothing warrants the assertion that they were sent by St. James to oppose St. Paul, or to enforce the separation of the Jewish from the Gentile Christians, much less to promulgate a modification of the decree of Jerusalem. If they were sent by St. James, probably means simply that they were of the sect formed by Barnabas' entourage—they came on some other commission.

On their arrival Peter, who up to this had eaten with the Gentiles, "withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision", and by his example drew with him not only the other Jews, but even Barnabas, Paul's fellow-labourer. Foreseeing the consequences of such conduct, Paul publicly rebuked him, because he "walked not uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel". "If thou being a Jew, he said to him, "livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" The incident has been made much of by Baur and his school as showing the existence of two primitive forms of Christianity, Petrinism and Paulinism, at war with each other. But anyone, who will look at the facts without preconceived theory, must see that between Peter and Paul there is really no real disagreement but merely a difference as to the practical conduct to be followed under the circumstances. "Conversationis fuit vitium non praedicationis", as Tertullian happily expresses it. That Peter's principles were the same as those of Paul, is shown by his conduct at the time of Cornelius' conversion, and at that of old time, when the Council of Jerusalem, and by his manner of living prior to the arrival of the Judaisers. Paul, on the other hand, not only did not object to the observance of the Mosaic Law, as long as it did not interfere with the liberty of the Gentiles, but he conformed to its prescriptions when occasion required it (Col. iii, 19). Thus he shortly after circumcised Timothy (Acts, vii, 1-5), and he was in the very act of observing the Mosaic rite when he was arrested at Jerusalem (Acts, xxvi, 26 sqq.). The difference between them was that Peter, recently come from Jerusalem, thought only of not wounding the susceptibilities of the seclots there, and was thus betrayed into a course of action apparently at variance with his own teaching and calculated to promote the designs of the Judaisers; whereas Paul, not preoccupied with such a consideration and with more experience among the Gentiles, took a broader and truer view of the matter. He saw that Peter's example would promote the same thing as the Judaizing principles of relations with the Gentiles, which was only an indirect way of forcing Jewish customs upon them. He saw, too, that if such a policy were pursued, the hope of converting the Gentiles must be abandoned. Hence his bold and energetic action. St. Paul's account of the incident leaves no doubt that St. Peter saw the justice of the rebuke. (In the above account Gal., ii,
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1-10, is with the large majority of commentators taken to refer to the Council of Jerusalem, and the incident at Antioch is consequently placed after the council. Some few interpreters, however, refer Gal. ii, 1-10, to the time of St. Paul's journey mentioned in Acts, xi, 28-30 [a. d. 44] and place the dispute at Antioch before the Synod of Jerusalem. The Judaizers in Other Churches.—After the foregoing events the Judaizers could do little mischief in Syria. But they could carry their agitation to the distant churches founded by St. Paul, where the facts were less well known; and this they attempted to do. The text of the Epistle to the Corinthians is most probably it to believe that they were at work at Corinth. The party or rather faction of Cephas (I Cor., ii, 12) very probably consisted of Judaizers. They do not seem, however, to have gone beyond belittling St. Paul's authority and person, and sowing distrust towards him (cf. I Cor., ix. 1-5; II Cor., xi. 5-12; xxii. 11-12; i. 17-20; x. 10-13). For while he has much to say in his own defence, he does not attack the views of the Judaizers, as he would certainly have done had they been openly preached. His two letters and his subsequent visit to Corinth put an end to the party's machinations. The author of the Epistle to the Galatians (who has been written soon after I and II Cor., as it very probably was) Judaizing emissaries had penetrated into the Galatian churches, whether North or South Galatian matters little here (see Galatians, Epistle to the), and by their skilful manoeuvres had almost succeeded in persuading the Galatians, or at any rate many of them, into accepting circumcision. As at Corinth they attacked St. Paul's authority and person. He was only a secondary Apostle, subordinate to the Twelve, from whom he had received his instructions in the Faith and from whom he held his mission. To his teaching they opposed the practice and teaching of two of the pillars of the Church, of those who had conversed with the Lord (Gal., ii, 2 sqq.). He was a time-server, changing his teaching and conduct according to circumstances with the view of ingratiating himself with men (Gal., i. 10; v. 11). They argued that circumcision had been instituted as a sign of an eternal alliance between God and Israel: if the Galatians then wished to have a share in this alliance, with its blessings, if they wished to be in the full sense of the term Christians, they must accept circumcision (Gal., iii. 3 sqq.; v. 2). They did not however insist, it would seem, on their musty law (v. 3 sqq.).

On hearing the news of the threatened defection of the churches which he had founded at such cost to himself, St. Paul hastily indited the vigorous Epistle to the Galatians, in which he meets the accusations and arguments of his opponents step by step, and uses all his powers of persuasion to induce his nephews to stand fast and not to be held against the yoke of bondage. The letter, as far as we know, produced the desired effect. In spite of its resemblance to the Epistle to the Galatians, the Epistle to the Romans is not, as has been asserted, a polemical writing directed against the Judaizing party at Rome. The tone of the Epistle is of a very different sort (cf. in particular i. 5-8, 11-12; xv. 14; xvi. 19). If he refers to the Jewish Christians of Rome, it is only to exhort the Gentiles to bear with these weak brethren and to avoid whatever might scandalize them (xiv. 1-20). He would not have shown such forbearance towards the Galatians, nor would the opponents of them have gentle tones. His purpose in treating of the uselessness of circumcision and legal observances was to forewarn and forewarn the Romans against the Judaizing disturbers, should they reach the capital, as he had reason to fear (Rom., xvi. 17-18). After their visit, that is St. Paul's opponents to them, they seem to have relaxed their activity, for in his later letters he rarely alludes to them. In the Epistle to the Philippians he warns against them in very severe terms: "Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers, beware of the concision" (Phil., iii. 2). They do not seem, however, to have been active in that church at the time. Beyond this only two allusions are found—one in I Tim., i. 6-7: "From which things some going astray, are turned aside unto vain babbling: desiring to be teachers of the law; notwithstanding neither the things they say, nor whereof they affirm", the other in Tit., iii, 9: "Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law. For they are unprofitable things and vain." Final History.—With the disappearance of the Jewish-Christian party, the good result of the Mosaic Law ceased to be of any importance in the Church, and soon became a dead issue. At the beginning of the second century St. Ignatius of Antioch, it is true, still warns against Judaizers (Magna, x, 3; viii, 1; Philad., vi, 1), but the danger was probably more a memory than a reality. During the rebellion the mass of the Jewish Christians of Palestine retired beyond the Jordan, where they gradually lost touch with the Gentiles and in the course of time split up into several sects (cf. Gal. i. 19). Justin distinguishes two kinds of Jewish Christians: those who observe the Law of Moses, but do not require its observance of others—these he would hold communion, though in this all his contemporaries did not agree with him—and those who believe the Mosaic Law to be obligatory on all, whom he considers heretics (Dial. cum Tryph., 47). If Justin is describing the Jewish Christians of his day, as he appears to do, they had changed little since Apostolic times. The accounts of later Fathers show them divided into three main sects: (a) the Nazarenes, who, while observing the Mosaic Law, seem to have been orthodox. They admitted the Divinity of Christ and the virginal birth; (b) the Ebionites, who denied the Divinity of Christ and the virginal birth, and considered St. Paul as an apostate. It should be noted, however, that though the Fathers restrict the name Ebionite to the heretical Jewish Christians, the name was common to all; (c) an offshoot of the last infected with Gnosticism (cf. art. Ebionites). After the middle of the fifth century the Jewish Christians disappear from history.

Judas Iscariot, the Apostle who betrayed his Divine Master. The name Judas (Ἰούδας) is the Greek form of Judah ( Heb. יְהוּדָ֫א, i.e., praised), a proper name frequently found both in the Old and the New Testament. Even among the Twelve there were two that bore the name, and for this reason it is usually associated with the name Iscariot, i.e., a man of Kerioth or Cariot, which is a city of Judah (cf. Jos., xv, 25). There can be no doubt that this is the right interpretation of the name, though the true origin is obscured in the Greek spelling, and, as might be expected, other derivations have been suggested (e.g. from Kerioth, a city of the hill-country, or Kerioth, the Sacred Text concerning the history of Judas Iscariot beyond the bare facts of his call to the Apostolate, his treachery, and his death. His birthplace, as we have seen, is indicated in his name Iscariot, and it may be remarked that his origin separates him from the other Apostles. Cariot and Kerioth are cities of Judah, Cariot is a city of Judah. It has been suggested that this fact may have had some influence on his career by causing want of sympathy with his brethren in the
Apostolate. We are told nothing concerning the circumstances of his call or his share in the ministry and miracles of the Apostles. And it is significant that he is never mentioned without some reference to his great betrayal. Thus, in the list of the Apostles given in the Synoptic Gospels, we read: "And Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him" (Matt., xxvi, 24; Mark, xv, 11; Luke, vi, 16), or "So again in St. John's Gospel the name first occurs in connexion with the foretelling of the betrayal: "Jesus answered them: Have not |I chosen you twelve; and one of you is a devil." Now he meant Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon: for this name was also given to Baptist, whereas he was one of the twelve" (John, vi, 71–2).

In this passage St. John adds a further particular in mentioning the name of the traitor Apostle's father, which is not recorded by the other Evangelists. And it is he again who tells us that Judas carried the purse. For, after describing the anointing of Christ's feet by Mary at the feast in Bethania, the Evangelist continues: "Then one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, he that was about to betray him, said: Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence, and given to the poor? Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and the ointure was his: he said this to betray him, whereas he was one of the twelve." (John, xii, 4–6). This fact that Judas carried the purse is again referred to by the same Evangelist in his account of the Last Supper (xiii, 29). The Synoptic Gospels do not notice this office of Judas, nor do they say that it was he who protested at the alleged waste of the ointment. But it is significant that both in Matthew and Mark the account of the anointing is closely followed by the story of the betrayal: "Then went one of the twelve, who was called Judas Iscariot, to the chief priests, and said to them: What will you give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" (Matt., xxvi, 14–5); "And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went to the chief priests, to betray him to them. Who hearing it were glad; and they promised him they would give him money." (Mark, xiv, 10–1). In both these accounts it will be noticed that Judas takes the initiative: he is not tempted and seduced by the priests, but approaches them of his own accord. St. Luke tells the same tale, but adds another touch by ascribing the deed to the instigation of Satan: "And Satan entered into Judas, who was surnamed Iscariot, one of the twelve. And he went, and discoursed with the chief priests and the magistrates, how he might betray him." (Luke, xxii, 6). And then it is added, "They were glad. And they promised him he would give him money. And he promised. And he sought opportunity to betray him in the absence of the multitude." (Luke, xxii, 3–6).

St. John likewise lays stress on the instigation of the evil spirit: "the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, to betray him" (xiii, 2). The same Evangelist, as we have seen, tells of an earlier intimation of Christ's foreknowledge of the betrayal (John, vi, 71–2), and in the same chapter says expressly: "For Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him." (vii, 18). He agrees with the Synoptics in recording a more explicit prediction of the treachery at the Last Supper: "When Jesus had said these things, he was troubled in spirit; and he testified, and said: Amen, amen I say to you, one of you shall betray me." (John, xiii, 21). And then St. John himself, at the request, asked who this was. "Jesus answered: He it is to whom I shall reach bread dipped. And when he had dipped the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the morsel, Satan entered into him. And Jesus said to him: That whose dast thou dost, do quickly. Now no man at the table knew what was the purpose he had in this. But Judas had the purse, that Jesus said to him: Buy those things which we have need of for the festivity; or that he should give something to the poor." (viii, 26–9). These last details about the words of Jesus, and the natural surmise of the disciples, are given only by St. John. But the prediction and the question of the disciples are recorded by all the Synoptics. (Matt., xxvi, 22; Mark, iv, 14; Luke, xxii, 21–22). St. Matthew adds that Judas Iscariot asked Jesus, "Lord, is it I, Rabbi?" and was answered: "Thou hast said it." (xxvi, 25).

All four Evangelists agree in regard to the main facts of the actual betrayal which followed so closely on this prediction, and tell how the traitor came with a multitude or a band of soldiers from the chief priests, and brought them to the disciples, as he knew, Jesus would be found with His faithful disciples (Matt., xxvi, 47; Mark, iv, 43; Luke, xxii, 47; John, xviii, 3). But some have details not found in the other narratives. That the traitor gave a kiss as a sign is mentioned by all the Synoptics, but not by St. John, who in his turn is alone in telling us that those who came to take Jesus fell backward to the ground as He answered, "I am he." Again, St. Mark tells that Judas said, "Hail, Rabbi," before kissing His Master, but does not give any reply. St. Matthew, after recording these words and the traitor's kiss, adds: "And Jesus said unto him: Friend, why art thou come?" (Mark, iv, 50). St. Luke (xxii, 48) gives the words: "Judas, dost thou betray the Son of man with a kiss?"

St. Matthew is the only Evangelist to mention the sum paid by the chief priests as the price of the betrayal, and in accordance with his custom he notices that an Old Testament prophecy has been fulfilled therein (Matt., xxvi, 15; xxvii, 5–10). In this last passage he tells of the repentance and suicide of the traitor, on which the other Gospels are silent, though we have another account of these events in the speech of St. Peter: "Men, brethren, the scripture must needs be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who was the leader of them that apprehended Jesus: who was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry. And he indeed hath possessed a field of the reward of iniquity, and being hanged, burst asunder in the midst: and all his bowels gushed out. And it became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem: so that the same field was called in their tongue, Haelcada, that is to say, The field of blood. For it is written in the book of Psalms: Let their habitation become desolate, and let there be none to dwell therein. And his bishopric let another take" (Acts, i, 16–20). Cf. Ps., lxvii, 26; xviii, 8). Sozlam, and on the other hand, his apparent discrepancies between this passage in the Acts and the account given by St. Matthew. For St. Peter's words taken by themselves seem to imply that Judas himself bought the field with the price of his iniquity, and that it was called "field of blood" because of his death. But St. Matthew, on the other hand, says: "Then Judas, who betrayed him, seeing that he was condemned, repenting himself, brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and ancients, saying: I have sinned in betraying innocent blood. But they said: What is that to us? look thou to it. And cast down the pieces of silver into the temple, depart." After this the Evangelist goes on to tell how the priests, who scrambled to put the money in the corbona because it was the price of blood, spent it in buying the potter's field for the burial of strangers, which for this cause was called a field of blood. And in this St. Matthew seems to fulfill the prophecy ascribed to Jeremias (but found in Zach., xi, 12): "And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was prised, whom they prised of the children of Israel. And they gave them unto the potter's field, as the Lord appointed to me." (Matt., xxvii, 9–10).

But there does not seem to be any great difficulty in reconciling the two accounts. For the field, bought
with the rejected price of his treachery, might well be described as indirectly bought or possessed by Judas, albeit he did not buy it himself. And St. Peter's words about the name Hazeldama might be referred to the "reward of iniquity" as well as to the violent death of the traitor. Similar difficulties are raised as to the date of the Crucifixion. A Catholic theory of the betrayal itself. But it will be found that, without doing violence to the text, the narratives of the four Evangelists can be brought into harmony, though in any case there will remain some obscure or doubtful points. It is disputed, for instance, whether Judas, however, whether the institution of the Holy Communion and the communication of the other Apostles. But the balance of authority is in favour of the affirmative. There has also been some difference of opinion as to the time of the treachery. Some consider that it was suddenly determined on by Judas after the anointing at Bethania, while others suppose a longer negotiation with the chief priests.

But these textual difficulties and questions of detail fade into insignificance beside the great moral problem presented by the fall and treachery of Judas. In a very true sense, all sin is a mystery. And the difficulty of the matter arises as a depth of the guilt, the smallness of the motive for doing wrong, and with the measure of the knowledge and graces vouchsafed to the offender. In every way the treachery of Judas would seem to be the most mysterious and unintelligible of sins. For how could one chosen as a disciple, and the close of the grace of the privilege of intimate friendship with the Divine Master, be tempted to such gross ingratitude for such a paltry price? And the difficulty is greater when it is remembered that the Master thus basely betrayed was not hard and stern, but a Lord of loving kindness and compassion, at any time, if we think deep and the various circumstances, it is no wonder that many attempts have been made to give some more intelligible explanation of its origin, and, from the wild dreams of of ancient heretics to the bold speculations of modern critics, the problem presented by Judas and his treachery has been the subject of strange and startling theories. As a traitor naturally excites a peculiarly violent hatred, especially among those devoted to the cause or person betrayed, it was only natural that Christians should regard Judas with loathing, and, if it was impossible, there was no allowance at all for allowing him no good qualities at all. This would be an extreme view which, in some respects, lessens the difficulty. For if it be supposed that he never really believed, if he was a false disciple from the first, or, as the Apocryphal Arabic Gospel of the Infancy has it, was possessed by Satan even in his childhood, he would not have felt the holy influence of Christ or enjoyed the light and spiritual gifts of the Apostolate.

At the opposite extreme is the strange view held by an early Gnostic sect known as the Caimites described by Irenaeus (Adv. haer., 1, c. ult.), and more fully by Tertullian (Presb. har., 3, St. Epiphanius (Heres., xxxviii)). Certain of these heretics, whose opinion has been revived by some modern writers in a more plausible form, maintained that Judas was really enlightened, and acted as he did in order that mankind might be redeemed by the death of Christ. For this reason they regarded him as worthy of gratitude and veneration. In the modern version of this theory it is suggested that Judas, who in common with the other disciples looked for a temporal kingdom of the Messias, did not anticipate the death of Christ, but wished to precipitate a crisis and hasten the advent of the Messias. This would provoke a rising of the people who would set Him free and place Him on the throne. In support of this they point to the fact, that, when he found that Christ was condemned and given up to the Romans, he immediately repented of what he had done. But, as Strauss remarks, this repentance does not prove that the result had not been foreseen. For murderers, who have killed their victims with deliberate design, are often moved to remorse when the deed is actually done. A Catholic theory of the influence of the Evangelists with favour since they are plainly repugnant to the text of Scripture and the interpretation of tradition. However difficult it may be to understand, we cannot question the guilt of Judas. On the other hand we cannot take the opposite view of those who would defend the traitor, and in the first place, this view seems hard to reconcile with the fact that he was chosen by Christ to be one of the Twelve.

This choice, it may be safely said, implies some good qualities and the gift of no mean graces.

But, apart from this consideration, it may be urged that in exaggerating the original malice of Judas, or denying that there was even any good in him, we minimize or miss the lesson of his fall. The examples of the saints are lost on us if we think of them as beings of another order without our human weaknesses. And in the same way it is a grave mistake to think of Judas without any element of guilt and grace. In his fall is left a warning that even the great grace of the Apostolate and the familiar friendship of Jesus may be of no avail to one who is unfaithful. And, though nothing should be allowed to palliate the guilt of the great betrayal, it may become more intelligible as the result of the common weakness of falling in lesser things. So again the repentance may be taken to imply that the traitor had received himself by a false hope that after all Christ might pass through the midst of his enemies as he had done before at the brow of the mountain. And though the circumstances of the crime, the crime of Judas, is the reason to fear the worst, the Sacred Text does not distinctly reject the possibility of real repentance. And Origen strangely supposed that Judas hanged himself in order to seek Christ in the other world and ask His pardon (In Matt., tract. xxxv).


W. H. KENT.

Judas Machabeus, third son of the priest Matthias, who with his family was the patriarh and ruler of the family that ruled the King of the Syriac (I Mach., ii, 4). Various conjectures have been put forth as to the origin of his surname. The name appears to be derived from the Syriac word magaza (a hammer or mallet) and it was bestowed by reference to the crushing prowess displayed by Judas against the enemies of the nation, being equivalent to the name Martel given to Charles Martel. Judas was designated by his dying father as the new leader of the band of guerrilla warriors in the year 167 B. C., and he remained in command until the year 161. He was animated with a great confidence in the help of the Lord for the good cause. He began his military operations by surprising and burning down many towns which had held out for the enemies of Israel, and when regular armed forces were sent to put a stop to his ravages, he did not refuse to meet them in the field (II Mach., viii., 1—7). He proved himself to be an excellent tactician as well as an intrepid warrior. Among his military exploits are mentioned the defeat and slaying of Apollonius the recent plunderer of Jerusalem, and the utter rout of the Syrian forces led by the deputy governor Seron in an encounter at Bethoron (I Mach., iii., 10—24). Other Syrian leaders were also vanquished by Judas, viz. Onias, who was murderer, Thaddeus, Becchides and Lysias (I Mach., iii., 10—iv., 35).

These victories afforded a respite during which Judas turned his attention to the condition of the
ruined city of Jerusalem and that of the Temple which had been ignominiously profaned. Having appointed a body of armed men to be on guard in check the Syrian garrison still occupying the citadel, the Jewish leader set about renovating and purifying the sanctuary, being aided in the work by the priests. When the renovation was completed the new Temple service was inaugurated by a feast of re-dedication which lasted eight days, and was so vast that henceforth in matters of this event an annual festa also of eight days should be celebrated (I Mach., iv, 30-59; II Mach., x, 1-8; John x, 22). Some of the neighbouring tribes, alarmed at the progress of the Jews, took up arms against them, but they were easily vanquished by Judas, who then bent all his energies to bring to a successful issue the way in which he was fighting against Syria. For three years he pursued this arduous task with relentless energy and patience and with varying success. In the meantime he sent messengers to Rome in order to secure the protection of the Government against the oppression of the Syrians. The mission was diplomatically successful, but before the negotiations had time to become known in the East, Judas had been defeated and slain on the battlefield at Laisha (161 b.c.) (I Mach., iv, 60-ix, 18; II Mach., x-xv). Beaucier in Vigiouez, Dict de la Bible, s. v. Judas Macha- ble; Gloor, Outlines of the New Testament, xxviii, 91.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Judas Thaddeus. See JUDE, EPISTLE OF SAINT.

Jude, Claude, French preacher and spiritual father, b. at Rouen, about 20 December, 1651; d. at Paris, 11 March, 1735. He entered the Society of Jesus on 18 September, 1677, and was admitted to his final vows on 2 Feb., 1695. He was first employed to preach, and did so successfully both in the provinces and in the capital. It soon became evident that he possessed oratorial gifts equal to Bourdaloue's, who indeed wished him to become his successor and spoke of bestowing on him his papers. Jude's superiors, however, asked him to sacrifice his pulpit success for the more humble but very important duty of training his brethren in religious virtues. The orator accepted this inconspicuous office, and from 1704 to 1721 he was instructor of the third probation at Rouen and rector of the Paris novitiate. The hearers of his retreats and expositions were charmed with his eloquence, at once vigorous and pathetique, and sought to keep the memory of it in writing. Hence the great number of copies which were preserved by Jesuits or made for the use of other religious communities, and of which many are still found in public and private libraries. Father Jude himself published any of his works, but after his death, thanks to the transcripts already mentioned, several collections appeared successively. Father Lallemant, S.J., had printed the "Retraite spirituelle pour les personnes religieuses" (Paris, 1746), which was early translated into Spanish by Father de Isla, S.J. (Madrid, 1755). Father Chéron, a Theater, gave to the public the "Exhortations sur les principaux devoirs de l'état religieux" (Paris, 1772). Finally, Abbé Lenoir-Duparc, a former Jesuit and novice under Father Jude, undertook from copies revised by the author a complete collection of "Œuvres spirituelles" (Paris and Lyons, 1781-2). At the beginning of these seven volumes, later reduced to five and often re-edited, there is, under the title of "Retraite spirituelle de trente jours", an excellent development of the Exercises of St. Ignatius, especially the parts known as the First and the Third Weeks. The treatises in catechetical form on confession, prayer, and the Mass, and the very instructive "Exhortations" are also worthy of note. Several parts of this collection have been, up to date, published separately, and also translated into German.

SOMMERVOGEL, Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus, IV, 863-6; IX, 520; LENOIR-DUPARC, Œuvres de Judas, préface.

PAUL DESCHY.

Jude, Epistle of Saint.—The present subject will be treated under the following heads: (1) The Author and the Authenticity of the Epistle: (2) Jude in the Books of the New Testament; (2) Tradition as to the Genuineness and the Canonicity of the Epistle; (3) Difficulties Arising from the Text; (4) The Relation of Jude to the Second Epistle of Peter; (5) Voice against Jude; (6) Jude and the Church of Jerusalem (Acts, xv, 13; xxii, 18), spoken of by St. Paul as "the brother of the Lord" (Gal., i, 19), who was the author of the Catholic Epistle of St. James, and is regarded among Catholic interpreters as the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus (see JAMES THE LESS, SAINT). This last identification, however, is not evident, nor, from a critical point of view, does it seem beyond all doubt. Most Catholic commentators identify Jude with the "Judas Jacobi" ("Jude, the brother of James") in the D. V. of Luke, vi, 16, and Acts, i, 13—also called Thaddeus (Matt., x, 3; Mark, iii, 18)—referring also to expression to the fact that his brother James was better known than himself in the primitive Church. This view is strongly confirmed by the title "the brother of James", by which Jude designates himself in the address of his Epistle. If this identification is proved, it is clear that Jude, the author of the Epistle, is reckoned among the Apostles of Christ. This opinion is most highly probable. Beyond this we find no further information concerning Jude in the New Testament, except that the "brethren of the Lord", among whom Jude was included, were known to the Galatians and the Corinthians; also that four of them were martyred; and Jude did not fully believe in Christ till after the Resurrection (I Cor., ix, 5; Gal., i, 19; John, viii, 52-5; Acts, i, 14). From a fact of Hegesippus told by Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xix, xx, xxii) we learn that Jude was "said to have been the brother of the Lord according to the flesh", and that two of his grandsons lived till the reign of Trajan (see, however, BRETHREN OF THE LORD).

(2) Tradition as to the Genuineness and the Canonicity of the Epistle.—The Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called κατ᾽ ἀποστόλον; but, although its canonicity has been questioned in several Churches, its genuineness has never been denied. The brevity of the Epistle, the coincidences between it and II Peter, and the supposed quotation from apocryphal books, created a prejudice against it which was gradually overcome. The history of its acceptance by the Church is briefly as follows:

Some coincidences or analogies exist between Jude and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers—between Barnabas, ii, 10, and Jude, 3, 4; Clemens Romanus, Ep. xx, 12; Ixiv, 2, and Jude, 25; Ep. ad Polyc., iii, 2; iv, 2, and Jude, 3, 20; Mart. Polyc., xx, and Jude, 24 sq. It is possible, though not certain, that the passages here noted were suggested by the text of
Jude. The similarity between “Didache”, ii, 7, and Jude, 22 sq., does not seem to be accidental, whilst in "All' Ennagora" (p. 17), Thomas of Antiokh (d. about 183), "Ad Autol.", IV, xvi, there is a clear reference to Jude, 6 and 13 respectively.

The earliest positive reference to the Epistle occurs in the Muratorian Fragment, "Epistolae sine Judae et superiscritae" (p. 11). Church in catholicae [sic. Ecclesia] had current.. The Epistle was thus recognized as canonical and Apostolic (for it is Jude the Apostle who is here meant) in the Roman Church about 170. At the end of the second century it was also accepted as canonical and Apostolic by the Church of Alexandria (Clement of Alexandria, "Praef. IV, III, 11", followed by Origen, "De Rerum Nat. et de Caelest. Rer.""). At the beginning of the third century the Epistle was universally accepted except in the primitive East Syrian Church, where none of the Catholic Epistles were recognized, nor the Apocalypse.

This remarkably wide acceptance, representing as it does the voices of ancient tradition, testifies to the canonicity and the genuineness of Jude. During the third and fourth centuries doubt and suspicion, based on internal evidence (especially on the supposed quotation from the Book of Henc/ho and the "Assumption of Moses"), arose in several Churches. In the latter, however, the prejudices created against the deutero-canonical Jude was soon overcome, so that the Epistle was universally accepted in the Western Church at the very beginning of the fifth century (see CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES).

In the Eastern Church Eusebius of Cesarea (269-340) placed Jude among the antilepomena or the "disputed books, which are nevertheless known and accepted by the greater number" (Hist. Eccl., II, xxii; III, xxxiv); he incorporated all the Catholic Epistles in the fifty copies of the Bible which, at the command of Constantine, he wrote for the Church of Constantinople. St. Athanasius (d. 337) and St. Ephraem (d. 403) placed Jude among the canonical and Apostolic writings. Junilius and Paul of Nisibis in Constantinople (545) held it as mediae auctoritatis. However, in the sixth century the Greek Church everywhere considered Jude as canonical.

The place of Jude in the Syriac Church is not clear. In Western Syria we find no trace of Jude in the fifth century. In Eastern Syria the Epistle is wanting in the oldest Syriac version, the Peshito, but it is accepted in the Philoxenian (508) and Heraclian (618) versions. Except among the Syriac Nestorians, that is, the Nestorians of Persia, var. some other sects, the beginning of the sixth century till the Council of Trent, which defined the canonicity of both the proto- and deutero-canonical books of the New Testament.

(c) Difficulties Arising from the Text.—The wording of v. 17—which some critics have taken as an evidence that the Epistle was written in the second century—does not imply that the recipients of the Epistle had, in a period that was past, received oral instructions from all the Apostles, nor does it imply that Jude himself was not an Apostle. The text τοις ἁλωμένοις λαοῖς does not mean to the readers that such "mockers" as are described by the writer would assai the Faith; it is not separation in time, but distance of place, that leads Jude to refer to the scattered Apostles as a body. Nor does he exclude himself from this body; he only declares that he himself was not an Apostle. The author of II Peter, who often ranks himself among the Apostles, uses a similar expression, τοῖς ἁλωμένοις λαοῖς (iii, 2), and certainly does not mean to imply that he himself was not an Apostle. Many Protestant scholars have maintained that the false teachers denounced in Jude are Gnostic teachers of the second century. But, as Bigg rightly says: "It is not really a tenable view" (op. cit. infra). St. Jude does not give any details about the errors denounced in his short letter, and there is no ground for identifying the false teachers with any of the Gnostic sects known to us. There is nothing in the references made to false doctrines that obliges us to look beyond the Apostolic times. The use made of apocryphal writings, even if proved, is not an argument against the Apostolicity of the Epistle; at most it could only invalidate its canonicity and inspiration. Verse 9, which contains the reference concerning the body of Moses, was supposed by Didymus ("Enarr. in Epist. Jude" in P. Q., XXXIX, 1811 sqq.), Clement of Alexandria (Adumbr. in Ep. Jude), and Origen (De Princ., III, iii, 1), to have been taken from the "Assumption of Moses", a document abnormally anterior to the Epistle of Jude. Jude may possibly have learned the story of the contest from Jewish tradition. But, at any rate, it is evident that Jude does not quote the "Assumption" as a written authority, and still less as a canonical book.

As regards the prophecy of vv. 14 sqq., many Catholic scholars admit it to be a loose and abbreviated citation from the apocryphal Book of Henoch, i, 1, 9, which existed a century before St. Jude wrote. But here again St. Jude does not quote Henoch as a canonical book. There is nothing strange, as Plumptre ("Introduction to the New Testament", p. 327) says, in finding books not included in the Hebrew Canon of the Old Testament, "as furnishing illustrations that gave point and force to his counsels. The false teachers, against whom he wrote, were characterized largely by their fondness for Jewish fables, and the allusive references to books with which they were familiar, were therefore of the nature of an argument ad hominem. He fought them, as it were, with their own weapons." He merely intends to remind his readers of what they know. He does not affirm or teach the literal origin of the apocryphal book; such is not his intention. He simply makes use of the general knowledge it conveys, just as the mention of the dispute between Michael and the Devil is but an allusion to what is assumed as being known to the readers. By no means, therefore, does either of the passages offer any difficulty against the canonicity of the Epistle, or against the Catholic doctrine of inspiration.

(4) The Relation of Jude to the Second Epistle of St. Peter.—The resemblance as to thought and language between Jude and II Peter, ii, is quite sufficient to make it certain that one of the two writers borrowed from the other; the hypothesis that both writers borrowed from a common document appears less probable, either, as having no support whatsoever. The question remains: Which of the two Epistles was the earlier? The priority of II Peter, as well as the priority of Jude, has found strong advocates, and much has been written about this intricate question. The following arguments, however, lead to the conclusion that the Epistle of Jude was the earlier of the two.

(a) It is not uncommon for St. Peter to throw a light on the more obscure passages of the Epistle of Jude, or to interpret the more difficult passages. At one time he puts them in a shorter form or uses more general terms; at another, while adding in general the same arguments, he adds a new one or omits one or another used in Jude. This shows that St. Peter had probably read the Epistle of St. Jude. Compare especially II Peter, ii, 12, with Jude, 10. (b) This may also be confirmed not only by II Peter, ii, 17, but also by Jude, 12, 13. (c) It doubles Jude's comparison and puts more strength into it, whilst Jude has more similitudes—but also by comparing the style of both; for, whereas the style of Jude is always the same, that of St. Peter differs somewhat from his usual way of writing, and the reasons for this change seem to be the matter he writes about and the influence of the Epistle of St.
Jude.

(c) Finally, it is more probable that St. Peter has embodied in his work the text of Jude's Epistle than that Jude should have included in his writing only a pastoral St. Peter's. If Jude wrote more than one Peter and found the same state of things, why did he omit the remaining questions, e. g. the doubts about the parousia? Or why should he, in order to combat the same heresies, give only a summary of St. Peter's Epistle, omitting entirely the strongest arguments?

(5) Vocabulary and Style.—The vocabulary of Jude proves that the author was a Jew, saturated with the Old Testament, using Hebraisms, yet acquainted with the koine dialectos—the "common dialect". Thirteen words found in Jude do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. Some words of the new Christian dialect appear in Jude as well as in the Pauline Epistles, but literary affinity or direct quotation cannot be proved. The style, although sometimes poetical, always evinces the severe and authoritative tone of a man of Apostolic rank, held in high honour.

II. ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.—(a) Exordium: Address and good wishes (vv. 1-2): occasion and purpose of the Epistle (3-4). (b) Part the first: He inveighs against the pseudo-doctors; describes their life and errors (5-16). They will be severely punished, as is evident from the severe punishment of the angels in the desert (5), and the wicked angels (6), and of the inhabitants of Sodom (7). He mentions their wicked teaching and life (8), and opposes the modesty of Michael the Archangel (9) to their pride (10). He foretells for the heretics the punishment of Cain, Balaam, and the sons of Cores, for they have imitated their errors (11-13). Enoch has already prophesied the judgment of God upon them (14-6). (c) Part the second: He exHORTS the faithful (17-23). They must remember the teaching of the Apostles, by whom they had been warned of the coming of such heretics (17-19). They must maintain the Faith, keep themselves in the love of God, and wait for life everlasting (20-21). What their behaviour should be towards Christians that have in any way fallen away (22-23). (d) Epilogue: a most beautiful doxology (24-25).

III. OCCASION AND OBJECT.—Occasion.—The Epistle is poisoned by the seed of the dogmatico-moral errors amongst the Hebrew Christians; pseudo-doctors "are secretly entered in", who abuse Christian liberty to give themselves over to intemperance; moreover "denying the only sovereign Ruler, and our Lord Jesus Christ (4)."

(1) Obvious was the intention was to caution his readers, the Hebrew Christians, against such depraved teaching, and to exhort them to keep faithfully the teaching of the Apostles.

IV. TO WHOM ADDRESSED.—The dedicatory address runs as follows: τοις ἐν Θεοὶ ἐκπολεμηταῖς καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ τιμημονεῖς δολοῦ (to them that are beloved in God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called). Which are the δολοῦ, or "called", becomes manifest from the context. They are not all the Christians of the whole Christian world, but those of a particular Church (vv. 3, 4, 17, 22). Several commentators think that St. Jude's Epistle was addressed to the same churches of Asia Minor to which St. Peter's Epistle was written. This opinion, according to these commentators, is to be held because in both Epistles the same errors are condemned, and also because Jude (v. 17) appears to his known Peter, and at least the prophecy of the Prince of the Apostles has been verified. But we have already proved that the second argument is of no value (see above I, 4); as for the first, there are two objections: (a) the errors condemned in the Epistle of St. Jude and in II Peter may have spread in countries outside Asia Minor; (b) we find in Jude several reasons for believing that the Epistle was addressed, not to the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor, but to the Jewish Christians of Palestine or of a neighbouring country.

V. DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION.—Date.—It is difficult to state the exact time at which St. Jude wrote his Epistle. But the doctrines against which he inveighs, and the looseness of morals or the so-called antinomianism, seem to indicate the end of the Apostolic age. Jude seems on the other hand to have written before a.d. 70; otherwise in vv. 5-7 he would have spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem. In those verses St. Jude mentions the different punishments of prevaricators, and therefore in their exhortation to Hebrew Christians he could not have passed over in silence so dire a calamity. Moreover we the Epistle of St. Jude was written before II Peter, which latter was probably written a.d. 64 (65). Therefore St. Jude must have written shortly before 64 (65).

Place of Composition.—Here we can only guess, but we prefer the opinion that the Epistle was written in Palestine, and probably in Jerusalem.


A. CAMELIN. JUDEA.—Like the adjective 'Ioudaioi, the noun 'Ioudaia comes from the Aramaic 'Iyadadai (1 Esd., iv, 12). It designates the part of Palestine adjacent to Jerusalem and inhabited by the Jewish community during their return from exile. It may be assigned as follows: Bethshur, on the south; Bethoron, on the north; Emmaus, on the west; the Jordan on the east. The Jews scattered in other parts of the country did not inhabit Judea properly so called. When, in 190 b. c., the Syrian general Bacchides attempted to keep Judea in his hands, he took his stand at Jericho, Bethoron, Bethel, Tibeon, and Tephon (not Bet-Nettif), and fortified Bethus and Gazer (1 Mach., iv, 50-52). Then, between Nehemiah (cf. II Esd., iii) and the Hasmonaeans, the boundaries of the Jewish kingdom underwent few modifications. But the Machabees, through their conquests, pushed the frontier back: Apheresa (Taybeh?), Lydda, Ramathem, (Rentis) (1 Mach., xi, 34), Jaffa (1 Mach., xii, 33), Misdab, Samaria, Scythopolis (Josephus, "Antiq. Jud.", XIII, ix, 1; x, 2) were in succession annexed to the Jewish territory. The Machabean kingdom is sometimes called Judea by Josephus (Antiq. Jud., XIII, xi, 3). Elsewhere, however, the same historian restrains Judea proper to more correct limits. To the north it extended only as far as Anath-Borkoese (Anah-Bergst), less than two miles north of Lubbâin; to the south as far as Fardas, on the confines of Arabia, thus taking in what was called Idumea at the time of the Syrian domination. The Jordan was its boundary on the east, the Mediterranean on the west (Bell. Jud., III, iii, 5). The history of this Judea is often confused with that of Jerusalem. At first a province (meidnath) of the Persian Empire, it was administered by a governor who resided at Jerusalem and was assisted by a council of elders. In 332 b. c., Alexander...
annexed it to the empire which he was then building. His successors long disputed over it. In 320 it was Egyptian in 198. It was Syrian. The Jewish rising under the Machabees, which began in 167, issued in the independence of Judea, which lasted from 130 to 63 B.c. At the latter date, Pompey made it tributary to the Romans. Under Herod, who became its king in 37 B.C., the Saviour was born at Bethlehem. Archelaus, his son and successor, was banished by the Romans, and in A.D. 68 the province of Judea disappeared as an individual district.

The evangelization of Judea began during the earthly life of Christ, Who journeyed through the land more than once and had friends there. It was one of the first provinces to benefit by the preaching of the Apostles. Judeans had heard the discourse of St. Peter, when he went forth from the upper chamber, and "there came together to Jerusalem a multitude out of the neighbouring cities, bringing sick persons, and such as were troubled with unclean spirits; who were all healed" (Acts, v. 16). Philip, one of the most zealous of the early Christians, even deposed from Ethiopia on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza, in the spring which rises at the foot of Bethshan. Thence this preacher betakes himself to Azotos ('Esploud), and from Azotos he goes up to Cesarea, preaching the Gospel in the towns through which he passes. Lydda and Joppa, where St. Peter was soon to find disciples, lay along St. Philip's itinerary (Acts, viii., 26 sqq.).

The Talmud is perhaps furnishing information on the preaching of the Gospel in Judea when it speaks of James of Kafar Sâma', who healed the sick in the name of Jesus. Kafar Sâmâ‘ was probably in the neighbourhood of Bethzur (Samarâ‘). St. Paul being on his second missionary journey, and again speaks of the Churches of Judea as being sorely tried by poverty, dissension, and persecution—Churches to which he was at first unknown, but which afterwards listened to his voice (1 Thess., i, 14; Gal., i, 22; Acts, xi, 29). Christianity was planted in Judea so that even at the time of the Council of Ephesus (431) we find bishops with cesareae, Ascalon, Nicopolis, Jamnia, Eleuthopolis, Maximianopolis (Hebron), Jericho, Lydda, Azotus, Gaza (Geler), "Patrium Niconorum nominis", Leizip, 1898). In later lists of bishops we find names to add to these: Joppa, Anthedon, Dicelo, Lydda, Raphtoh, etc. (Hierocles, "Synecdemus", Berlin, 1866). From the fourth century to the Arab invasion the monastic life rose to a great height; it is enough to mention the foundations of St. Euthymius, St. Theodossius, and St. Sabas (cf. Génier, "Vie de St. Euthyme le Grand", Paris, 1909).

Considered in the extension given to it by Josephus—i.e. as a great square of territory lying between Aqaribeh, Deir Ballût, and the Nahr el Audjeh, on the north; the Mediterranean, on the west; Bersabee and Tell Arad, on the south; the Dead Sea and the Jordan, on the east—Judea presents a sufficiently varied physiognomy. On the west the ancient Philistia, the plains of Shephelah, of the Daróm, and of Saron produce sesame, wheat, and sorghum in abundance, while the orange, citron, palm, and vine grow there freely. In this level region are several important places: Jaffa (23,000 inhabitants), Gaza (16,000 inhabitants), Lydda, and Ramleh. Between the plain and the main range of hill country without any important towns. The mountain region of Judea rises to a height of 3280 feet, and is not very fertile, except near the springs. The summits are quite bare; where any earth is to be found on the rocks the fig, the olive, the vine, and barley grow. Of this region the chief centres are Jerusalem (80,000 to 100,000 inhabitants), Bethlehem (7000 inhabitants), Hebron (9000 inhabitants). The eastern part of Judea, Shah in the Dead Sea and the Jordan, is dotted with little hills, and peopled by nomadic tribes. The south, where Negeb offers a light soil, is not unsuited for cultivation. Water is scarce in Judea. In the mountains the rainfall is collected in cisterns; in the plains deep wells have been dug. There are a few springs but, having been deposed in the year 6 of our era, the government of Judea was confided to Roman procurators, one of whom, Pontius Pilate, condemned Christ to the cross, and two others, Felix and Porcius Festus, are involved in the history of St. Paul. Administered from A. D. 41 to the time of Agrrippa I, it returned to the procurators until A. D. 66, and in A. D. 70 Judea disappeared as an individual district.

The Roman roads with which Judea formerly scored are now immaculate. The only roads fit for wheeled vehicles are those from Jerusalem to Jericho, to Hebron by way of Bethlehem, to St. John in Montana, to Nablus, to Jaffa, and to the Mount of Olives— all of recent construction. There is also a narrow gauge railroad from Jerusalem to Jaffa, the latter being the chief port of Judea, Gaza being the second. Among the industries of Judea are, however, a few special industries: at Jerusalem, carving in olive wood; at Bethlehem, carving in mother-of-pearl; at Gaza, goat's hair tissue, sippers, and soap; at Hebron, leather and water-bottles, jars and glass trinkets. The Muteasefill of Jerusalem, which nearly corresponds to the ancient Judea, has an area of 8484 square miles, and comprises 328 cities, towns, villages, and hamlets, with an aggregate population of 350,000, of whom 100,000 are non-Muslim. There are 27,000 Catholics, having for their parishes Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Bêt-Sahur, Bêt-Djâlah, Ramallah, Taybeh, Bêt-Zeit, Ramleh, Jaffa, and Gaza. Although not a vilayet, this province is directly dependent on the minister of the interior at Constantinople. It has five sub-prefectures: Jaffa, Gaza, Hebron, Bersabee, and (since 1906) Nazareth, which last is geographically within the vilayet of Beirut.

Judge, Ecclesiastical (Judex ecclesiasticus), an ecclesiastical person who possesses ecclesiastical jurisdiction either in general or in the strict sense (see Jurisdiction). The official body appointed by the qualified ecclesiastical authority for the administration of justice is called a court (judicium ecclesiasticum, tribunal, auditorium). Every such court consist of the least of two sworn officials, the judge who gives the decision, and the clerk of the court (scriba, secretarius, scrinia, notarius, cancellarius), whose duty is to keep a record of the proceedings and the decision (c. xi, X, De probat., II, xix). As a rule, however, an ecclesiastical court forms a collegiate tribunal, the members of which either join with the presiding officer in giving the decision as judges (judices) or merely advise with him as councilors (auditores, assessorae, consultores, consules, consultores privatæ, assessor, etc., et pot. jud. deleg. II. xix). Connected with the courts are advocates, procurators, syndics, defenders, promoters, conservators, apparitors, messengers, etc. The procurators and advocates conduct the case as the representatives or defenders of the parties to the suit (X, De postul., I, xxxvii; X, De procurat., I, xxxviii).
The syndic is the counsel of a juridical person, a college body or a chapter (X, De syndic, I, xxviii). The chief duty of the conservators is to represent the rights of the *persona miseriae*, i.e., members of orders, the poor, widows, orphans (c. xv, in VIIa, De off. et pot. jud. deleg., I, xiv.). The fiscal promoter (*promotor facialis*) is appointed by the ecclesiastical and civil authority over certain matters (Inst. Congr. Ep. et Reg., 11 June, 1880, art. xiii), consequently in penal cases he appears as public prosecutor. *A defender matrimonii*, or defender of the matrimonial tie, assists in suits concerning the invalidity of a marriage (Benedict XIV, “Dei miseratione”, 3 Nov. 1743, d. xi).

In addition to his jurisdiction, which can be arbitrary, quasi-arbitrary, or delegated, the judge must also have certain physical and moral qualities. First, he must be an ecclesiastical (e. i, X, De jud., II, i). Consequently women and laymen are excluded from the office of ecclesiastical judge. Yet the pope could confer the office upon a layman (Glos to “Praesumptum”, e. i, X, De jud., II, i). It is further necessary to have full use of his senses and understanding, and suitable legal knowledge; the person appointed must also be at least 20 years old; but eighteen years will suffice for a judge appointed over ecclesiastical dementies or over concordats (c. xii, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xii). The judge also must not have a good reputation, but must not be excommunicated, suspended from office, or under an interdict (c. xxiv, X, De sent. et re jud., II, xxvii). Above all he must be impartial. A suspicion of partiality attaches to the judge who is personally interested in a case (c. xxxvi, X, De appellat., II, xxvii), or is related to or blooded within the fourth degree to one of the parties, or connected with one by marriage (c. xxxvi cit.), or who lives in the same house, or dines at a common table, or is otherwise friendly, or on the other hand inimical, towards one of the parties (c. xxxv, X, De off. jud. deleg., II, ix), and he must be excepto judicis suspecti by the accused or by both parties as prejudiced (suspectus). If objection be raised against a judge on the ground of prejudice, which must be done in writing and if possible before the beginning of the action (c. xx, X, De sent. et re jud., II, xxvii), arbitrators are to pass on the objection (c. xxxix, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix); if, however, objection be raised against the delegate of the bishop, the decision rests with the bishop (c. iv, X, De foro compet., II, ii). If the objection be declared well-founded, the judge transfers the case, with the concurrence of the party who brought it, to another or to a higher judge (c. xi, X, De appellat., II, xxviii). If the judge lacks the necessary qualifications, and this be known to the parties in the suit, the decision is invalid. If, however, his unfitness be unknown to the parties, and he follow statute law, the Church supplants the deficiency, even if the judge that have acted in bad faith.

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is exercised over all baptized persons. In order, however, that an ecclesiastical judge may be permitted to exercise de facto his judicial power he must also be competent, i.e., must be authorized to pass judgment on a given person in a given case. Proceedings held before a judge without competence are null and void. Those subject to the jurisdiction of a certain judge are said to be within the competence (*competentia*) of his court, or have their forum in him. The forum is either the free, voluntary choice of the parties (*forum prorogatum*), or it is laid down by the law (*foedus*) in matrimonial and matrimonial cases there is no forum prorogatum (c. ix, X, De in integr. restit., I, xii). Ecclesiasties can choose another judge only with the permission of the bishop, and in this case he must be an ecclesiastic (c. xii, xviii, X, De foro compet., II, ii). The legal forum (*forum legale*) is either ordinary, if the proper course of the regular courts is followed, or extraordinary, if, for legal reasons, a regular court is passed over. Moreover, the forum legale is either general (*commune*), corresponding to the universally valid law, or special or privileged (*speciale sive privilegiatum*), resting on privilege, as in the case of ecclesiastics on account of the *privilegium fori* which they cannot renounce. As the jurisdiction of a judge is generally limited to a certain district, a person is domiciled by domicile or quasi-domicile of the accused. The axiom holds: *Actor sequitur forum rei*, the plaintiff goes to the court of the accused (c. v, viii, X, De foro compet., II, ii). Domicile (q. v.) is that place where one actually resides with the intention of always remaining there. Quasi-domicile is domicile, with the intention of not remaining there at least the greater part of the year. There is also a domicile by operation of law, legal or fictitious domicile (*domicilium legale sive fictitium*). Thus a wife is subject to the jurisdiction of the domicile of the husband, children to that of the parents, religious to that of the place where the monastery is situated, persons having no fixed abode to that of the present place of residence. A process can be instituted at Rome against an ecclesiastic who is only accidentally there (c. xx, X, De foro compet., II, ii). Besides the domicile, the *domicilia controversiae* are the object (*forum rei sitar*, where the thing is situated), e. complaint can be brought before the judge in whose district the controverted object is (c. iii, X, De foro compet., II, ii); the forum where the contract is made (*forum contractus*), i.e. the parties can bring action before the judge in whose district the disputed contract is situated (c. xv, X, De foro compet., II, ii); that of the offence (*forum delicti*), within the jurisdiction where the offense was committed (c. xiv, X, De foro compet., II, ii). There is also a forum arising from the connexion of matters (*forum connexialis sive continens causarum*), if the matters in dispute are so connected that one cannot be decided without the other (c. i, X, De causa possess., II, xii); also the forum of a counter plea (*forum reconvensionis sive recausationis*), i.e. in a criminal suit the defendant can, on his side, accuse the plaintiff in the court of the judge before whom he is to be tried (c. ii, X, De mut. petit., II, iv). If the judge himself wishes to bring an accusation the superior appoints the judge who is to hear it (c. i, xvi, Q. vi). The decision of an incompetent judge is valid if by common error (*error communia*) he is held to be competent. In civil disputes the parties can entrust the decision to any judge of their choice (X, De transact., I, xxxvi; X, De arbitr., I, xii).

If the judge render a defective decision appeal can be taken to the next higher judge. This relation of the courts to one another and the successive course of appeals (*gradus*) is called succession of instances, and follows the order of superior to inferior from the beginning the bishop, or his representative, the archdeacon, or the "official" (*officialis*), or the vicar-general, was the judge in first instance for all suits, contentious or criminal, which arose in the diocese or in the corresponding administrative district, so far as such suits were not withdrawn from his jurisdiction by the common law. The court of second instance was originally the provincial synod, later the metropolitan [c. iii (Syn. of Nicaea, an. 325, c. v), iv (Syn. of Antich, an. 341, c. xx), D. XVIII]. The court of third instance was that of the pope. The court of first instance for bishops was the provincial synod, the metropolitan, or the synod of exarch; the highest court of appeal was that of the pope [c. xxxvi (Syn. of Sardica, an. 343, c. vii), c. II, Q. vi]. Only the pope could be the judge of first instance for exarchs and patriarchs. Since the Middle Ages the pope is the judge of first instance in all more important episcopal causes (*causa* majoris, graviore, difficillioris, aequoris), the number and extent of which are in no way exactly definable, but to
which above all belong the *causa criminales graviores contra episcopos*—more serious criminal charges against bishops (c. i, X, De translat. episc., i, vii). Conformably to this the diocesan bishop or his representative (the vicar-general, or officials, or some other diocesan authority) is now the judge of the court of first instance, so far as common law has not withdrawn from him this jurisdiction (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, De ref., c. xx). If the see is vacant the vicar-capitular is judge of the court of first instance. The judge of the second instance is the metropolitan (c. ixv, X, De translat. episc., ii, xixvii). For archdioceses, as a rule, the judge of second instance is a neighbouring archbishop or bishop appointed by the Holy See (Concil. plur. Baltimore, III, an. 1884, n. 316; Leo XIII, "Trans Oceanum", 15 April, 1897, n. 14). The same ordinance also applies to exempt bishoprics (Sac. Congr. pro negot. eccles. extraord., 11 September, 1906). The court of the third instance is the Apostolic See, but in the *causa maioris* it is the court of first instance. As, however, the pope is the *jusdictio ordinaria omnium*, the ordinary ecclesiastical judge of all, ecclesiastical suits without exception can be brought or summoned before the pope as the court of first instance (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, De ref., c. xx; Vatic., Sess. III, De eccl., c. iii).

In the Middle Ages the lower courts were often evaded, or the popes summoned the suits at once before their forum (c. livi, X, De appelle., ii, xxviii). The advantages on account of the better legal education and greater impartiality of the members of the papal court. On the other hand the administration of justice was delayed, and, above all, made more costly by the rule enforced in the papal courts that the parties must appear in person. What made the matter still worse was that such summonses to Rome, as to the court of first instance, diminished un

JUDGES, the seventh book of the Old Testament, second of the Early Prophets of the Hebrew canon.

I. TITLE.—The Hebrew name of the book was בָּשָׁר (Basa Bathra, 14 b); it was translated by Oregen Zephania, and by St. Jerome Sophim; it was translated by Melito and Oregen Karis, by the Sept. יְדִיבָרָם בְּבֵית אֵל בֶּן זֵרֵעַ, 80, too, by the Greek Fathers; the Latin translated Liber Judicium or Judicium. The Hebrew verb meant originally "to act as a Divine judge", and was applied to God (Gen. xviii, 25), and to Moses, acting as the specially inspired law-giver and judge of Israel (Ex., xviii, 13, 16). In time the elders of the people became the "judges" (vv. 25, 26). In this book the term judges (shophethim) is applied to the leaders of Israel, and would seem to indicate that their right was Divine (Judges, x, 2, 3). The office of judge differed from that of king only in the absence of hereditary principle, and especially appointed by the pope (c. xxviii, X, De descript., i, iii; c. xi, in VI, De descript., i, iii).

II. CONTENTS.—(1) Introduction (i—ii, 5). A summary of the conquest of Canaan (i, 1—36). The angel of Jehovah reproves the tribes that made league with the stranger (ii, 1—5). (2) The history of Israel under the judges (ii, 6—xvi), introduced by a summary of its contents—Israel's forsaking of Jehovah, turning to Baal and Astaroth, defeat by the Philistines, return to Jehovah by the Judges (ii, 6—iii, 8). Then follow the wonderful deeds of the judges, of whom Gideon and Samson are the chief heroes; to them are devoted seven chapters.

(3) Two more stories of the times of the judges—the migration of Dan and their idolatrous worship of the idol of Michae (xxviii—xxxvii), the crime of the Benjamites. A remarkable feature of the Judges is the fallibility of the judges; where the dispute arose and the consequent lack of knowledge of the judges, the people have been at times appointed at the place where the dispute arose, the bishops are each to select, on occasion of the provincial or diocesan synod, at least four men (judices synodales) having the qualities designated by Boniface VIII (c. xi, in VI, De descript., i, iii), and must present their names to the Apostolic See, which in its selection of judges is to be so limited to the persons thus named that the delegation of any other person is invalid. As provincial and diocesan synods are no longer regularly held, bishops are permitted to make this selection with the advice of the chapter (Benedict XIV, "Quamvis paterna", 26 August, 1741). Consequently, judges so appointed are called judges pro synodales. At any rate, however, there is also no longer customary. On the contrary, the Apostolic See appoints its representatives in partibus entire independently, but it is so arranged that the delegation is bestowed on neighbouring bishops and archbishops for a definite term of years. Such delegation is all the more necessary in case a State does not permit ecclesiastical suits to be tried outside of its boundaries, or will only permit the judgment of such a court to be executed within its territories by the secular power.


JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÖLLER.
Rationalists and of Protestants in the matter of the so-called late and manifold redaction of Judges.

IV. AUTHENTICITY.—The chief arguments for the authenticity of Judges are given below under History and Sources. We now pass to the several points of the contents of the book by Jews and Christians as an authentic narrative part of Israel's history; (b) the life-like style of the work; (c) the minute and accurate details of the narrative; (d) the evident purpose of the narrator to give a history of the things whereof he knows. V. FORM.—Although the purpose of the narrator is not to give a minute account of the events that took place in Israel between the days of Josue and of Samuel, yet that purpose is rather epic and didactic than historical in the modern sense of the word. (1) The narrator does not purpose history in the modern sense; he does not narrate in historical order all the important events of the period. This fact is clear from the appendixes (xiv—xxi), which give very important events outside their proper historical order. (2) The historian of Judges has an epic purpose, as early historians (e.g. Herodotus) often had. The epos, or theme, of the historian of Judges is the revolt and subjugation of the Israelites with he introduces the history proper; he has it ever in mind to unfold why Jahweh allowed the foe to abide so long in the promised land, and even to defeat the chosen people, and why He raised up the judges. The idolatry of Israel is the reason. (3) The didactic purpose of the book is to teach Israel that the commandments of Jahweh should be obeyed (iii, 4). When Israel leaves Jahweh, Jahweh leaves Israel, at least for the while; the foes of Israel triumph (cf. Aug., "De Civ. Dei", xvi, 43).

VI. SOURCES.—The problem is complicated. Most contradictory theories have been proposed. According to Moore (see "Internat. Crit. Comm." on "Judges"); also art. in "Encyc. Bib.") the body of the book (i, 6—xvi, 31) is Deuteronomistic; the general setting of the stories and the purpose of that setting show characteristics of the seventh and sixth centuries, the influence of Deuteronomy and of the great Prophets Jeremias and Ezechiel. The stories of the book, out of their setting and apart from their set purpose in the Book of Judges, are pre-Deuteronomistic; they show no Deuteronomic traces except in the introductions and the links that chain the various stories together. Indeed, Moore would have it that this redaction has but the intention of the setting of which the Rationalists frame their various hypotheses. The song of Debora (v) is archaic by contrast with the language of its setting. The story of Gedeon is original from a different hand than that of the first writer of Sanam's history; the latter uses וָעֲשָׁה (xi, 6; xiv, 17, 20), while that former has פָּשַׁל (vi, 17; vii, 12; viii, 26); he who originally wrote that "the spirit of God chased (וֹאכַֽלּ) Gedeon" (vi, 34), may be admitted not to have been identical with him who conceived that "the spirit of the Lord rushed (וָעֲשָׁה) upon Sanam" (xvi, 6; 19; xv, 14).

Catholic for the book's old assigned the Book of Judges to many hands. So Maldonatus (Comm. in Matt., ii, 23), Pineda (In Job, praef., iii), Clair (p. 10), and many others. Hummelaer (In Jud., 27) argues that the longer narratives—those of Aod (iii, 15—30), Barae (iv and v), Gedeon (vi—viii), Abimelech (ix), and Jepht (xi, 1—xii, 7), and Samson (xiii—xiv)—are distinct accounts, written by separate authors, who were contemporary or almost contemporary with the events they narrated. These varied narratives Samuel incorporated much as he found them; he drew from tradition for the minor details which he gives about the lesser judges. While setting these stories together, Samuel diverged in regard to the complete thoughts he culled from others, as well as the introductions, links, and remarks he superadded.

VII. HISTORICITY.—(1) Internal Evidence.—The
writer of Judges was contemporary with some of the events which he narrated; used documents written by those who were contemporary, or all but contemporary, with the deeds they told; and shows every sign of sincerity, care, and truth. The very concern of the writer to give the truth explains the manifold literature (Ist and 2nd books) preserved. He has preserved the style of the song of Debora and that of the fable of Joatham. He has transmitted sayings peculiar to place and to person (ii, 5; iv, 5; vi, 24, 32; xv, 19; xviii, 12, 29). The rationalistic objections to the miraculous in the stories of Gideon and Samson are generally met by the writers who tell upon these portions of Judges as legendary; to Catholics these are as historical as any other portion of the work. The enemies to the historicity of the book in vain insist that these stories are set down as legends to please the Israelites. The writer of Judges so berates the Israelites for idolatry and inter-tribal dissension that it is unscientific to accuse him of truckling to their pride in their heroes.

(2) External Evidence.—(a) Catholic tradition is clear. The Fathers look upon the narrative of Judges as fact-narrative; their unani mity is admitted by all who deem that unanimity worth consideration. (b) O.-T. tradition is marked by a sum monous amount of interest (1–5), gives details the historical value of which is attested by Josue (see Josue): Juda's siege of Dabir (i, 10–15; Jos., xv, 14–19), the Jebusites in Jerusalem (i, 21; Jos., xv, 63), the Chanaanites in Gazer along with Ephraim (i, 29; Jos., xvi, 10), the Chanaanites dwelling with Manasses (i, 27; Jos., xvi, 11). Like details are the death of Josue (i, 6–9; Jos., xxiv, 28– 31), the capture of Leshem by Dan (xvii, 28; Jos., xix, 47). The Books of Kings tell as facts much that we read in Judges: Israel's forgetfulness of Jehovah, her defeat by the foe and salvation by the judges (1 Kings, 8:4–24 after the death of Solomon, the death of Gideon (ix, 53); 2 Kings, xi, 21). The Psalms dwell proudly on the deeds of the judges: the fate of Sisara, Jabin, Oreb, Zeb, Zebee, and Salmann (vii, 22, 25; iv, 15; viii, 21; Ps. lxii, 10–12); the entire history of Judges in outline (Ps. cv, 34–40). The Prophets refer to real facts given in Judges: the defeat of Madian by Gideon (Isa. ix, 4; x, 29); the crime at Gaba (Osee, ix, 9; x, 9). (c) In the N. T., St. Paul mentions the judges in their proper place between Josue and Samuel (Acts, xxii, 20); praises some of the judges along with certain kings (Heb., xi, 32).

Hence internal evidence shows that the Masoretic text is in very good condition. "It is better preserved than any other of the historical books" (Moore, "Judges", 433). The only serious difficulties are in the song of Deborah. (2) Greek.—We have two distinct Septuagint forms (cf. Lagarde, "Septuaginta-Studien", 1892, 172): one is seen in the Alexandrinus (A), Codex Vaticanus (V), Basilianus, Vaticanus (V), and many cursive; the other version is represented by the Vatican (B), and a considerable number of cursive. (3) Latin.—St. Jerome's version is one of his most careful efforts at translation of the Masorah, and is of the greatest exegetical importance. Fathers: Tertullian, Quaestiones in Libros Judicium in P. G., XXXVI, 485; Procopius, Gomma, in Judices in P. G., LXXVII, 104; St. Aquinas, Questions in Ignatius against the Jews, L, 479; Claris, De Lege et Ruth (Paris, 1878). Protestant commentators of worth are Moore, Halkett, Budge, Bertheau, and Walter Drum.

Judgment. See Procedure, Canonical.

Judgment, Divine.—This subject will be treated under four heads: I. Divine Judgment Subjectively and Objectively Considered; II. Pre-Christian Beliefs Concerning Judgment after Death; III. Particular Judgment; IV. General Judgment.

I. Divine Judgment Subjectively and Objectively Considered.—Divine judgment (judicium divinum), as an immanent act of God, denotes the action of God's retributive justice by which the destiny of rational creatures is decided according to their merits and demerits. This includes: (1) God's knowledge of the moral worth of the acts of free creatures (Deus qui illum patris animam approbat, on determining the just consequences of such acts; (2) the Divine verdict upon a creature amenable to the moral law, and the execution of this sentence by way of reward and punishment. It is clear, of course, that the judgment, as it is in God, cannot be a process of its nature; it is not identical with the Divine Essence. But the effects of the judgment, since they take place in creatures, follow the sequence of time. The Divine judgment is manifested and fulfilled at the beginning, during the progress, and at the end of time. In the beginning, God pronounced judgment upon the whole race, as a consequence of the fall of its representatives, the first parents (Gen., iii). Death and the infirmities and miseries of this life are the consequences of that original sentence. Besides this common judgment there have been special judgments on particular individuals and peoples. Such great catastrophes as the flood (Gen., vii, 17), the destruction of Sodom and Gomorra (Gen., xviii, 20), the earthquake that swallowed up Core and his followers (Num., xvi, 30), the plagues of Egypt (Ex., vi, 6; xii, 12), and the evils that came upon other oppressors of Israel (Ezech., xxv, 11; xxviii, 22) are represented in the Bible as Divine judgments. The fear of God is such a fundamental idea in the Old Testament that it insists mainly on the punitive aspect of the judgment (cf. Prov., xi, 31; Ezekiel, xiv, 21). An erroneous view of these truths led many of the rabbis to teach that all the evil which befalls man is a special chastisement from on high, a doctrine which was declared false by Christ.

There is also a judgment of God in the world that is subjective. By his acts man adheres to or deviates from the law of God, and thereby places himself within the sphere of approval or condemnation. In a sense, then, each individual exercises judgment on himself. Hence it is declared that Christ came not to judge but to save (John, iii, 17; xviii, 15; xii, 47). The intermediate judgment proceeds according to a man's attitude towards Christ (John, iii, 18). Though all the happenings of life cannot be interpreted as the outcome of Divine judgment, whose external manifestation is in the intermediate judgment, it is extensive with the life of the individual and the race. The judgment at the end of time will complement the previous visitations of Divine retribution and will manifest the final result of the daily secret judgment. By its sentence the eternal destiny of creatures will be decided. As there is a twofold end of time, so there is likewise a twofold eternal judgment, the particular judgment, at the hour of death, which is the end of time for the individual, and the general judgment, at the final epoch of the world's existence, which is the end of time for the human race.

II. Pre-Christian Beliefs Concerning Judgment after Death.—The idea of a final judgment beyond the grave, which would rectify the sharp contrast so often observed between the conduct and the fortune of men, was prevalent among all nations in pre-Christian times. Such was the doctrine of metempsychosis or the transmigration of souls, as a justification of the ways of God, adopted among the Hindus of all classes and sects, the Pythagoreans, the Orphic mystics, and the Druids. The doctrine of a forensic judgment in the unseen world, by which the eternal lot of departed souls is determined, was also widely prevalent in pre-Christian times.

The Egyptian idea of the judgment is set forth with great precision of detail in the "Book of the Dead", a collection of formule designed to aid the dead in
their passage through the underworld (see EGYPT). The Babylonians and the Assyrians make no distinction between the good and the bad so far as the future habitation is concerned. In the Gilgames epic the hero is marked as judge of the dead, but whether his rule was the moral value of their actions is not clear. An unerring judgment and compensation in the future life was a cardinal point in the mythologies of the Persians, Greeks, and Romans. But, while these mythological schemes were credited as strict verities by the ignorant body of the people, the learned saw in them only the allegorical presentation of truth. There were always some who denied the doctrine of a future life, and this unbelief went on increasing till, in the last days of the Republic, skepticism regarding immortality prevailed among Greeks and Romans.

With the Jews, the judgment of the living was a far more prominent idea than the judgment of the dead. The Pentateuch contains no express mention of recompense in the future life, and it was only at a comparatively late period, under the influence of a fuller revelation, that the belief in resurrection and judgment began to play a capital part in the faith of Judaism (Vigouroux, "La Bible et les découvertes modernes", pt.V, ii, c.vi). The traces of this theological development are plainly visible in the Maccabean struggles between the two great opposing parties, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, whose divergent interpretations of Scripture led to heated controversies, especially regarding the future life. The Sadducees denied all reward and penalty in the hereafter, while their opponents encumbered the truth with judicious details. Thus some of the rabbis asserted that the trumpet which would summon the world to judgment would be one of the horns of the ram which Abraham offered up instead of his son Isaac. Again they said: "When God judges the Israelites, He will stand, and make the judgment brief and mild; when He judges the Gentiles, He will sit and make it long and severe." A part from such rabbinical fables, the current belief reflected in the writings of the rabbis and the pseudepigrapha at the beginning of the Christian Era was that of a preliminary judgment and of a final judgment to occur at the consummation of the world, the former to be executed against the wicked by the personal prowess of the Messias and of the saints of Israel, the latter to be pronounced as an external sentence by God or the Messias (cf. Tixeront, "Histoire des Dogmes", i, 1, 43). The particular judgment of the individual person is lost sight of in the universal judgment by which the Messias will vindicate the wrongs endured by Israel (Tixeront, op. cit., 41). With Alexandrian Judaism, on the contrary, with that at least of which Philo is the exponent, the dominant idea was that of an immediate retribution after death (Tixeront, op. cit., 51, 52). The two dissenting sects of Israel, the Essenes and the Samaritans, were in agreement with the majority of Jews as to the existence of a discriminating retribution in the life to come. The Essenes believed in the pre-existence of souls, but taught that the after-existence was an unchanging state of bliss or woe according to the deeds done in the body. The eschatological tenets of the Samaritans were at first few and vague. Their doctrine of the resurrection and of the day of vengeance and recompense was a theology patterned after the model of Judaism, and first formulated for the sect by its greatest theologian, Marka (a.p. fourth century).

III. PARTICULAR JUDGMENT. - A. Dogma of Particular Judgment. - The Catholic doctrine of the particular judgment consists in this, that immediately after death the eternal destiny of each separated soul is decided by the just judgment of God. Although there has been no formal definition on this point, the dogma is clearly implied in the Union Decree of Eugene IV (1439), which declares that souls quitting their bodies in a state of grace, but in need of purification, are cleansed in Purgatory, whereas souls that are perfectly pure are at once admitted to the beatific vision of the Godhead (\textit{ipses Deum summum et trinum}), and those who depart in actual mortal sin, or merely with original sin, are at once consigned to eternal punishment, the quality of which corresponds to their sin (\textit{penis tamen disporbus}) (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", ed.10, n. 595—twelfth ed., n. 596). The doctrine is also in the profession of faith of Michael Paleologus in 1274 (Denz., "Ench.", ed. 10, n. 464—old ed., n. 387), in the Bull "Benedictus Deus" of Benedict XII, in 1316 (Denz., "Ench.", ed. 10, n. 521—old ed., n. 456), in the profession of faith of Gregory XIII (Denz., "Ench.", ed. 10, n. 1064—old ed., n. 870), and of Benedict XIV (ibid., n. 1468—old ed., n. 875).

B. Existence of Particular Judgment Proved from Scripture. - Eccles., xi, 9; xii, 1 sq.; and Heb., ix, 27, are sometimes quoted in proof of the particular judgment, but though these passages speak of a judgment after death, neither the context nor the force of the words proves that the sacred writer had in mind a judgment distinct from that at the end of the world. The Scriptural arguments in defence of the particular judgment must be indirect (cf. Billot, "Questions de Novaismus", II, p. 1). There is no text of which we can certainly say that it expressly affirms this dogma, but there are several which teach an immediate retribution after death and thereby clearly imply a particular judgment. Christ represents Lazarus and Dives as receiving their respective rewards immediately after death. They have always been regarded as types of the just man and the sinner. To the penitent thief it was promised that his soul instantly on leaving the body would be in the state of the blessed: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke, xxiii, 43). St. Paul (II Cor., v) longs to be absent from the body that he may be present to the Lord, evidently understanding death to be the entrance into his reward (cf. Phil., i, 21 sq.). Eccles,
xi, 28-29, speaks of a retribution at the hour of death, but it may refer to a temporal punishment, such as sudden death in the midst of prosperity, the evil remembrance that survives the wicked, or the misfortunes suffered by the innocent. The quotations have been quoted are sufficient to establish the strict conformity of the doctrine with Scripture teaching. (Cf. Acts, i, 25; Apoc., xx, 4-6, 12-14.)

C. Paedicis Testimony Regarding Particular Judgment.—St. Augustine witnesses clearly and emphatically to this faith in the early Church. Writing to the presbytery of Peter, he criticizes the works of Vincentius Victor on the soul, pointing out that they contain nothing except what is vain or erroneous or mere commonplace, familiar to all Catholics. As an instance of the last, he cites Victor's interpretation of the passage of St. Lucas (v, 11, 15), the temporal or eternal to that" said St. Augustine, "which he [Victor] most correctly and very soundly holds, viz., that souls are judged when they depart from the body, before they come to that judgment which must be passed on them when reunited to the body and are tormented or glorified in the same flesh which has been rejoined to the spirit. The matter of which you [Peter] were unaware. Who is so obstinate against the Gospel as not to perceive those things in the parable of the poor man who carried after death to Abraham's bosom and of the rich man whose torments are set before us? (De anima et ejus origen, II, n. 6). In the sermon of the Fathers occur graphic descriptions of the particular judgment (cf. S. Ephraem, "Sermon de secundo Adventu"); "Sermo in eou qui in Christo obdormiunti"

D. Heresies.—Lactantius is one of the few Catholic writers who discussed this doctrine (Inst., div., VIII, c. xxi). Among heretics the particular judgment was denied by one at one and Vigintio in the Hymn and the Thelpeleychites and the Thetilpeleychites believed that at death the soul passed away, according to the former into a state of unconsciousness, according to the latter into temporary destruction. They believed that souls would arise at the resurrection of the body for judgment. This theory of "soul-slumber" was defended by the Nestorians and Copts, and later by the Anatapists, Socinians, and Armenians. Calvin (Inst. III, 25) holds that the final destiny is not decided till the last day.

E. Prompt Fulfilment of Sentence.—The prompt fulfilment of the sentence is one of the dogmata of the doctrine of particular judgment, but until the question was settled by the decision of Benedict X, in 1332, there was much uncertainty regarding the fate of the departed in the period between death and the general resurrection. There was never any doubt that the punishment of the soul in the hereafter was the responsibility of the judges and the theologians maintained the opinion that until the resurrection the just do not enjoy the intuitive or the vision of God, but are under the protection and consolation of the humanity of Jesus Christ. Pope John XXII (1316-1334) at Avignon, as a private theologian, supported this idea; but he gave it any official sanction is a false invention of the Fallibilists. His successor, Benedict XII, ended the controversy by the Bull "Benedictus Deus"

F. Circumstances of Particular Judgment according to Canonists and Theologians. Most of these theologians suppose that the particular judgment will immediately follow the moment of death. The separated soul is internally illuminated as to its own guilt or innocence and of its own initiation it takes its course either to hell, or to purgatory, or to heaven (St. Thomas, "Suppl.", Q. ixxii, a. 2; Q. lixxvii, a. 2). In confirmation of this the particular judgment is the work of the soul written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ (Rom., ii, 15-16). The "Book of Judgment", in which all the dead, who are written (Apoc., xx, 12), and the appearance of angels and demons to bear witness before the judgment seat are regarded as allegorical descriptions (St. Aug., "De Civ. Dei", XX, xiv). The common opinion is that
the particular judgment will occur at the place of death (Suares in III, Q. lxx, a. 6, disp. 52).

IV. GENERAL JUDGMENT (JUDICIUM UNIVERSALE).

—A. Existence of the General Judgment.—(1) Few truths are oftener or more clearly proclaimed in Scripture than that of the general judgment. To the Prophets of the Old Testament refer they speak of the "Day of the Lord" (Joel, ii, 31; Ezech., xxi, 5; Is., ii, 12), in which the nations will be summoned to judgment. In the New Testament the second Parusia, or coming of Christ as Judge of the world, is an oft-repeated doctrine. Himself not only foretold the event but graphically portrays its circumstances (Matt., xxiv, 27 sqq.; xxv, 31 sqq.). The Apostles give a most prominent place to this doctrine in their preaching (Acts, x, 42; xvii, 31) and writings (Rom., ii, 5-16; xiv, 10; I Cor., iv, 5; II Cor., v, 10; II Tim., iv, 1; II Thess., i, 5; James, v, 7). Besides the name Parusia (ἐπαρεσία), or Advent (I Cor., xvii, 23; I Thess., ii, 19), the Second Coming is also called Epiphany, dvipimena, or Appearance (II Thess., ii, 8; I Tim., vi, 14; II Tim., iv, 1; Tit., ii, 13), and Apocalypse (ἀποκάλυψις), or Revelation (II Thess., i, 7; I Peter, iv, 13). The time of the Second Coming is spoken of as "that Day" (II Tim., iv, in prosperity and adversity, which are sometimes the promissory lot of the good and of the bad, everything is ordered by an all-wise, all-just, and all-ruling Providence: it was, therefore, necessary not only that rewards and punishments should await us in the next world, but that they should be awarded by a public and general judgment.

B. Signs that are to Precede the General Judgment.

—The Scriptures mention certain events which are to take place before the final judgment. These predictions were not intended to serve as indications of the exact time of the judgment, for that day and hour are known only to the Father, and will come when least expected. They were meant to foreshadow the last judgment and to keep the end of the world present to the minds of Christians, without, however, exciting useless curiosity and vain fears. Theologians usually enumerate the following nine events as signs of the last judgment: (1) General Preaching of the Christian Religion.—Concerning this sign the Saviour says: "And this gospel of the kingdom, shall be preached in the whole world, for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the consummation come" (Matt., xxiv, 14). This sign was understood by Chrysostom and Theoph-
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eraly admitted from the foregoing and other texts that before the Second Coming there will arise a powerful adversary of Christ, who will seduce the nations by his wonders, and persecute the Church (see 2 Thess. ii, 9 sq.). But the power of this Antichrist will be checked and curtailed by the operation of the providence of God. The Scriptures clearly indicate that the judgment will be preceded by unwonted and terrific disturbances of the physical universe (Matt. xxiv, 29; Luke, xxi, 25-28). The wars, pestilences, famines, and earthquakes foretold in Matt. xxiv, 6 sq., are also understood as a threat of the coming deluge of judgments. (6) The judgment will be exhibited in its full intensity of the last times. (7) The Universal Conflagration.—In the Apostolic writings we are told that the end of the world will be brought about through a general conflagration, which, however, will not annihilate the present creation, but will change its form and substance into a glorious state (cf. 2 Pet. iii, 10-13; cf. 1 Thess. v, 2, Apoc. iii, 3, and xvi, 15). Natural science shows the possibility of such a catastrophe being produced in the ordinary course of events (cf. Kirvan, "Comment peut finir l’univers," chap. i), but theologians generally incline to the belief that its origin will be entirely miraculous. (8) The Trumpet of Resurrection.—Several texts in the New Testament speak of a trumpet which will awaken the dead to resurrection (1 Cor. xv, 52; 1 Thess. iv, 15; John v, 28). According to St. Thomas (Suppl. Q. lxvii, a. 2) there is reference in these passages either to the voice or to the apparition of Christ, which will cause the resurrection of the dead. The trumpet is indicated as the sign immediately preceding the appearance of Christ to judge the world. By this sign the Fathers of the Church generally understand the appearance in the sky of the Cross on which the Saviour died, a wonderful cross of light. C. Circumstances Accompanying the General Judgment.—(1) Time.—As was stated above, the signs that are to precede the judgment give no accurate indication of the time when it will occur (Mark, xiii, 32). When the disciples asked the Saviour: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" He answered: "It is not for you to know the times or moments, which the Father hath put in his own power" (Acts, i, 6, 7). The uncertainty of the day of judgment is continually urged by Christ and the Apostles as an incentive to vigilance. The day of the Lord will come like a thief (Matt. xxi, 34), like a lightning suddenly appearing (ibid., verse 27), like a snare (Luke, iii, 34), as the Deluge (Matt. xxiv, 37). (2) Place of the Judgment.—All the texts in which mention is made of the Parousia, or Second Coming, seem to imply clearly enough that the general judgment will take place on the earth, and that the Son of Man will appear in the heavens (1 Thess. iv, 16, that the judgment will be held in the air, the newly risen being carried into the clouds to meet Christ; according to others the prophecy of Joel (iii, 1 sq.), places the last judgment in the Valley of Josaphat (q. v.). (3) The Character of the Judge.—As this judgment is described to Christ, not only as God, but also as Man, is expressly declared in Scripture; for although the power of judging is common to all the Persons of the Trinity, yet it is specially attributed to the Son, because to Him also in a special manner is ascribed wisdom. But that as Man He will judge the world is confirmed by Christ Himself (John, v, 22, 27). At the Second Coming Christ will appear in the heavens, seated on a cloud and surrounded by the angelic hosts (Matt. xvi, 27; xxv, 30; xxv, 31). The angels will minister to the Judge by bringing all before Him (Matt. xxiv, 31). The elect will aid Christ in a celestial capacity (1 Cor. vii, 2). The lives of the just will in themselves be a condemnation of the wicked (Matt. xxv, 41), whose punishment they will publicly approve. But the Apostles will be judges of the world in a sense yet more exact, for the promise that they shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix, 28) seems to imply a real participation in judicial authority. According to a very probable opinion, this prerogative is extended to all who are suitably called to the college of the ministers of the Gospel (Matt. xix, 27, 28). Nothing certain is known as to the manner in which this delegated authority will be exercised. St. Thomas conjectures that the greater saints will make known the sentence of Christ to others (Suppl. Q. lxxxviii, a. 2). (4) Those to be judged are both good and bad, according to the Arian Creed, will appear in the judgment to give an account of their deeds. As to children who have personally done neither good nor evil, the baptized must be distinguished from the unbaptized. The former appear in the judgment, not to be judged, but only to receive the reward of their works (Summa Theol., Suppl., Q. lxxx, a. 5 ad 3 um), while the latter, ranked with the wicked, although not judged, will be enabled to realize the justice of their eternal loss (Suárez). The angels and the demons will not be judged directly, since their eternal destiny has already been fixed; yet, because they have shared in the fortunes of men, the sentence pronounced on the latter will have a corresponding effect on them also (Summa Theol., Suppl., Q. lxxxix, a. 8). (5) Object of the Judgment.—The judgment will embrace all works, good or bad, forgiven as well as unforgiven, sins of the Son of Man appearing in the Heavens."—In St. Matthew, xxiv, 30, this is indicated as the sign immediately preceding the appearance of Christ to judge the world. By this sign the Fathers of the Church generally understand the appearance in the sky of the Cross on which the Saviour died, a wonderful cross of light. (6) Form of the Judgment.—The procedure of the judgment is described in St. Matthew (xxv, 31-46) and in the Apocalypse (xx, 12). Commentators see in these passages allegorical descriptions intended to convey in a vivid manner the fact that in the last judgment the conduct and deserts of each individual will be made plain not only to his own conscience but to the knowledge of the assembled world. It is probable that no words will be spoken in the judgment, but that, like a Divine illumination, each creature will thoroughly understand his own moral condition and that of every fellow-creature (Rom., ii, 15). Many believe, however, that the words of the sentence: "Come, ye blessed", etc., and "Depart from me", etc., will be really addressed by Christ to the multitudes of the saved and lost. D. Results of the General Judgment.—With the fulfillment of the sentence pronounced in the last judgment the relations and the dealings of the Creator with the creature find their culmination, are explained and justified. The Divine purpose being accomplished, the human race will, as a consequence, attain its final destiny. The result of mankind will be the sequel of the General Judgment.

St. Thomas, Summa Theologica, Suppl., De Resurrectione, Q. xix-xxi; JUINUMANN, Tractatus de Novissima (Ratisbon, 1856); COMPENDIUM, Theol. Dogm. IV (Innsbruck, 1885); T. T. BILLOR, Questiones de Novissima (Rome, 1903); POHLE, Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, III (Faderborn, 1906), 659-662 and 722-725; ATBERGEN, Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie (Freiburg, 1896); TIXERONT, Histoire des Dogmes, I, II (Paris, 1868).

J. A. McCULLOUGH.

Judgments of God. See ORDEALS.

Judica Sunday, name given to the fifth Sunday of Lent, and derived from the first words of the Introit of that day: "Judica me, Deus"—"Judge me, O God" (Ps. xlii). Passion Sunday is the more common name, and in Germany this day is called "Black Sunday", from the custom of veiling the crosses and statues in
the church, which was formerly done at the words in the Gospel "Jesus hid Himself", but is now done in the Mass during Holy Week. Many say that in very early times this day was called "Dominica mediana", a title that seems more properly to belong to mid-Lent Sunday. On Judica Sunday several significant changes take place in the Church's Liturgy. The Judica psalm is not again said at the beginning of Mass until Easter Day, the Gloria is omitted, to signify the ignominy of Christ's Passion, when His glory was for the time being laid aside; and the whole spirit of the Office and Mass is one of solemn preparation for the great events of the coming Holy Week. At Rome the station on this day was formerly observed in the Vatican Basilica.

PHILIPPE, RITORNO DIVINI OFFICI (Venice, 1589): MARTINEZ, De Actis, Mon. Rubius (Lyons, 1890): GESCHWANDER, L'ANNEE LITURGIQUE, t. SHEPHERD (Dublin, 1887); LEHNT, HIST. ET SYMBOLOSMES DE LA LITURGIE (Paris, 1809). G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Judith, Book of—History.—Nabuchodonosor, King of Nineveh, sends his general Holofernes to subdue the Jews. The latter besieges them in Bethulia, a city on the southern verge of the Plain of Esdrelon. Achor the Ammonite, who speaks in defence of the Jews, is maltreated by him and sent into the besieged city to await his punishment when Holofernes shall have taken it. Famine undermines the courage of the besieged and they contemplate surrender, but Judith, a widow, upbraids them and says that she will deliver the city. She goes into the camp of the Assyrians and captivates Holofernes by her beauty, and finally takes advantage of the general's intoxication to cut off his head. She returns inviolate to the city with his head as a trophy, and a sally on the part of the Jews results in the rout of the Assyrians. The book closes with a hymn to the Almighty by Judith to celebrate her victory.

TEXT.—The book exists in distinct Greek and Latin versions, of which the former contains at least eighty-four verses more than the latter. St. Jerome (Pref. in Lib.) says that he translated it from the Chaldaic in one night, "magis sensum e sensu, quam ex verbo verbum transierit" (aiming at giving sense for sense rather than at giving closely to the wording). He adds that his codices differed much, and that he expresses in Latin only what he could clearly understand of the Chaldaic.

Two Hebrew versions are known at present, a long one practically identical with the Greek text, and a shorter, evidently abridged, of which the former is closely allied to the latter when discussing the origin of the book. The Chaldaic, from which St. Jerome made our present Vulgate version, is not recoverable unless indeed it be identified with the longer Hebrew version mentioned above. If this be the case we can gauge the value of St. Jerome's work by comparing the Vulgate with the Greek text. We at once find that St. Jerome did not exaggerate when he said that he made his translation hurriedly. Thus a comparison between vi, 11, and viii, 9, shows us a certain confusion relative to the names of the elders of Bethulia—a confusion which does not exist in the Septuagint, where also x, 6, should be compared. Again in iv, 5, the high priest is Elishachim, which name is later changed into Joachim (xv, 9)—an allowable change but somewhat misleading; the Septuagint is consistent in using the form Joachim. Some of the historical statements in the Greek text are curious: according to the Vulgate, for example, the thirteenth year (Vulg.) of Nabuchodonosor becomes the eighteenth in the Septuagint, which also adds a long address of the king to Holofernes. St. Jerome has also frequently condensed the original—always on the supposition that the Septuagint and the longer Hebrew version do really represent the original. To give but one instance:

Septuagint (ii, 27).

"And he came down into the plain of Damascus at the time of the wheat harvest, and he burnt up all their fields, their flocks and their herds which he delivered to destruction, their vineyards, their olive groves, and the fruits of their fertile plains he scattered like chaff, and he struck all their young men with the edge of the sword."

Vulgate (ii, 17).

"And after these things he went down into the plains of Damascus in the days of the harvest, and he set all the corn on fire, and he caused all the trees and vineyards to be cut down."

With regard to the Septuagint version of the Book of Judith it should be noted—that it has come down to us in two recensions: Codex B or Vaticanus on the one hand, and Codex Alexandrinus (A) with Codex Sinaiticus (G) on the other.

HISTORIORITY.—Catholics with very few exceptions accept the Book of Judith as a narrative of facts, not as an allegory. Even Jahn considers that the genealogy of Judith is inexplicable on the hypothesis that the story is a mere fiction ("Introductio", Vienna, 1814, p. 461). Why carry out the genealogy of a fictitious person through fifteen generations? The Fathers have nothing to say on the subject as historical. St. Jerome, who excluded Judith from the Canon, none the less accepted the person of the valiant woman as historical (Ep. Ixv, 1).

Against this traditional view there are, it must be confessed, very serious difficulties, due, as Calmet insists, to the doubtful and disputed nature of the text. The historical and geographical statements in the book, as we now have it, are difficult to understand: thus (i) Nabuchodonosor was apparently never King of Ninevè, for he came to the throne in 605, whereas Ninevè was destroyed certainly not later than 606, and that after the battle of Carchemish; (ii) the allusion in i, 6, to Erioch, King of the Eliechis, is suspicious; we are reminded of the Arich of Gen., xiv, 1. The Septuagint makes him King of the Elumeans, presumably the Elamites, (iii) the character of Nabuchodonosor is hardly that portrayed for us on the monuments: in the India House Inscription, for example, his sentiments are remarkable for the modesty of their tone. On the other hand, we must remember that, as Sayce says, the "Assyrian kings were most brazen-faced liars on their monuments"; (iv) the name Vagoa, or the Septuagint Bagos, for the eunuch of Holofernes is suggestive of the Bagoes, who, according to Josephus (Antiquities, XI, vii, 1), polluted the temple and to whom apparently we have a reference in the recently discovered papyri from Assuan; (v) the mixture of Babylonian, Greek, and Persian names in the book should be noted; (vi) the genealogy of Judith as given in the Vulgate is a medley: that given in the three principal Greek codices is perhaps better but varies in every one. Still it is an historical genealogy, though ill-conserved; (vii) a geographical puzzle is presented by the Vulgate of ii, 12-16; the Septuagint is much superior, and it should be noted that throughout this version, especially in Codex B, we have the most interesting details furnished us (cf. particularly i, 9; ii, 13, 28-9). The Septuagint also gives us information about Achor which is wanting in the Vulgate: it is apparently hinted in vi, 2, 5, that he was an Ephraimite and a mercenary hired by Moab; (viii) Bethulia is a mystery: according to the Vulgate there are few streets and towers (vii, 22, 32), and withstood a long siege at the hands of a vast army. Its position, too, is stated with minuteness; it stood on the edge of the Plain of Esdrelon and guarded the pass to Jerusalem; yet no trace of the existence of such a place is to be found (unless we accept the theory of Conder, "The Book", 5th ed., p. 239); (ix) the name, Judith (Jew-
oe), Achior (brother of light), and Bethulia (?Bethel, i.e. ?Jerusalem, or perhaps from the Hebrew הננה "a virgin"—in the shorter Hebrew version Judith is called not "the widow" but "the virgin", i.e. Bethulia), sound rather like symbolic names than those of actual persons. To the Restoration; (xi) there is no king in Palestine (iv, 5), but only a high priest, Joachim or Eliachim; and in iv, 8; xi, 14; xv, 8 (Sept.), the Sanhedrin is apparently mentioned; (xiii) the book has a Persian and even a Greek colouring, as is evidenced by the recurrence of such names as Bagao and Hoilofernes.

These are serious difficulties, and a Catholic student must be prepared to meet them. There are two ways of doing so. (a) According to what we may term "conservative" criticism, these apparent difficulties can every one be harmonized with the view that the book is perfectly historical and deals with facts which actually took place. Thus, the geographical details are not to be strained by the translators of the original text or to copyists living long after the book was composed, and consequently ignorant of the details referred to. Calmet insists that the Biblical Nabuchodonosor is meant, while in Arphaxad he sees Phraorotes whose name, as Vigouroux (Les Livres Saintes et La Critique Rationaliste, iv, 4th ed.) shows, could easily have been thus perverted. Vigouroux, however, in accordance with recent Assyrian discoveries, identifies Nabuchodonosor with Assur-bani-pal, the contemporary of Phraorotes. This enables him to refer the events to the time of the captivity of Manassees under Assur-bani-pal (1 Par., xxviii, 11; cf. Sayce, "Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments", 4th ed., p. 458). It is further maintained that the campaign conducted by Hoilofernes is well illustrated in the records of Assur-bani-pal which have come down to us. And these facts will undoubtedly afford an explanation of the apparent allusion to the captivity: it was indeed a Restoration, but that of Manassees, not that of Edeas. The reference, too, to the Sanhedrin is doubtful; the term ימא is used of the "ancients" in Lev., ix, 3, etc. Lastly, Conder's identification of Bethulia with Mithilah (loc. cit: supra) is highly probable, and he gives us the geographical position in iv, 1-9, knew the geography of Palestine thoroughly. And we are given details about the death of Judith's husband which (viii, 2-4) can hardly be attributed to art, but are rather indications that Judith represents a really existing heroine. With regard to the state of the text it should be noted that the extraordinary variants presented in the various versions are themselves a proof that the versions were derived from a copy dating from a period long antecedent to the time of its translators (cf. Calmet, "Intro in Lib. Judith").

Catholic writers are not satisfied with Calmet's solution of the difficulties of the Book of Judith; they deem the errors of translators and of scribes to be no sufficient explanation in this matter. These few Catholics, together with the non-Catholics that do not care to throw the book over entirely into the realm of fiction, assure us that the Book of Judith has the style of composition, the style, etc., round us local personage, she and her heroic deed lived in the memory of the people; but the difficulties enumerated above seem to show that the story as we now have it was committed to writing at a period long subsequent to the facts. The history, so it is maintained, is vague; the style of composition, the style, etc., round us personal narrative, the story is not the same as the Book of the Books of Machabees. A remarkable knowledge of the Psalter is evinced (cf. vii, 19, and Ps. cxv, 6; vii, 21, and Ps. lxxviii, 10, cxiii, 2; ix, 6, 9, and Ps. xix, 8; ix, 16, and Ps. cxlvii, 10; xiii, 21, and Ps. cv, 1). Some of these psalms must almost certainly be referred to the period of the Second Temple. Again, the High Priest Joachim must presumably be identified with the father of Eliashib, and must therefore have lived in the time of Artaxerxes long before the time of Artaxerxes. (n. c. Cf. Josephus, "Antiquities", XI, vi-vii). We referred above to a shorter Hebrew version of the book; Dr. Gaster, its discoverer, assigns this manuscript to the tenth or eleventh century A. D. (Proceedings of Soc. of Bibl. Archæol., XVI, pp. 156 sqq.). It is expressly stated that only the gist of the story. Yet it seems to offer a solution of many of the difficulties suggested above. Thus Hoilofernes, Bethulia, and Achior, all disappear; there is a very natural explanation of the purification in xii, 7; and, most noticeable of all, the enemy is no longer an Assyrian, but Seleucus, and his attack is on Jerusalem, not on Bethulia.

If it could be maintained that we have in this manuscript the story in its original form, and that our canonical book is an amplification of it, we should then be in a position to explain the existence of the numerous and various. The influence of Seleucus brings us down to Machabean times, the title of Judith, now no longer the "widow" but the "virgin" (נים), may explain the mysterious city; the Machabean colouring of the story becomes intelligible, and the theme is the efficacy of prayer (cf. vi, 14-21; viii, 4; II Mach., xv, 12-16).

Canonity. The Book of Judith does not exist in the Hebrew Bible, and is consequently excluded from the Protestant Canon of Holy Scripture. But the Church has always maintained its canonity.

St. Jerome, while rejecting in theory those books which he did not find in his Hebrew manuscript, yet consented to translate Judith because "the Syedon of Nicea is said to have accounted it as Sacred Scripture" (Pref. in Lib.). It is true that no such declaration is to be found in the Canons of Nicea, and it is uncertain whether St. Jerome is referring to the use made of the book in the discussions of the council, or whether he was misled by some spurious canons attributed to that council, but it is certain that the Fathers of the earliest times have reckoned Judith among the canonical books; thus St. Paul seems to quote the Greek text of Judith, vii, 14, in I Cor., ii, 10 (cf. also I Cor., x, 10, with Judith, viii, 25). In the early Christian Church we find it the writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians, iv, 7, Clement of Alexandria, Origin, and Tertullian, consult the various Biblical dictionaries and introductions; also Cursel Costello (1887). The best summary of the various views and arguments on the question is in GROUT, "Special Introd. to the Jewish People in the Time of Christ", div. II, vol. III. Vigouroux, La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes, IV (9th ed.), 275-305; Brunengo, II Nabuchodonosor di Giuda (Naples, 1888).

HUGH POPE.

Juliana, Saint, suffered martyrdom during the Diocletian persecution. Both the Latin and Greek Churches mention a holy martyr Juliana in their lists of saints. The oldest historical notice of her is found in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" for 16 Feb., the place of birth being given as Cumae in Campania (In Campania Cumbas, natale Julianae). It is true that the notice is contained only in the one chief manu-
Naples, telling him to accede to the wishes of Januaria ("Gregori Magni epist."); lib. IX, ep. xxxv, in Migne, P. L., LXXVII, 1015). The Acts of St. Juliana used by Bede in his "MartYROLOGIUM" are purely legendary, and are found in both a Latin and a Greek version. According to the account given in this legend, St. Juliana lived in Naples and was betrothed to the Senator Eleusius. Her father Africanus was a pagan and hostile to the Christians. In the persecution of Maximianus, Juliana was beheaded after suffering frightful tortures. Soon after a noble lady, named Sphenia, came through Nicomedia and took the saint's body with her to Italy, and had it buried in Campania. Evidently it was this alleged translation that caused the martyrdom. Juliana, honoured in Nicomedia, to be identified with St. Juliana of Cumae, although they are quite distinct persons. The veneration of the St. Juliana of Cumae became very widespread, especially in the Netherlands. At the beginning of the thirteenth century her remains were transferred to Naples. The description of this translation by a contemporary writer is still extant. The feast of the saint is celebrated in the Latin Church on 16 Feb., in the Greek on 21 December. Her Acts describe the circumstances in which the saint had with her husband. She is represented in pictures with a winged devil she leads by a chain.


J. P. KIRSCH.

Juliana Falconieri, Saint, b. in 1270; d. 12 June, 1341. Juliana belonged to the noble Florentine family of Falconieri. Her uncle, St. Alexius Falconieri, was one of the seven founders of the Servite Order (q. v.). Through his influence she also consecrated herself from her earliest youth to the religious life and the practices of Christian perfection. After her father's death she received about A. D. 1335 from St. Philip Beniti, then General of the Servites, the habit of the Third Order, of which she became the foundress. Untill her mother's death she remained in her parents' house, where she followed the rule given her by St. Philip Beniti, practising perfect chastity, strict obedience, the exercises of religious prayer, and works of Christian charity. After her mother's death she and several companions moved into a house of their own in 1305, which thus became the first convent of the Sisters of the Third Order of Servites, Juliana remaining the superior until the end of her life. Their dress consisted of a black gown, secured by a leather girdle, and a white veil. As the gown had short sleeves to facilitate work, people called the sisters of the new order "Mantellate". They devoted themselves especially to the care of the sick and other works of mercy, and the superiores, through her heroic deeds of charity, set a noble example to all. For thirty years Juliana directed the community of Servite Tertiaries. An extraordinary occurrence, mentioned in the oratio of her feast day, took place at her death. Being unable to receive Holy Communion because of constant vomiting, she requested the priest to spread a cuspidary on her breast and go on with the Host. Shortly afterwards the Host disappeared and Juliana expired, and the image of a cross, such as had been on the Host, was found on her breast. Immediately after her death she was honoured as a saint. The Order of Servite Tertiaries was sanctioned by Martin V, and Juliana was beatified by him. In 1509, at the permission of Clement XII, the Church at St. Juliana.

JULIANA Falconieri canonized her in 1737, and extended the celebration of her feast on 19 June to the entire Church. St. Juliana is usually represented in the habit of her order with a Host upon her breast.

Acta SS., III, June, 917-25; BERNARD, Vita della beata Giuliana Falconieri (Florence, 1681); LOMBARDI, Vita di S. Juliana Falconieri (Rome, 1758); LEGNANI, Giuseppe, Storia della vita di S. Juliana Falconieri (Bologna, 1866); FELT, Hans, Life of St. Juliana Falconieri (Bohemia, 1681); BARTINI, Comprensione della vita di S. Giuliana Falconieri (Florence, 1664); BATTINI, Giuseppe, Comprensione della vita di S. Giuliana Falconieri (Brussels, 1897).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Julian and Basilissa, Saints, husband and wife, died at Antioch or, more probably, at Antioch in the reign of DIOCLETIAN, early in the fourth century, on 9 January, according to the Roman Martyrology, or 8 January, according to the Greek Menaea. We have no historically certain data relating to these two holy personages, and more than once this Julian of Antioch has been confounded with Julian of Cilicia. The confusion is easily explained by the fact that thirty-nine saints of this name are mentioned in the Roman Martyrology, eight of whom are commemorated in the one month of January. But little is known of this saint, once we put aside the exaggerations of his Acts. He is described by his family to have had with his wife Basilissa, that they should both preserve their virginity, and further encouraged her to found a convent for women, of which she became the superior, while he himself gathered a large number of monks and undertook their direction. Basilissa died a very short time after her husband's death, on 5 March. During the persecution of Diocletian he was arrested, tortured, and put to death at Antioch, in Syria, by the order of the governor, Martian, according to the Latin; at Antioch, in Egypt, according to the Greeks, which seems more probable. Unfortunately, the Acts of this martyr belong to those pious romances so much appreciated in early times, whose authors, concerned only for the edification of their readers, drowned the few known facts in a mass of imaginary details. Like many similar lives of saints, it offers miracles, prodigies, and improbable utterances, that lack the least historical value. In any case these two saints must have enjoyed a great reputation in antiquity, and their veneration was well established before the eighth century. In the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" they are mentioned under 6 January; Usuard, Adu, Notker, and others place them under the ninth, and Bolland under the thirteenth of the same month, while Vandelbert puts them under 13 February, and the Menology of Canisius under 21 June, the day to which the Greek Menaea assign St. Julian of Cessarea. There used to exist at Constantinople a church under the invocation of these saints, the dedication of which is inscribed in the Greek Calendar under 5 July.

Acta SS., Bolland, Jan., I (1643), 570-75; MARCUCCHI, I SS., Giuliano e Basilissa, spose, vergini e martiri, protettori dei congiunti (Genoa, 1873); TEMOPOLE, Mémories pour servir à l'Histoire eccl., V (Paris, 1686), 799 sqq.; SZECHA, Völ. Sanct., I (Venice, 1851), 61-62.

LÉON CLUGNET.

Juliana of Liège, Saint, nun, b. at Retinne, near Liège, Belgium, 1193; d. at Fosses, 5 April, 1258. At the age of five she lost her parents and was placed in the convent of Mont-Cornillon, near Liège. She made rapid progress, and read with pleasure the writings of St. Augustine and St. Bernard. She also cultivated an ardent love of the Blessed Virgin, the Sacred Passion, especially the Blessed Sacrament. In 1203 she received the veil, and devoted herself to the sick in the hospital in charge of the convent. She very early exerted every energy to introduce the feast of Corpus Christi. In 1230 she was chosen supecessoress by the unanimous vote of the community. But soon God sent the sky heavy trials. In 1237 she received permission to celebrate the Feast of St. Juliana. Clement XII canonized her in 1737, and extended the celebration of her feast on 19 June to the entire community. In 1233 by intrigues and bribery. Disliking the virtues
and piety of Juliana, and much more her entertainments and recreations, he incited the populace against her. She fled to the cell of St. Eve of Liège, and then to a house given her by John, a canon of Lausanne. Vindicated in the courts through the influence of Robert de Thorate, Bishop of Liège, she was restored to her position in the community, and Roger was deposed. But in 1247 Roger was again in power, and successively one after the other the saint. Juliana found refuge at Namur and then at Fosses, where she passed the last years of her life in seclusion. At her own request she was buried at Villiers. After her death a number of miracles occurred at her intercession (Acta SS., April, I, 456 sq.). In 1689 Pius IX ratified her vision of St. Bernard and of Jesus in her sleep and Mass in her honour. Her feast is on 6 April.

Messner of the Sacred Heart (1898), 221; Irish Ecc. Record (1827), 301; MONTCHAMP, Les ristolec de Blee, laume de Cornilson (Lille, 1889); SCHRAMMEN in Ann. soc. archéol. Nivelles, VII (Nivelles, 1890), 1-88; CHEYALLES, Histoire.

FRANCIS MERMAN.

Juliana of Norwich, English mystic of the fourteenth century, author or recipient of the vision contained in the book known as the "Sixteen Revelations of Divine Love". The original form of her name appears to have been Julian. She was probably a Benedictine nun, living as a recluse in a nunnery of which traces still remain in the east part of the churchyard of St. Julian in Norwich, which belonged to Carrow Priory. According to her book, this revelation was "shewed" to her on 8 or 14 May (the readings differ), 1373, when she was thirty years and a half old. This would refer her birth to the end of 1342. Her statement, that "for twenty years after the time of this shewing, save three months, I had teaching inwardly", proves that the book was not written before 1393. An early fifteenth-century manuscript, recently purchased for the British Museum from the Amherst library, states that she "yet is on life, Anno Domini 1413". It is probable that this is the manuscript cited by Francis Blomefield, the eighteenth-century historian of Norfolk, and that a misreading of the date led to the statement that she was still living in 1442. Attempts have been made to identify her with Lady Julian Lampet, the anchoress of Carrow, references to whom occur in documents from 1426 to 1478; but this is manifestly impossible. The newly-discovered manuscript differs considerably from the complete version hitherto known of, which it is a kind of condensation, lacking the beginning and the end. Only three, much later, manuscripts of the whole text are known to exist. The earliest of these is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (from which the book was first edited by Serenus de Cresey in 1670), dates from the sixteenth century; the other two, both in the British Museum and not independent of each other, belong to the seventeenth. The better of the latter, which was edited in a modernized form by Grace Warrack in 1901, is evidently a copy of a much earlier original.

Whatever be their precise date, these "Revelations", or "Shewings", are the most perfect fruit of later medieval mysticism in England. Juliana describes herself as "a simple creature unlettered" when she received them; but, in the years that intervened between the vision and the composition of the book, she evidently acquired some knowledge of theological phraseology, and her work appears to show the influence of Walter Hilton, as well as neo-Platonic analogies. There is another probability of the author of the "Divine Cloud of Unknowing". There is one passage, concerning the place in Christ's side for all mankind that shall be saved, which argues an acquaintance with the letters of St. Catherine of Siena. The psychological insight with which she describes her condition, distinguishing the manner of her vision and recognizing when she has to deal with a more delusion, is worthy of St. Teresa. When seemingly at the point of death, in the bodily sickness for which she had prayed in order to renew her spiritual life, she passes into a trance while contemplating the cross, and has the vision of Christ's sufferings "in which all the shewings that follow be grounded and joined".

The book is the record of twenty years' meditation upon that one experience; for, "when the shewing, which is given for a time, is passed and hid, then faith keepeth it by grace of the Holy Ghost unto our lives end". More than fifteen years after, she received in "ghostly understanding" the explanation, the key to all religious experience: "What? How dost thou wait upon Lord's meaning in this thing? Was it not Jesus that was His meaning. Who shewed it thee? Love. Wherefore shewed He it thee? For love. Hold thee therein, thou shalt wit more in the same. But thou shalt never wit therein other without end." With this illumination, the whole mystery of Redemption and the purpose of human life become clear to her, and even the possibility of sin and the existence of evil does not trouble her, but is made "a bliss by love". This is the great deed, transcending our reason, that the Blessed Trinity shall do at the last day: "Thou shalt see thyself that all manner of thing shall be well." Like St. Catherine of Siena, Juliana has little of the dualism of body and soul that is frequent in the mystics. God is in our "sensuality" as well as in our "substance", and the body and the soul render mutual aid: "Either of them take help of other till we be brought up into stature, as kind worketh." Knowledge of God and knowledge of self are inseparable: we may never come to the knowing of one without the knowing of the other. "God is more nearer to us than our own soul", and in falling and in rising we are ever previously kept in one love." She lays special stress upon the "homeliness" and the "courtesy" of God's dealings with us, "for he delighteth in wisdom and in meekness and in meekness doth he work with us." With this we must correspond by a happy confidence; "failing of comfort" is the "most mischief" into which the soul can fall. In the Blessed Virgin the Lord would have all mankind see how they are loved. Throughout her revelation Juliana submits herself to the authority of the Church: "I yield me to our mother Holy Church, as a simple child ought.

Sixteen Revelations of Divine Love, shewed to a Devout Servant of Our Lord, called Mother Julian of Norwich, ed. CREASY, 1670 (reprinted, London, 1843); ed. COLLIN (London and Derby, 1877); ed. WARRACK (London, 1901); ed. TYNDR (London, 1902); BLOMEFIELD in "Historical and Statistical History of the County of Norfolk, IV" (London, 1867); "Carrow Abbey otherwise Carrow Priory (Norwich, 1889); INGE, Studies of English Mystics (London, 1895); British Museum, Add., MS. 37790.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Julianists. See Eutychianism.

Julian of Eclanum, b. about 386; d. in Sicily, 454; the most learned among the leaders of the Pelagian movement and Bishop of Eclanum near Beneventum. He was the son of Memoriaus, a bishop in Apulia, and his ecclesiastical career began in his father's church, where he was occupied and subsequently deacon. About 417 he was raised to episcopal rank by Innocent I, and placed in charge of a see variously styled Eclana, Eclanum, Ecclanum, Eclanum or Eclanum. There is no means of deciding how Julianus, who enjoyed an enviable reputation for learning, zeal, and sanctity, was led finally himself with the Pelagian theses to the Heretical Church. In 418, his "Epirotol Tractatoria", Julianus was one of the eighteen Italian bishops who refused to subscribe to the condemnation of Pelagius which it contained. In consequence of this refusal he was exiled under the decree of the Emperor Honorius, which pronounced banishment against Pelagius and his sympathizers. Driven from Italy in 421, he commenced an active
literary campaign in the interests of the new heresy, and by his writings soon won for himself the position of intellectual leader of the opposition party. To him is due the credit of having systematized the teachings of Pelagius and Cælestinus. His writings, which were frankly Pelagian, were largely directed against the doctrines which St. Augustine had denied, and for several years after the expulsion of the Pelagians the controversy had a history. There is much material in the controversy between Julian and Augustine. Most of Julian's works are lost, and are known only through the copious quotations found in the works of his great adversary. Principal among them are the letter to Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, and the epistle to the Pelagians, to Bishop Augustin, at the request of Pope Boniface, which is refuted in his work "Against Two Letters of the Pelagians"; the reply to Augustine's work "De Nuptiis et Concipientiis"; and his answer to Augustine's defence of his own work. Driven from Italy, he found refuge for a time with Theodoric of Mopsuestia, who, though sympathetically, subsequently subscribed to his condemnation. At the accession of each pontiff Julian sought to have the Pelagian controversy re-opened, but this merely resulted in further condemnations by Cælestinus, Sixtus III, and Leo I. For a time he enjoyed the patronage and friendship of Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Bishop of the Emperor Theodosius II, Marius Mercator, by his "Communitorium de Cælesto", opened the eyes of the emperor to the true character of Pelagianism. By reason of this Julian was expelled from Constantinople. His subsequent career, with the exception of his attempts to conciliate the pope, is not known. Julian was the most learned among the Pelagians, and, though superior to Pelagius and Cælestinus, his system did not differ materially from theirs.

Bartholomeus, Patrolog. Gr. Tom. (St. Louis, 1908); D. F. de C. 2. C. Tim. 1. 1710. KOHANN, Der Pelagianismus nach seinen Ursprüngen und seiner Lehre (Freiburg im Br., 1865; 2nd ed., 1874); KLÄM, Die innere Entwicklung des Pelagianismus (Freiburg im Br., 1882); HERRE, Consilium, Geschichte, II, 104 sq.; BRUCKNER, Julian von Ecdemon, sein Leben und seine Lehre in Texten und Untersuchungen, XY (Leipzig, 1897), iii.

Patrick J. Healy.

Julian of Halicarnassus. See Eutychianism.

Julian of Speyer, often called Julianus Truxonicus, a famous composer, poet, and historian of the thirteenth century, b. at Speyer; d. at Paris about 1250 (not in 1258, as is so often stated). He studied at the celebrated University of Paris, and was the musical director at the Palace of Germany both to the reigns of Philip Augustus (1170-1223) and Louis VIII (1223-6) of France. When he resigned to become a member of the newly founded Order of St. Francis is not known. But it is certain that Julian accompanied Brother Simon Angelicus to his native land, where the latter was made Provincial of Germany by the General Chapter of Assisi in 1227. It is possible that he was present at the translation of St. Francis at Assisi in May, 1230. Subsequently he again lived in Paris at the great convent of the Minorites, where he was choir-master as well as corrector mensis in which capacity he superintended the reading in the church. During his life he was known to the family of Aegidius of Assisi (written between 23 February, 1229, and 4 October, 1235), as well as that of St. Anthony of Padua, who was canonized on 30 May, 1232 (composed probably shortly after 1241).

Both these musical, as well as poetical, masterpieces are still used by the Minorites. The acme of liturgical narrative poems, these works are equally distinguished for the harmony, rhythm, and rhyme of the verses, and for their subtle and profound compositions. Of their kind they are unequalled. Only a few sentences in the third nocturn (the antiphons) were written by Pope Gregory IX and the cardinals; the remainder is all Julian's composition. Even outside the Franciscan Order the rhythmic liturgical structure has been acknowledged. This is most frequently taken (especially from the "Historia rhythmica" of St. Francis), and these plagiarisms set to Julian's melodies without any alteration. It is not known how much of the poetical narrative of St. Dominic (d. 1221), used on his feast by both Franciscans and Dominicans, belongs to Julian II; but some portions of the Mass formulas of St. Francis and Anthony are undoubtedly the musical and poetical composition of Julian. Only in the last decade was Julian recognized as the author of the "Legenda S. Francisci"—partly published in the "Acta SS." October, II, 548 sq., and published in full in "Analecta Bollandiana," XXI (1902), 160-202—and of the "Vita ab auctore anonymo" of St. Anthony of Padua, printed in the "Acta SS.", June, II, 705 sqq.


Michael Bihl.

Julian the Apostate (Flavius Claudius Julianus), Roman emperor 361-363, b. at Constantinople in 331; d. 26 June, 363; son of Julius Constantius, the half-brother of Constantine the Great. With his stepbrother Gallus, who was some years older, he escaped the massacre of his kinsfolk at Constantinople after the death of Constantine the Great, and was brought up by the eunuch Mardonius and the philosopher Neoplatonists—his latter secretly a pagan. The ambitious Emperor Constantius sent Julian later to the castle of Macellum in Cappadocia. Julian received a Christian training, but the recollection of the murder of his relatives sowed in him a bitter resentment against the authors of that massacre, and he extended this hatred of the Christians during his reign. When the Christians of Egypt became involved in war in the West with the usurper Magnentius, he named Gallus his colleague, with the title of Caesar. Julian was allowed to study at Constantinople, but his intellectual character aroused attention and caused Constantius to send him in 350 to Neustria. Here Julian distinguished himself exclusively to neo-Platonic philosophy, mixed with all kinds of magic and mysteries. The neo-Platonic, Maximus of Ephesus, dazzled him by his fantastic teachings and prophesied his destined task, the restoration of paganism. When, at the close of 354, Constantius recalled Gallus Caesar to Italy and had him beheaded for his manifold cruelties, Julian was taken a state prisoner to Milan, but, gaining the sympathy of the Empress Eusebia, secured permission to visit in 355 the schools of Athens, where Greek philosophy and rhetoric were enjoying their last period of prosperity. Julian now went over completely to the so-called Hellenism, and was initiated into the mysteries of the Egyptian mysteries. Julian was presented on 6 November, 355, to the army as Caesar, married the emperor's youngest sister Helena, and then went to Gaul. Here he at once displayed great ability, both as soldier and administrator. He boldly advanced from his headquarters at Vinetiae to Reims, and thence made a sally
In May, 362, Julian left Constantinople for Asia and made active preparations at Antioch for a great war with Persia. While at Antioch in the winter of 362–63, he wrote his books against the Christians. In March, 363, he advanced from Antioch through Mesopotamia and Armenia. Long jealous of Julian, the emperor now ordered the latter to send a part of his most experienced German auxiliaries, although these troops had been enlisted for the Gallic war only. Against the advice of Julian the missioner Decennius in the winter of 360 started with the picked troops by way of Paris, and stopped here to rest: a mutiny now broke out, the troops appeared before Julian's residence, and enthusiastically proclaimed him Augustus. To avoid a civil war, Julian sought to come to an agreement with Constantius whom he was ready to acknowledge as supreme emperor. Constantius, however, demanded the unconditional surrender of the title of Caesar and of his position as governor of Gaul. Neither the army nor the people would consent to this, and Julian died in the spring of Illyricum, taking possession of the capital, Sirmium. Shāpūr having disbanded his great Persian army, Constantius now planned to turn his entire fighting strength against his rebellious cousin Julian. While on the march, however, Constantius died, 3 November, 361.

Julian advanced in triumph to Constantinople. Hitherto outwardly a Christian, he now let himself be portrayed as under the protection of Zeus, who in his opinion possessed with Helius the same undivided creative power. He commanded all towns to reopen the temples for pagan worship, restored animal sacrifices, and assumed the duties of a Pontifex Maximus. The Christians were united in fighting their enemy. Julian issued a decree that all titles to lands, rights, and immunities bestowed since the reign of Constantine upon the Galileans, as he contemptuously called the Christians, were abrogated, and that the moneys granted to the Church for the revenge of St. Basil the great the State must be repaid. He forbade the appointment of Christians as teachers of rhetoric and grammar. Still, he copied the organization of the Christian Church; he created, for example, a form of hierarchy, the head of which was the imperial Pontifex Maximus, and urged pagans to imitate such Christian virtues as charity and mercy. Yet Julian's changes failed to bring him any appreciable success. His attempt to defy the Gospel and rebuild the temple at Jerusalem was brought to nothing by fire and earthquake.

Julie Billiart, BLESSED, foundress and first superior-general of the Congregation of the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur, b. 12 July, 1751, at Cuville, a village of Picardy, in the Diocese of Beauvais and the Department of Oise, France; d. 8 April, 1816, at the mother-house of her institute, Namur, Belgium. She was the sixth of the seven children of Pierre Billiart and his wife Marie-Louise-Antoinette Debraine. The childhood of Julie was remarkable; at the age of seven she knew the catechism by heart, and used to gather her little companions around her to hear them recite it and to explain it to them. Her education was confined to the village school, which was kept by her uncle, Thiibault Guilbert. In spiritual things her progress was so rapid that the parish priest, M. Dangecourt, allowed her to make her First Communion and to be confirmed at the age of nine years. At this time she made a vow of chastity. Misfortunes overtook the Billiart family and forced Julie and her mother to leave the village, which was then kept by her uncle, Thiibault Guilbert. In spiritual things her progress was so rapid that the parish priest, M. Dangecourt, allowed her to make her First Communion and to be confirmed at the age of nine years. At this time she made a vow of chastity. Misfortunes overtook the Billiart family and forced Julie and her mother to leave the village, which was then kept by her uncle, Thiibault Guilbert.
At Amiens, where Julie Billiart had been compelled to take refuge with Countess Baudoin during the troublous times of the French Revolution, she met Françoise Blin de Bourdon, Viscountess of Gézaincourt, who was destined to be her co-labourer in the great work as yet unknown to either of them. The Viscountess Blin de Bourdon was thirty-eight years old at the time of her meeting with Julie, and had spent her youth in piety and good works and had been imprisoned with all her family during the Reign of Terror, and had escaped death only by the fall of Robespierre. She was not at first attracted by the almost speechless paralytic, but by degrees grew to love and admire the invalid for her wonderful gifts of soul. A little company of young and high-born ladies, friends of the viscountess, was formed around the youth of “the saint”. Julie taught them how to lead the interior life, while they devoted themselves generously to the cause of God and his poor. Though they attempted all the exercises of an active community life, some of the elements of stability must have been wanting, for these ladies disingenuously dropped off until none was left but Françoise Blin de Bourdon. She was never to be separated from Julie, and with her in 1803, in obedience to Father Varin, superior of the Fathers of the Faith, and under the auspices of the Bishop of Amiens, the foundation was laid of the Institute of the Sisters of Notre Dame, a society which had for its primary object the salvation of poor children. Several young persons offered themselves to assist the two superiors. The first pupils were eight orphans. On the feast of the Sacred Heart, 1 June, 1804, Mother Julie, after a novena made in obedience and patience to her, was cured of paralysis. The first vows of religious were made on 15 October, 1804, by Julie Billiart, Françoise Blin de Bourdon, Victoire Leelu, and Justine Garson, and their family names were changed to the names of saints. They proposed for their life-work the Christian education of girls, and the training of religious teachers who should go wherever their services were asked for. Father Varin gave the community a provisional rule by way of probation, which was so far-sighted that its essentials have never been changed. In view of the extension of the institute, he would have it governed by a superior-general, charged with visiting the houses, nominating the local superiors, corresponding with the members dispersed in the different convents, and assigning the revenues of the society. The characteristic devotions of the Sisters of Notre Dame were established by the foundress from the beginning. She was original in doing away with the time-honoured distinction between choir sisters and lay sisters, but this perfect equality of rank did not in any way prevent her from putting each sister to the work for which her capacity and education fitted her. She attached great importance to the formation of the sisters destined for the schools, and in this she was greatly assisted by Mother St. Joseph (Françoise Blin de Bourdon), who had herself received an excellent education.

When the Congregation of the Sisters of Notre Dame was approved by an imperial decree dated 19 June, 1806, it numbered thirty members. In that and the following years foundations were made in various towns of France and Belgium, the most important being those at Ghent and Namur, of which latter house Mother St. Joseph was the first superior. This spread of the institute beyond the Diocese of Amiens cost the foundress the greatest sorrow of her life. In the absence of Father Varin from that city, the confessor of the community, the Abbé de Sambucy de St-Étèbre, a man of superior intelligence and attainments but evangelical, endeavored through legal means and at the cost of much time and labor, to have the constitution and fundamental constitutions of the new congregation so as to bring it into harmony with the ancient monastic orders. He so far influenced the bishop, Mgr Demondolx, that Mother Julie had soon no alternative but to leave the Diocese of Amiens, relying upon the goodwill of Mgr Pisani de la Gaultie, Bishop of Namur, who had invited her to make his episcopal city the centre of her congregation, should a change become necessary. In leaving Amiens, Mother Julie laid the case before all her subjects and told them they were perfectly free to remain or to follow her. All but two chose to go with her, and thus, in the mid-winter of 1809: the convent of Namur became the mother-house of the institute and is so still. Mgr Demondolx, soon undeceived, made all the amends in his power, entreating Mother Julie to return to Amiens and re-build her institute. She did indeed return, but, after vain struggle to find subjects or revenues, went back to Namur. The seven years of poverty and labor, all the sacrifices she were spent in forming her daughters to solid piety and the interior spirit, of which she was herself the model. Mgr de Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, said of her that she saved more souls by her inner life of union with God than by her outward apostolate. She received special supernatural favours and unlooked-for aid in peril and need. In the space of twelve years (1804–16) Mother Julie founded fifteen convents, made one hundred and twenty journeys, many of them long and toilsome, and carried on a close correspondence with her spiritual daughters. Hundreds of these letters are preserved in the mother-house. In 1815 Belgium was the battle-field of the Napoleonic wars, and the mother-general suffered great anxiety, as several of her convents were in the path of the armies, but they escaped injury. In January, 1816, she was taken ill, and, after three months of pain borne in silence and patience, she expired. An elegant effort of charity was the first to make her burial. The fame of her sanctity spread abroad and was confirmed by several miracles. The process of her beatification, begun in 1811, was completed in 1906 by the decree of Pope Pius X dated 13 May, declaring her Blessed.

Blessed Julie’s predominating trait in the spiritual order was her ardent charity, springing from a lively faith and manifesting itself in her thirst for suffering and her zeal for souls. Her whole soul was echoed in the simple and naïve formulas which was continually on her lips and pen: “Oh, qu’il est bon, le bon Dieu!” (How good God is). She possessed all the qualities of a perfect superior, and inspired her subjects with filial confidence and tender affection.

Sister of Notre Dame. The Life of Blessed Julie Billiart (London, 1890); CLAIR, Le Bienheureuse Julie Billiart (Paris, 1900); ARENS, Die selige Julie Billiart (Berlin and St. Louis, 1908); ANNALS of the Institute of the Sisters of Notre Dame (Namur, 1804–1909); Process of the Beatification and Canonization of the Blessed Julie Billiart (Rome, 1902–05).

Sister of Notre Dame.

Juliopolis, a titular see in the province of Bithynia Secunda, suffragan of Nicæa. The city was founded under the Emperor Augustus by a robber chieftain named Cleon, who was a native of the region; presumably it had been named Clea (Stobæus, Hist. XIV, viii, 9; Pliny, "Hist. Natur.", V, xl, 3). The location of the city is unknown, none of its titulars being known, neither does it figure in any "Notitia episcopatum", unless it may be considered identical with Cordosberoi, as Le Quien thinks (Oriens Christ., I, 879). This Juliopolis must not be confounded.
with another town of the same name situated in Galatia Prima, and which under the name of Gordium was formerly the capital of Phrygia. It was there, in the temple of Zeus, that Alexander cut the famous Gordian knot. Under its own name, or that of Basilica, Juliiopolis of Galatia is noticed in all the "Notitia episcopatum", and Le Quien (op. cit., I, 475-78) gives the name of a number of its bishops. Its ruins are about six miles S. S. E. of Nali-Khan, and about three miles north of the Sangarius, in the plain of Aigamghir and the vilayet of Angora.

**Julius I, Saint, Pope, 337–352.** The immediate successor of Pope Sylvester, Marcus, ruled the Roman Church for only a very short period—from 18 January to 7 October, 330—and after his death the papal chair remained vacant for four months. What occasioned this comparatively long vacancy is unknown. On 6 Feb., 337, Julius, son of Rusticus and a native of Rome, was elected pope. His pontificate is chiefly celebrated for his firm intervention in the Arian controversies, about which we have abundant sources of information. After the death of Constantine the Great (22 May, 337), his son Constantine II, Governor of Gaul, permitted the exiled Athanasius to return to his See of Alexandria (see Athanasius). The Arians in Egypt, however, set up a rival bishop in the person of Pius, sent an embassy to Julius asking him to admit Pius into communion with Rome, and delivering to the pope the decisions of the Council of Tyre (335) to prove that Athanasius had been falsely deposed. Athanasius likewise sent envoys to Rome to deliver to Julius a synodal letter of the Egyptian bishops, containing a complete justification of their patriarch. On the arrival of the Athanasian envoys in Rome, Macarius, the head of the Arian representatives, left the city; the two remaining Arian envoys, with the Athanasian deputies, were summoned by Pope Julius. The Arian envoys now begged the pope to assemble a great synod before which both parties should present their case for decision.

Julius convened the synod at Rome, having dispatched two envoys to bear a letter of invitation to the Eastern Church. Under the leadership of Eusebius, who had been raised from Nicomedia to the See of Constantinople, the Arian bishops had meanwhile held a council at Antioch, and elected George of Capadocia Bishop of Alexandria in the place of Pius. George was intruded forcibly into his see, and Athanasius, being again exiled, made his way to Rome. Many other Eastern bishops removed by the Arian party, among them Marcellus of Ancyra, also came to Rome. In a letter couched in haughty terms, however, the Arian bishops of the party of Eusebius refused to attend the synod summoned by Julius. The synod was held in the autumn of 340 or 341, under the presidency of the pope, in the titular church of the presbyter Vitus. After a detailed examination of the documents, Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra, who had made a satisfactory profession of faith, were exonerated and re-established in their episcopal rights. Pope Julius communicated this decision in a very notable letter to the bishops of the Eusebian party. In this letter he justifies his proceedings in the case, defends in detail his action in reinstating Athanasius, and animadverts strongly on the non-appearance of the Eastern bishops at the council, the convening of which they themselves had suggested. Even if Athanasians were somewhat.grown, the letter runs, the Alexandrian Church should first have written to the pope. "*Can you be ignorant*," writes the pope, "*that this is the custom, that we should be written to first, so that from here what is just may be defined*" (Julii ep. ad Antiocch. e. c. xxxii). After his victory over his brother Constantine II, Emperor Constans was ruler over the greater part of the Empire. He was entirely orthodox in his views, and, at the request of the pope and other Eastern bishops, invited to the council held with Constantius, Emperor of the East, in favour of the bishops who had been deposed and persecuted by the Arian party. Both rulers agreed that there should be convened a general council of the Western and Eastern bishops at Sardica, the principal city of the Province of Dacia Mediterranea (see Constantine the Great). It took place in the autumn of 342 or 343. July 33rd and 4th (326). The representatives the priests Archidamus and Philoxenus and the deacon Leo. Although the Eastern bishops of the Arian party did not join in the council, but held their assembly separate and then departed, the synod nevertheless accomplished its task. Through the important canons iii, iv, and v (in the Latin text) of this council, the procedure against accused bishops was more exactly regulated, and the manner of the papal intervention in the condemnation of bishops was definitely established.

At the close of its transactions the synod communicated its decisions to the pope in a dutiful letter. Notwithstanding the reaffirmation of his innocence by the Synod of Sardica, St. Athanasius was not restored to his see by Emperor Constantius until after the death of George, the rival Bishop of Alexandria, in 346. Pope Julius took this occasion to write a letter, which is still extant, to the priests, deacons, and the faithful of Alexandria, to congratulate them on the return of their great pastor. The two bishops Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursia, who, on account of their Arianism, had been deposed by the Council of Sardica, now made a formal recantation of their error to Julius, who, having summoned them to an audience and received a signed confession of faith, restored to them their episcopal sees. Concerning the inner life of the Roman Church during the pontificate of Julius we have no exact information; all agree, however, that there was a rapid increase in the number of the faithful in Rome, and also in the basilicas erected: the titular church of Julius (now S. Maria in Trastevere) and the Basilica Julia (now the Church of the Twelve Apostles). Besides these he built three churches over cemeteries outside the walls of Rome: one on the road to Porto, a second on the Via Aurelia, and a third on the Via Flaminia adjoining the tomb of the martyr St. Valentine. None of the last-mentioned have been discovered. The veneration of the faithful for the tombs of the martyrs continued to spread rapidly. Under the pontificate of Julius, if not earlier, catalogues of feast-days of saints came into use—the Roman feast-calendar of Philemon dates from the year 336.

Through St. Athanasius, who remained in Rome several years subsequent to 339, the Egyptian monastic life became well-known in the capital, and the example of the hermits of the Egyptian deserts found many imitators in the Roman Church. Julius died on 12 April, 352, and was buried in the catacombs of Calepodius on the Aurelian Way, and, very soon after his death, was honoured as a saint. His body was later transported to S. Maria in Trastevere, the church which he had built. His feast is celebrated on 12 April.

Giulianetto, Pope (Giuliano della Rovere), b. on 5 December, 1443, at Albissola near Savona; crowned on 22 March, 1455, in St. Peter's in the night of 10-21 February, 1513. He was born of a probably noble but impoverished family, his father being Rafael della Rovere and his mother Theodora Manerola, a lady of Greek extraction. He followed his uncle Francesco della Rovere into the Franciscan Order, and lived as hermit in the valley of the Nera near the church of St. Mary of the Convent near Perugia. With the elevation of his uncle to the papacy as Sixtus IV on 9 August, 1471, begins the public career of Giuliano. On 15 December, 1471, he was created Cardinal of St. Peter in Vincoli, and thereafter literally overwhelmed with benefices, although during the lifetime of Sixtus IV he never took a prominent part in the turmoil and dissipation of the pontificate. For the church of St. Mary of the Convent near Perugia he was commendatory Abbot of Nonantola, Grottaferrata, and Gorze, and drew the revenues of various other ecclesiastical benefices. These large incomes, however, he did not spend in vain pomp and dissipation, as was the custom of many ecclesiastics of those times. Indeed, he sought to use his wealth to advantage and spent most of his superfluous money in the erection of magnificent palaces and fortresses. Still his early private life was far from stainless, as is sufficiently testified by the fact that before he became pope he was the father of three daughters, the best known of whom, Felice, he gave in marriage to Giovanni Giordano Orsini in 1508.

In June, 1474, Giuliano was sent at the head of an army to restore the papal authority in Umbria. He succeeded in reducing Todi and Spoleto, but for the subjugation of Città di Castello he needed the assistance of Duke Federigo of Urbino. In February, 1476, he was sent as legate to France to regulate the affairs of his Archdiocese of Aigleon, and probably to oppose the council which Louis XI intended to convene at Lyons. In 1480 he was sent as legate to the Netherlands and France to accomplish three things, viz. to settle the quarrel concerning the Burgundian inheritance between Maximilian and Louis XI, to prevent the help of France against the Turks, and to effect the liberation of Cardinal Balduino whom Louis XI had held in strict custody since 1469 on account of treasonable acts. After successfully completing his mission he returned to Rome in the beginning of 1492, accompanied by the illustrious Cardinal Bichi. At that time a war was just breaking out between the pope and Venice on one side and Ferrara on the other. Giuliano made various attempts to restore peace, and was probably instrumental in the dissolution of the Veneto-Papal alliance on 12 December, 1482. He also protected the Cismon family against the cruel persecutions of Cardinal Girolamo Riario in 1484. After the death of Sixtus IV on 12 August, 1484, Giuliano played a disreputable role in the election of Innocent VIII. Seeing that his own chances for the papacy were extremely meagre, he turned all his efforts to securing the election of a pope who was likely to be a puppet in his hands. Such a person he saw in the weak and irresolute Cardinal Bichi, who owed his cardinalate to Giuliano. To effect the election of his candidate he did not scruple to resort to bribery. Bichi ascended the papal throne as Innocent VIII on 29 August, 1484. Inflamed during the last eight years of his pontificate by the strong and energetic Giuliano, the war that broke out between the pope and King Ferrante of Naples must be attributed chiefly to Giuliano, and it was also due to him that it did not come to an earlier conclusion.

After the death of Innocent VIII on 25 July, 1492, Giuliano again aspired to the papacy, but his great influence during Innocent's pontificate and his pronounced sympathy with the claims of the Romagna made him a likely candidate to the cardinals. He was shrewd enough to understand the situation. He was, however, loath to see the tiara go to Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, not because the latter was an unworthy candidate, but on account of his personal aversion towards the Borgia. Despite Giuliano's efforts, Borgia was the successful candidate, and ascended the papal throne as Alexander VI on 11 August, 1492. Fearing for his safety in Rome, Giuliano withdrew to his strongly fortified castle at Ostia towards the end of 1492. An apparent reconciliation between Alexander VI and Giuliano was effected in July, 1493, but Giuliano did not trust the sly machinations of Alexander and returned to France. Another appearance of trust between them was afterward declared. When Giuliano assisted the pope in the matrimonial affairs of Cesare Borgia. But Giuliano's distrust of Alexander remained. He evaded Rome, spending most of his time in France and Northern Italy.

After the death of Alexander on 18 August, 1503, he returned to Rome on 3 September to take part in the election of the new pope. He was again a strong candidate for the papacy, but his great ambition was not yet to be realized. The sick and aged Francesco Piccolomini ascended the papal throne as Pius III, but died on 18 October, 1503, after a reign of only twenty-six days. Giuliano's chance of being elected was now better than at any previous election. To ensure his success he made great promises to the cardinals, and did not hesitate to employ bribery. The conclavists began 31 October, and after a few hours the cardinals united their votes on Giuliano, who as pope took the name of Julius II. It was the shortest conclavist in the history of the Church. In preparing the cardinals for the election, the following terms were secured by the cardinals: (1) the continuation of the war against the Turks; (2) the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and the convocation of a general council for that purpose within two years; (3) that no war was to be undertaken without the consent of two-thirds of the cardinals, who were to be consulted on all important matters, especially concerning the creation of new members for the Sacred College; (4) that the pope with two-thirds of the cardinals were to determine upon the place of the next general council. Such an unlawful restriction, it was stipulated that Giuliano should remain in possession of all his dignities and benefices, and should be guaranteed secure and undisturbed residence in Rome. Giuliano, however, still feared the secret machinations of Alexander and returned to France. Another appearance of trust between them was afterward declared. When Giuliano assisted the pope in the matrimonial affairs of Cesare Borgia.
hands. Cesare Borgia refused and was arrested by the pope's order. Venice, however, stubbornly refused to give back the cities which it had previously taken. A temporary settlement was reached in March, 1503, when Venice restored most of its conquests in the north. They were meanwhile treaties signed at Perugia and Bologna, two cities that belonged to the Papal States. At Perugia the Baglioni and at Bologna the Bentivogli were acting as independent despots. The warlike Julius II personally directed the campaign against both, setting out at the head of his army on 20 August, 1508. Perugia surrendered without any bloodshed on 13 September, and the pope proceeded towards Bologna. On 7 October he issued a Bull deposing and excommunicating Giovanni Bentivoglio and placing the city under interdict. Bentivoglio fled, and Julius II entered Bologna triumphantly on 10 November. He did not leave the city until 22 February, 1507, arriving again at Rome on 27 March.

The Venetians meanwhile continued to hold Rimini and Faenza, two important places in the Romagna; they moreover encroached upon the papal rights by filling the lands and joined the papal soldiers independently of the pope, and they subjected the clergy to the secular tribunal and in many other ways disregarded the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Julius II. Unable to cope alone with the powerful Republic of Venice, he reluctantly joined the League of Cambrai on 29 March, 1508. This League, formed by Emperor Maximilian I and Louis XII of France chiefly with the purpose of forcing Venice to restore its recent continental conquests to their original owners. On 27 April, 1509, Julius II placed Venice under interdict and dispatched his troops into the Romagna. Venice was too weak to contend against the combined forces of the League and suffered a complete defeat at the battle of Agnadello on 14 May, 1509. The Venetians were now ready to enter negotiations with Julius II, who withdrew from the League and freed the Venetians from the ban on 24 February, 1510, after they agreed upon the following terms: (1) to restore the disputed towns in the Romagna; (2) to renounce their claims to fill vacant benefices; (3) to acknowledge the ecclesiastical tribunal for ecclesiastics and exempt them from taxes; (4) to revoke all treaties made with papal cities; (5) to permit papal subjects free navigation on the Adriatic. The Swiss then again sent supreme temporal master over the entire Pontifical States, but his national pride extended beyond the Patrimony of St. Peter. His ambition was to free the whole of Italy from its subjection to foreign powers, and especially to deliver it from the galling yoke of France. His efforts to gain the assistance of Emperor Maximilian, Henry VIII of England, and Ferdinand of Spain, proved futile for the moment, but the Swiss and the Venetians were ready to take the field against the French. Julius II inaugurated the hostilities by deposing and excommunicating his vassal, Duke Alfonso of Ferrara, who supported France. The French, supported by Pope Alexander VI, retaliated and confined the papal legates and of French bishops at Tours in September, 1510, where it was decreed that the pope had no right to make war upon a foreign prince, and, in case he should undertake such a war, the foreign prince had the right to invade the Ecclesiastical States and to withdraw his subjects from their obedience to the pope. The synod was then opened, when receiving no notice of this synod, Julius again assumed personal command of his army and set out for Northern Italy. At Bologna he fell severely sick, and would probably have been captured by the French had it not been for the timely appearance of the Venetians. He had secretly returned, when recovering from the effects of the weather, he marched against Minundola which he took on 20 January, 1511. On 23 May, 1511, the French made a descent upon Bologna which Julius II had left nine days previously, drove out the papal troops and reinstated the Bentivogli.

Some of the cardinals were displeased with the pope's anti-French policy, and five of them went so far as to convocate a schismatical council at Pisa on 1 September, 1511. They were promptly arrested in the presence of the King of France and for some time also by Emperor Maximilian. The pope now looked for aid to Spain, Venice, and England, but before completing negotiations with these powers he fell dangerously sick. From 25 to 27 August, 1511, his life was despaired of. It was during this sickness of Julius II that Emperor Maximilian conceived the fantastic plan of uniting the viands with the imperial crown on his own head (see Schulte, "Kaiser Maximilian als Kandidat für den päpstlichen Stuhl", Leipzig, 1906; and Naegele, "Hat Kaiser Maximilian I in Jahres 1507 Papst werden wollen" in "Historisches Jahrbuch" XXVIII, Munich, 1907, pp. 44-60, 278-305). But Julius II recovered on 28 August, and on 4 October the so-called Holy League was formed for the purpose of delivering Italy from French rule. In the beginning the League included only the pope, the Venetians, and Spain, but on 17 November a treaty was signed by which Francis I of France was followed by the emperor and by Switzerland. Under the leadership of the brilliant Gaston de Foix, the French were at first successful, but after his death they had to yield to the superior forces of the League, and, being defeated in the bloody battle of Ravenna on 1 April, 1512, formed a new League. Bologna again submitted to Julius II and the cities of Parma, Reggio, and Piacenza were added to the Ecclesiastical States.

Julius II was chiefly a soldier, and the fame attached to his name is greatly due to his re-establishment of the Pontifical States and the deliverance of Italy from its subjection to France. Still he did not forget his duties as the spiritual head of the Church. He was free from nepotism; heard Mass almost daily and often celebrated it himself; issued a strict Bull against simony at papal elections and another against duelers; erected dioceses in the recently discovered American colonies of Haiti (Española), San Domingo, and Porto Rico; condemned the heresy of Piero de Lucca concerning the Incarnation on 7 September, 1511; made various ordinances for monastic reforms; instituted the still existing Capella Julia, a school for ecclesiastical chant which was to serve as a feeder for the Capella Palatina; and held a Council at Treviri to oblige the Lateran Council to eradicate abuses from the Church and especially from the Roman Curia, and to frustrate the designs of the schismatic cardinals who had convened their unsuccessful council first at Pisa, then at Milan (see LATERAN COUNCILS). Julius II has also gained an enviable reputation as a patron of arts. Bramante, Raphael, and Michelangelo gave to the world some of their greatest masterpieces while in his service. He laid the cornerstone of the gigantic Basilica of St. Peter on 18 April, 1506, and conceived the idea of uniting the Vatican with the Belvedere, engaging Bramante to design a new project. Among the famous frescoes of Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel and of Raphael in the Stanze, the Corti of St. Damasus with its loggias, the Via Giulia and Via della Lungara, the colossal statue of Moses which graces the mausoleum of Julius II in the church of San Pietro in Vincoli, and many other magnificent works in and out of Rome are lasting witness of his great art.
conclave on 29 November. They were divided into three factions: the Imperials, the French, and the adherents of Farnese. The friends of Farnese united with the Imperial party and proposed Reginald Pole and Juan de Toledo as their candidates. The French party rejected both, and, though in the minority, they were strong enough to prevent the election of either candidate. The adherents of Farnese and the Imperial party finally reached a compromise and agreed upon Cardinal del Monte, who was duly elected on 7 February, 1550, after a conclave of ten weeks, although the emperor had expressly excluded him from the list of candidates. The new pope took the name of Julius III. In fulfillment of promises made in the conclave, Julius restored Parma to Ottavio Farnese a few days after his accession. But, when Farnese applied to France for aid against the emperor, Julius allied himself with the emperor, declared Farnese deprived of his title, and sent troops under the command of his nephew Giambattista del Monte to co-operate with Duke Gonzaga of Milan in the capture of Parma. In a bull, dated 13 November, 1550, Julius transferred the council from Bologna back to Trent, and ordered that its sessions be resumed on 1 May, 1551, but he was compelled to suspend it again on 15 April, 1552, because the French bishops would not take part in it, and, to escape his enemies, the emperor had to flee from Innsbruck. The success of the French arms in Northern Italy also compelled Julius on 29 April, 1552, to make a truce with France, in which it was stipulated that Farnese was to remain in the peaceful possession of Parma for two years.

Discouraged at his failure as an ally of Charles V, the pope henceforth abstained from interfering in the political affairs of Italy. He withdrew to his luxurious palace, the Villa Giulia, which he had erected at the Porta del Popolo. Here he spent most of his time in ease and comfort, occasionally making a weak effort at reform in the Church by instituting a few committees of cardinals for reformatory purposes. He was a liberal supporter of the rising Jesuit Order, and at the instance of St. Ignatius issued the Bull of foundation for the Collegium Germanicum on 31 August, 1552, and granted it an annual subsidy. During his pontificate the Catholic religion was temporarily restored in England by Queen Mary, who succeeded Edward VI on the English throne in 1553. Julius sent Cardinal Reginald Pole as legate to England with extensive faculties to be used at his discretion in the interests of the Catholic restoration. In February, 1553, an embassy was sent by the English Parliament to Julius III to inform him of its unsanctioned submission to the papal supremacy, but the embassy was still on its journey when the pope died. Shortly before his death Julius III sent Cardinal Morone to represent the Catholic interest at the Religious Peace of Augsburg. At the beginning of his pontificate Julius III had the earnest desire to bring about a reform in the Church and with this intent he reopened the Council of Trent. That the council was again suspended was due to the force of circumstances. His inactivity during the last three years of his pontificate may have been caused by the frequent and serious attacks of the gout to which he was subject. The great blemish in his pontificate was nepotism. Shortly after his accession he bestowed the purple on his unworthy favourite Innocenzo del Monte, a youth of seventeen whom he had picked up on the streets of Parma some years previously, and who had been adopted by the pope’s brother, Baldassarre. There were some disagreeable remarks concerning the pope’s relation to Innocenzo. Julius was also extremely lavish in bestowing ecclesiastical dignities and benefices upon his relatives.

MASSARELLI. De Pontificatu Iuli III, d. ianu. 258-329. PARTON,
Julius Africanus (c. 160–c. 240; the full name is Sextus Julius Africanus, Σεξτός Ιουλίου Ἀφρικανός) is the father of Christian chronography. Little is known of his life and little remains of his works. He is important because his chronicle of Church history from the beginnning to the death of Constantine, and on all the later writers of Church history among the Fathers, and on the whole Greek school of chroniclers. His name says that he was an African; Suidas calls him "a Libyan philosopher". Gelzer ("S. Julius Africanus", pp. 4, 5) thinks he was of Roman descent. He knew Greek (in which language he wrote), Latin, and Hebrew. He was at one time a soldier and had been a pagan; he wrote all his works as a Christian. Tille- ment deduced that he was a priest from the fact that he addresses the priest Origen (in his letter to him) as "dear brother" ("Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique de Rome", 1, 74–86; Cambridge, 1912, cit., 9) points out that a friendly Christian layman could quite well use such a form. The statement that Julius Africanus was a bishop does not appear till the fourth century. It is probably an error. He went to Alexandria to study, attracted by the fame of its catechetical school, possibly about the year 215 (Euse- bius, "H. E.", VI, 31). All the dates of his life are uncertain. One tradition places him under the Emperor Gordianus (238–244; Gelzer, p. 7), another mentions him under Alexander Severus (222–235; id., p. 6). He appears to have known Abgar VIII, the Christian King of Armenia. In his Galatian, he calls him a "holy man" (Gelzer, p. 3). Eusebius, in his chronicle (ad a. Abr., 2239, ed. Schoene, II, Berlin, 1875, 178), says that under Alexander Severus the city of Emmaus in Palestine was restored and called Nikopolis under the direction of "Julius Africanus the writer of the Chronicle". It appears that he lived there for a time (Bardenhewer, "Patrologie", Freiburg, 1894, p. 173). He shows in his Chronicle that he knows the topography of Palestine (Gelzer, p. 10). He seems to have been in Greece; he went to Rome about the year 221 (id., 11). Bardenhewer (op. cit., p. 173) puts his death about 240 (Pruckner, "Unter- der altchristlichen Literatur", p. 507) says that he died "after 221" and adds "under Gordianus 238– 244?", Harnack ("Realenc. für prot. Theol. u. Kirche", Leipzig, 1901, IX, 627) says, "after 240".

The works of S. Julius Africanus are: (1) The "Chronicle" (Xwnevypapias) in five books, covering the time from the Creation (n. c. 5499 in his calculation) to the third year of Elagabalus (A. d. 221). Gelzer thinks he wrote this work between 212 and 221 (op. cit., 12). It is an attempt to combine the account in the Bible and the secular (Roman and Greek) history known to him, especially regarding chronology. For the third book the order is strictly chronological. Julius uses sources first from the Bible, then Greek, Roman, and Jewish historians, especially Justus of Tiberias, who depends on Josephus. He is also influenced by the "Stromata" of Clement of Alexandria (Gelzer, 19–24). As the first Christian attempt at a universal history, in which the sources are chronicology, this work is of great importance. Eusebius made it the foundation of his chronicle. It is the source of all later Byzantine writing of history, so that for centuries the Christian world accepted the dates and epochs calculated by Julius. Only fragmentary copies of the "Chronicle" survive, the best being from the 6th century and the 7th century. The works of Julius Africanus, of whom five books of "temporibus (= the Chronography)" are extant, were a mission for the restoration of the city of Emmaus, which Julius was to visit a few years later.

Sextus Julius Africanus, different from the Christian Julius Africanus. This is directly contradicted by Eusebius in his "Chronicle" (E., VI, 31): Africanus (the author of the "Chronography"), wrote the "composite Embroideries" (ἐκ τῶν ἐγγεγραμμένων κειμένων συγγραφών). Gelzer (2–3) has shown that the author of the "Chronicle" was a Christian (he quotes Ps. xxxiii, 9) and that there is no reason to doubt Eusebius's statement. This work, too, constantly quoted and much esteemed by the Germans, has its influence on Eusebius. All the later writers of Church history have fragments about agriculture and war (Gelzer, 13–16). It had originally twenty-four books. It is from the "Chronicle" in which the author discourses of magic, divination and medicine, that the opinion arose that he was a physician. (3) Two letters of Julius are known, one to Origen, in which he disputes the authenticity of the story of Susanna, pointing out that the play upon words in the Greek text (πάρθενον, an oak-tree, and παρθένος, to saw asunder; σίδηρος, a mastic-tree and σίδηρον, to cleave: Dan., xxxii, 54–55, 58–59) would not exist in the Hebrew or Aramaic. Gelzer ("Kýkrhos zôi kal old") seems to have been an old man when he wrote it. Origen answered it. Both letters are included in Origen's works (e. g. ed. of De la Rue, I, Paris, 1733, 10). This letter is the only one of Julius's works that is completely extant. His criticism has won for him high respect among modern writers. J. G. Rosenmüller (Historia Interpretationis, III, 161) considers that these few lines contain more true exegesis than is to be found in all Origen's works. Gelzer (p. 17) points out that the "Chronography" and especially the "Chronicle" show that Julius does not deserve the reputation as a Christianist that is addressed to a certain Aristides. In it he proposes what is still the favourite explanation of the two pedagogies of our Lord (Matt., i, 11–19; Luke, iii, 11–20), namely that St. Joseph's two fathers, Jacob (Matt., i, 16) and Heli (Luke, iii, 23), were half-brothers of the same mother, that Heli died without children, and Jacob took his wife to raise up seed to his brother according to the Levitical law (Deut., xxv, 5–6). Of this letter a fragment is preserved by Eusebius (H. E., i, vii), another fragment is contained in an epitome of Eusebius's "Questions de differ. Evang.," published by A. Mai ("Script. 1. Orientis", IV, Rome, 1852). Julius also translated Tertullian's "Apologeti- cum" into Greek (Harnack in "Texte und Untersuchun- gen", VIII, 4).

Later Syrian writers mention works that have disappeared. Dionysius Bar-Salibi speaks of a commentary on the Gospels (Assemanii, "Bibliotheca orientalis", II, Rome, 1721, 158), Ebed-Jesu of commentaries on the New Testament (Hebedieu, "Catalogus librorum chaldæorum", Rome, 1633, p. 15). Spuri- ous works are the Acts of St. Symphorosa (Ruinart, "Acta primorum martyrum", Ratisbon, 1658, 70), a Latin version of "Abd al Abdul Abul ("Historia apostolica, auctore Abdin", Cologne, 1576, which asserts itself throughout, even the title, that it was translated from the Hebrew by Julius Africanus) and an astonishing semi-pagan "Interpretation of the things that happened in Persia through the Irana- this of our Lord and God and Savior, Jesus Christ," written by Ignaz Christ, a Jewish convert. The other "Beiträge zur Gesch. u. Litter.", II, Munich, 104, 52– 69. St. Jerome in his "de Viris illustribus" (no. 63) includes: "Julius Africanus, of whom five books de temporibus (= the Chronography) are extant, accepted a mission for the restoration of the city of Emmaus, which Julius was to visit a few years later.

There is a letter to Origen about the question of Su-
senna in which he says that this fable is not in the Hebrew, nor does ὐπὸ τοῦ φυσιοῦ καὶ τὸ ὐπὸ τοῦ σκλήρου agree with Hebrew etymology; against whom Origén wrote a learned letter. There exists also an answer of his to Aristides in which he discusses at length the disagreement which seems to be in the genealogy of the Saviour in Matthew and Luke. Except for the wrong date (M. Aurelius) this account, taken from Eusebius, represents very fairly what we know of Afriacus.


ADRIAN FORTESCUE

Julius Echter von Mespelbrunn. See ECHTER VON MESPELBRUNN, JULIUS.

Jumièges, Benedictine Abbey of, situated on the north bank of the Seine, between Duclair and Caudebec, in Normandy (Seine-Infrérieure). The abbey was founded in 634 by St. Philibert, who had been the companion of St. Ouen and Warden at the Merovingian court. Philibert became first abbot, but was later expelled at the instance of certain enemies who were obliged to leave Jumièges, and afterwards founded another monastery at Noirmoutier, where he died about 685. Under the second abbot, St. Achard, Jumièges flourished exceedingly and numbered within its walls nearly a thousand monks. Enjoying the patronage of the dukes of Normandy, the abbey became a great centre of religion and learning, its schools producing, amongst many other scholars, the national historian, William of Jumièges. It reached the zenith of its fame about the eleventh century, and was regarded as a model of perfection for all the monasteries of the province. It was renowned especially for its charity to the poor, being popularly called "Jumièges l'Aumônière". In the ninth century it was pillaged and burnt by the Normans, but was rebuilt on a grander scale by William, Duke of Normandy, surnamed Longe-Épée. The church was enlarged in 1256, and again restored in 1573. The abbots of Jumièges took part in all the great affairs of the Church and nation; one of them, Robert, became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1040; many others became bishops in France, and some were also raised to the cardinalitial dignity. The fortunes of the abbey suffered through the English invasion and the Hundred Years' War, but it recovered and maintained its prosperity and high position until the whole province was devastated by the Huguenots and the Wars of Religion. In 1649, during the abbacy of Francis III, Jumièges was taken over by the Maurist Congregation, under which rule some of its former grandeur was resuscitated. The French Revolution, however, closed its career as a monastery, and only its majestic ruins now remain to show what it was in the days of its splendour. These comprise the church, with its beautiful twin towers and western façade, and portions of the cloisters and library. The contents of the latter were removed to Rouen when the abbey was suppressed.

Jungmann, Bernard, dogmatic theologian and ecclesiastical historian, b. at Münster in Westphalia, 1 March, 1833; d. at Louvain, 12 Jan., 1895. He belonged to an intensely Catholic family of Westphalia; like him, two of his brothers entered the service of the Church, one joining the Society of Jesus and the other becoming a missionary in the United States. After finishing his studies with brilliant success at the public schools of his native town, he entered the German College at Rome for the mediation of the bishop's secretary, afterwards Cardinal Meichers, and made his philosophical and theological studies in the Gregorian College. In 1854 he received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy; he was ordained priest in Rome on 8 June, 1857, and two years later received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He was professor to the young, and worked for a short time as chaplain in the church of St. Adelgunde at Emmerich. Bishop Malou of Bruges, who chanced to be present in Rome in 1854 when Jungmann made his public defence of the philosophical theses, called him in September, 1861, to the chair of philosophy in the Petit Séminaire at Roulers. Four years later (1865) he became professor of theology in the ecclesiastical seminary at Bruges. Even at Roulers, while performing his duties as teacher, he began that literary activity, which was thenceforth ever associated with his professorial duties. His appointment to the chair of ecclesiastical history at Louvain opened the way to Wouters, whom he recommended for his great ability. A keen intellect with powers of clear exposition, joined to the spirited delivery which distinguished his lectures, ensured him great success. He enlarged the field of ecclesiastico-historical studies by delivering special lectures on patrology, and establishing in 1890 a seminarium in which students were to receive a scientific and methodical training in original historical research. Jungmann remained to the end of his life a professor at Louvain, declining the honour of a call to be professor of dogmatic theology in the newly founded Catholic University at Washington. He was seized with a fit of apoplexy at the burial of a colleague, and died at Louvain in 1895. His activity as a writer was equal to his energy as a lecturer. As professor of philosophy he wrote "Demonstratio christiana. I. Demonstrationis christianae praemissa philosophica" (Roulers, 1864; 2nd ed., 1867). In the domain of theology he wrote his "Institutiones theologicae dogmaticae specialia" in five tracts, widely used and much appreciated for their clear style: "De Gratia" (Bruges, 1866; 5th ed., Ratisbon, 1882); "De Deo uno et trino" (Bruges, 1867; 4th ed., Ratisbon, 1882); "De Deo et Deo-creator" (Bruges, 1868; 4th ed., Ratisbon, 1888); "De verbo rursum" (Bruges, 1868; 3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1884); "De quattuor novissimis" (Ratisbon, 1871; 3rd ed., 1885). He wrote also the "Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae generalis" (Bruges, 1871; 4th ed., Ratisbon, 1886). In church history he first re-edited Wouter's "Historiae ecclesiasticae compendium" (5 vols., Louvain, 1856, and later published special studies, particularly on theological controversies and on the papacy: "Dissertationes selectae in historiam ecclesiasticam" (5 vols., Ratisbon, 1880). In patrology he issued Fessler's "excellent Institutiones Patrologiae" in a new and much enlarged edition (9 vols., Inbruck, 1890, 1899), and published numerous articles to German and French journals, particularly worthy of mention being: "Die neue französische Fortschrittsphilosophie" in the "Katholik" (Mainz, 1863); "Die hl. Märtyrer von Gorkum", ibid. (1867); Clemens V. und die Aufhebung des Templerorden in the "Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie" (Innsbruck, 1881); "Le caractère moral de Luther" in "La Controverse" (1883).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Jungmann, Josef, b. 12 Nov., 1830, at Münster, Westphalia; d. at Innsbruck, 25 Nov., 1885. In 1850 he entered the German College at Rome, and was
JURISDICTION

ordained priest in 1855. He afterwards joined the Society of Jesus and as early as 1858, even before the expiration of his novitiate, was elected to fill the chair of eloquence in the re-established theological faculty at Innsbruck. Besides many articles in periodicals Jungmann published: "Fünf Sätze zur Erklärung und wissenschaftlichen Begründung der Andacht zum hl. Hersen Jesu und zum reinsten Hersen Marie" (Innsbruck, 1889); "Eine Litanei zum hl. Hersen Jesu an die hl. Schrift" (2nd ed.; ibid., 1871); "Gefahren bellistrischter Lektüre" (ibid., 1872); "Zur Verehrung U. L. Frau" (2nd ed., ibid., 1879); "Das Gemüt und das Gefühlsvermögen der neuen Psychologie" (2nd ed., ibid., 1885); "Die Andacht zum hl. Hersen Jesu und die Bedenken gegen dieselbe" (ibid., 2nd ed., ibid., 1885); "Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction" (2 vols., 3rd ed., Innsbruck, 1886); "Aesthetik" (2 vols., 3rd ed., 1886). A third edition of his "Bereadsmak Heil" was published by his colleague, Michael Gatterer, who also edited a fourth and much abbreviated edition. Jungmann had a wonderful influence over his students. Speaking of him, one of them writes: "I do not know what it was that always charmed the other students so much, but, for myself, I felt irresistibly drawn to him on account of his high sentiments and character, founded on deeply rooted principles, influenced by such alone, and therefore immovable. The more I knew him, the more I loved him; the more I loved him, the more I knew him; in his daily avocations, in his religious exercises." HOPFANN, Des Nikolaus zu Innsbruck einst und jetzt (Innsbruck, 1898), 129.

KARL KLAAR.

Jürgens, Hermann. See Bombay, Archdiocese of.

Jurisdiction, Ecclesiastical, the right to guide and rule the Church of God. The subject is here treated of under the following heads: I. General Concept and Classification of Jurisdiction; II. Development of Jurisdiction in its strict sense; III. Present Scope of Jurisdiction in its strict sense.

I. General Concept and Classification of Jurisdiction.—The Church founded by Christ for the salvation of man is, like every society, a regulating power (the authority of the Church. The Church has bestowed upon it. Directly before His Ascension He gave to the Apostles collectively the commission, and with it the authority, to proclaim His doctrine to all nations, to baptize them, and to teach them to observe all things that He had commanded (Matt., xxviii. 19). This authority He distinguished from the "Lamentabili sane", of 3 July, 1907, rejects (n. 52 sqq.) the doctrine that Christ did not desire to found a permanent, unchangeable Church endowed with authority. It is customary to speak of a threefold office of the Church: the office of teaching (prophectic office), the priestly office, and the pastoral office (governing office), also, therefore, of the threefold authority of the Church, that is, the teaching authority, ministerial authority, and ruling authority. Since, however, the teaching of the Church is authoritative, the teaching authority is traditionally included in the ruling authority; regularly, therefore, only the ministerial authority and the ruling authority are distinguished. By ministerial authority, which is conferred by an act of consecration, is meant the inward, and, because of its indissoluble character, permanent capacity to perform acts by which Divine grace is transmitted. By ruling authority, both the Church and the Church body, the Church body (canonica, canonical mission), is understood the authority to guide and rule the Church of God.

Jurisdiction, in so far as it covers the relations of man to God, is called jurisdiction of the internal forum or jurisdiction of the forum of Heaven (jurisdiction polit.). See Forum, Ecclesiastical.) This again is either sacramental or penitential, so far as it is used in the Sacrament of Penance, or extra-sacramental, e.g. in granting dispensations from private vows. Jurisdiction, in so far as it regulates external relations, is called jurisdiction of the external forum or briefly juridicitio fori. This jurisdiction, the actual power of ruling is legislative, judicial, or coercive. Jurisdiction can be possessed in varying degrees. It can also be held either for both fora, or for the internal forum only, or, in either. Jurisdiction can be further sub-divided into: ordinary, special, extraordinary, and delegated jurisdiction. Ordinary jurisdiction is that which is permanently bound, by Divine or human law, with a permanent ecclesiastical office. Its possessor is called an ordinary judge. By Divine law the pope has such ordinary jurisdiction for the entire Church and a bishop for the diocese. If this jurisdiction is possessed by the cardinals, officials of the Curia and the congregations of cardinals, the patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, archbishops, the prolatus nullius, and prelates with quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, the chapters of orders, or, respectively, the heads of orders, cathedral chapters in reference to their own affairs, the archdiocesans in the Middle Ages, and parish priests in the internal forum. If, however, jurisdiction is permanently connected with an office, but the office itself is not perpetual and irrevocable, the jurisdiction is said to be quasi-ordinary, or juridicitio extra fori. The latter is, for example, by a vicar-general. Temporary exercise of ordinary or quasi-ordinary jurisdiction can be granted, in varying degrees, to another as representative, without conferring on him an office properly so called. In this transient form jurisdiction is called delegated or extraordinary, and concerning it canons law, following the Roman law, has developed exhaustive provisions. This development began when the popes, especially since Alexander III (1159-81), found themselves obliged, by the tremendous mass of legal business which came to them from all sides as the "judices ordinarii omnium" to hand over, with proper instruction, a large number of cases to third parties for decision, especially in matters of contentious jurisdiction.

Delegated jurisdiction rests either on a special authorization of the holders of ordinary jurisdiction or on delegatio ab homine, i.e., by the pope, lege, a jure, a canonise. Thus, the Council of Trent transferred a number of papal rights to the bishops "tanquam Apostolices Sedis delegati", i.e., as delegates of the Apostolic See (Sess. VI, De ref., c. ii, iii, etc.), and "etiam tanquam Apostolices Sedis delegati", i.e., also as delegates of the Apostolic See (Sess. VI, De ref., c. iv, etc.). In the first class of cases the pope did not ordain ordinary jurisdiction. The meaning of the second expression is disputed, but it is generally taken as purely cumulative. If the delegation applies to one or several designated cases only, it is special delegation. If, however, it applies to an entire class of subjects, it is then general delegation or delegation for the universality of causes. Delegated jurisdiction for the total of a number of matters is known as delegatio mandata. Only those can be appointed delegates who are competent to execute the delegation. For an act of consecration the delegate must have himself the necessary sacred orders. For acts of jurisdiction he must be an ecclesiastic, though the pope could also delegate a layman. Papal delegation is usually conferred only on ecclesiastical dignitaries or canons (c. xi, in VI", De rescript, I, iii; Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, De ref., c. x). The delegate must be twenty years old, but eighteen for dispensation for one appointed to the Church, (xvi, x, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix). He must also be free from excommunication (c. xxiv, x, De sent. et re jud., II, xxvii). Those placed under the jurisdiction of the delegate must submit to the delegation (c. xxviii, x, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix). Delegation for one matter can also be conferred upon several. The distinction
here to be made is whether they have to act jointly and severally (collectively), jointly but individually (solidarily), or solidarily at least in some given case (c. xvi, xxi, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix; c. vii, in IV, h. t. I, xiv). The delegate is to follow the instructions given to him, however un-powered to do all that is necessary to execute them (c. i, v, vii, viii, xi, xxi, xxv, xxviii, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix). If he exceed his power, his act is null (c. xxxvii, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxxix). When necessary the delegate can himself delegate, i.e. sub-delegate, a qualified person; he can do this especially if the delegate has been delegated a number of cases (Gloss to "Delegatus", c. lix, X, De appell., II, xxvii). Since delegation constitutes a new court appeal can be taken from the delegate to the delegate, and in the case of sub-delegation to the original delegator (c. xxvii, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxix). Delegated jurisdiction expires on the death of the delegate, in case the commission were not issued in view of the permanence of his office, on the loss of office or the death of the delegate, in case the delegate has not acted within the allotted time (i.e. by petition, on recall of his authority by the delegator (even re adhuc nondum integra, the matter being no longer intact), on expiration of the allotted time, on settlement of the matter, on declaration of the delegate that he has no power (c. xiv, xiv, iv, xxxvii, X, De off. jud. deleg., I, xxxix).

II. DEVELOPMENT OF JURISDICTION IN ITS STRUCTURE.

The Church has the right, as a perfect and independent society provided with all the means for attaining its end, to decide according to its laws disputes arising concerning its internal affairs, especially as to the ecclesiastical rights of its members, also to carry out its decisions, if necessary, by suitable means of compulsion, contentious or civil jurisdiction. It has, therefore, the right to admonish or warn its members, ecclesiastical or lay, who have not conformed to its laws, and also, if needful to punish them by physical means, that is, coercive jurisdiction. The church has, first, the power to judge sin. This it does in the internal forum. But a sin can be at the same time externally a misdemeanour or a crime (delictum crimen), when threatened with external ecclesiastical or civil punishment. The church also judges ecclesiastical crimes, because the civil cannot, in the absence of laws, impose penalties, except when the wrong-doing has remained secret. In this case it contents itself, as a rule, with penance voluntarily assumed. Finally, another distinction is to be drawn between necessary jurisdiction and voluntary jurisdiction; the latter contemplates voluntary subjection on the part of those who seek in legal matters the co-operation of ecclesiastical agencies, e.g. notarially executed instruments, testaments, etc. The judicial power described above, jurisdiction strictly so called, was given by Christ to his Church, was exercised by the Apostles, and transmitted to their successors (Matt. xvi, xviii, 16 sqq.; I Cor., iv, 21; v, 1 sqq.; I Tim., vi, 1 sqq.; II Cor., xiii, 10; I Tim., i, 20; v, 19 sqq.).

From the beginning of the Christian religion the ecclesiastical judge, i.e. the bishop, decided matters of dispute that were purely religious in character (causa mere ecclesiastia). This jurisdiction of the Church was recognized by the civil courts and ultimately became Christian. But long before this the early Christians, following the exhortation of Saint Paul (I Cor., vi, 14), were wont to submit to ecclesiastical jurisdiction matters which by their nature belonged to the civil courts. As long as Christianity was not recognized by the State, it was left to the conscience of the individual whether he would conform to the decision of the bishop or not. When, however, Christianity had received civil recognition, Constantine the Great raised the former private usage to a public law. According to an imperial constitution of the year 321 the parties in dispute could, by mutual agreement, bring the matter before the bishop even when it was already pending before a civil judge, and the latter was denied the jurisdiction of the bishop. A further constitution of 331 provided that in any case of the suit any one of the parties could appeal to the bishop even against the will of the others (Hænel, "De constitutionibus, quas F. Simondus, Paris, an. 1631 editid, 1840"). But Arcadius, in 398, and Honorius, in 408, limited the judicial competence of the bishop to the cases in which both parties applied to them (I Cor., vii, Cod. Just., De audientia episc., I, iv). This arbitral jurisdiction of the bishop was not recognized in the new Teutonic kingdoms. In the Frankish kingdoms purely ecclesiastical matters of dispute belonged to the jurisdiction of the bishop, but mixed cases, in which civil interests appeared, e.g. marriage questions, law suits concerning Church property, etc., belonged to the civil courts.

In the course of the Middle Ages the Church succeeded in extending its jurisdiction over all matters that offered an ecclesiastical interest (causa spiritualis), and even over matters that, in the eyes of the common law, were the property of laymen, so long as the issues involved had an ecclesiastical interest (c. xvi, X, Qui filii sint legit., IV, xvii: c. viii, X, De donat., IV, xx); matters concerning burial (X, De sepult., III, xxvii); testaments (X, De testam., III, xxvi); compacts ratified with an oath (c. iii, in IV, De foro compet., II, ii); matters pertaining to benefices (c. ii, X, De suppl. neglig. prelat., I, xx); questions of prebend (X, De jur. patron., III, xxxviii); litigation concerning church property and tithes (X, De decim., III, xxx). In addition all civil litigation in which the element of sin was in question (ratio peccati) could be summoned before an ecclesiastical court (c. xiii, X, De judic., II, i).

Also, the ecclesiastical court had jurisdiction over the affairs of ecclesiastics, monks, and nuns, the poor, widows, and orphans (persona miserabilis), also of those persons to whom the civil judge refused legal redress (c. xi, X, De foro compet., II, ii). Owing to the unsatisfactory administration of justice in the medieval world this far-reaching civil jurisdiction of the Church was beneficial. However, it eventually overlapped the natural boundaries of Church and State. The result was that the ecclesiastical became too much involved in secular litigation and grew estranged from the state, since it could not carry out its mission (especially the Church) as a result of the tax system. But in the fifteenth century, under Henry VIII, it was even taken over by the new monarch, who thus turned the Church into a purely lay body.
The Church in the Middle Ages increased its penal jurisdiction in the civil domain by infliction of varied penalties, some of them purely secular in character. Above all, by means of the principe forti it withdrew the so-called "criminous clerks" from the jurisdiction of secular courts and placed them under the jurisdiction of the church, thereby strengthening the power of the pope. This change altered the central tenet of the church's power, i.e., the right to determine the guilt of clerics, and brought about the development of the modern system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The power was further strengthened in the later Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, when the church was able to impose its authority over secular courts and even to declare war or peace.

The Church's power was not confined to the clergy, but extended to laymen as well. In the 12th century, the church began to assert its control over laymen, particularly in the area of ecclesiastical law. The Church's control over laymen was further extended by the introduction of the inquisition, which was established in the 13th century. The inquisition was a judicial body that was charged with investigating and punishing heresy and other religious offenses. The inquisition was able to exercise a great deal of power, and its decisions were often final.

The Church's power also extended to the realm of politics. In the 14th century, the Church was able to exert its influence over the political affairs of Europe, and it was able to use its power to influence the course of history. The Church's power was further increased by the Council of Trent, which was held in the 16th century. The Council of Trent was a major turning point in the history of the Church, and it marked the beginning of the Counter-Reformation.

The Church's power was not without its critics. During the Enlightenment, the Church was called into question, and its power was challenged by the rise of secularism. The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of nationalism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the state over the church.

The Church's power was further diminished by the French Revolution, which marked the end of the Church's influence in Europe. The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of socialism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the people over the church.

The Church's power was further diminished by the rise of democracy, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the people over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of modernism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of science over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of the state, which sought to assert its sovereignty over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of internationalism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the world over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of globalism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the planet over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of scientism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of science over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocracy, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cybernetics, which sought to assert the sovereignty of cybernetics over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cultural relativism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of culture over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of postmodernism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of postmodernism over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of globalization, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the world over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocentrism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of scientism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of science over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocracy, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cybernetics, which sought to assert the sovereignty of cybernetics over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cultural relativism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of culture over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of postmodernism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of postmodernism over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of globalization, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the world over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocentrism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of scientism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of science over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocracy, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cybernetics, which sought to assert the sovereignty of cybernetics over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of cultural relativism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of culture over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of postmodernism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of postmodernism over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of globalization, which sought to assert the sovereignty of the world over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of technocentrism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of technology over the church.

The Church's power was also challenged by the rise of scientism, which sought to assert the sovereignty of science over the church.
toine, at the request of the botanist Vaillant, and after Vaillant's death in 1722 was appointed the latter's successor as professor and assistor at the Jardin du Roi. He devoted all his energies to the royal garden, which his brother Antoine left almost entirely to him. He also made botanical excursions in the country surrounding Paris, and was able in 1725 to issue a revised and enlarged edition of Tournesort's work on flowers and plants. This publication gained his admission into the Academy of Sciences. Many persons studied botany under his guidance, as the chemist Lavoisier. Owing to de Jussieu's unusual modesty and unselfishness he published very little, notwithstanding the wide range of his researches. He wrote an important paper on soo-
phytes, sea-organisms whose classification as plants or animals was then a matter of dispute. To study them he went three times to the coast of Normandy, proved in the "Mémoires" of 1742 that they belonged to the animal kingdom (before Peyssonel), and sought to classify them at this early date into genera. He also separated the fish, which had previously been included among the mammals. The few botanical papers which he published (1739–42) treat of three water-plants.

In 1758 Louis XV made de Jussieu superintendent of the royal garden at Trianon near Paris, in which all plants cultivated in France were to be reared. His greatest achievement is the system he arranged and catalogued the plants in the garden at Trianon; it is called "the older Jussieu natural system of plants of 1759", or the Trianon system. Jussieu himself never published anything about his system, nor did he offer any explanation of his arrangement, or give it a theoretical foundation. The genera are not arranged systematically in groups according to a single characteristic, but after consideration of all the characteristics, which, however, are not regarded as of equal value. De Jussieu proposed three main groups, to which he gave no name; these contained altogether fourteen classes, with sixty-five orders or families. Be-
inning with the cryptogams, the system proceeds from the monocotyledon to the dicotyledon, and closes with the coniferæ. Before this Linnaeus had pointed out that only the natural system should be the aim of botanical classification, and published, outside of his "Species stirpium" (1737), his "Système des plantes" (from 1789) and were extreme adherents of the Lin-
naean system. Even more vigorously than his uncle Bernard he upheld the theory of subordination or unequal value of the characteristics of a plant, according to which certain characteristic signs have a more general and comprehensive influence. The characteristics are "weighed, not simply mechanically counted" (pens et non comptes). Once ascertained, these essential characteristics are to be used like the chief fossils in geology, in order to assign plants to a definite group. It is true that in the application this principle frequently leads to false results. Antoine-
laurent gave to the three main groups of the original classification of his uncle the names of Acoyledon, Monocotyledon, and Dicotyledon, and divided them into fifteen classes, containing in all one hundred fami-
lies. A most important fact is that he sought out and clearly defined the characteristics of families, largely indeed in later treatises. In the period, beginning in 1789, of the French Revolution, it may be said in brief that with other scholars he reorganized the Natural History Museum at Paris in 1790, and in 1808 was appointed by Napoleon counselor of the university. During the years 1789–1802 he published no botani-
cal works. In 1814 "Antoine de Jussieu, et ses "Mémoires" of the Natural History Museum were founded that there began for him a new era of intense activity in investigation. He wrote for these publica-
tions, 1802–20, a very large number of memoirs and notes on individual species or genera, and especially, monographs on numerous families. He was led
largely to these labours by the work "De fructibus et seminibus plantarum" (1758-91) of the German botanist Joseph Gürzene (1701-1775), and published "Principes de la méthode naturelle des végétaux" (Paris, 1824). He partly prepared a greatly desired second edition of the "Genera plantarum", but the work was never issued. Only what had been left ready for print, an entirely rewritten "Introduc- tion" and a part of the "Genera", was published after his death by his son Adrien [An. des Sc. nat. (1837)].

(5) Adrien-Henri de Jussieu (botanical abbreviation, A. Juss.), son of Antoine-Laurent, b. at Paris, 23 December, 1797; d. there, 29 June, 1853. He re- ceived in 1824 the degree of Doctor of Medicine at Paris, presenting a dissertation on the plant family Eu- phorbiaceae. When his father retired in 1826 he was made professor of agricultural botany at the Jardin des Plantes; in 1845 he was made professor of organo- graphy of plants at the university. His textbook "Cours élémentaire de botanique" (Paris), passed through numerous editions and translations. Bes- sides a "Glosse de botanique" (Paris, 1845), he also published monographs on several families of plants, especially the Malpighiaceae (1843). He was presi- dent of the French Academy of Sciences.

Sachs, Geschichte der Botanik (Munich, 1875); Réé, Ge- schichte der biologischen Theorien, II (Leipzig, 1883).

JOSEPH ROMPE.

Jus Spoli (Right of Spoliation and Rapite Captive), a claim, exercised in the Middle Ages, of succession to the property of deceased clerics, at least such as they had derived from their ecclesiastical benefices. It was an outcome of ancient usages, which forbade clerics to dispose by will of goods accruing from their ecclesiastical office. These usages were gradually relaxed because of the difficulty of distinguishing between ecclesiastical and patrimonial property. Abuses then arose. Churches were despoiled at the death of their incumbents. Bishops and archbishops seized for the cathedral the spoils of abbots and other benefices, on the pretense that all other churches were but offshoots of the cathedral. After the fall of the Western Empire any one present at the death of a cleric felt at liberty to carry off whatever he desired. He decreed, if he desired, the whole, wise, he could seize (rapite captive, seize and take). As the civil power became more conscious of itself it began to restrain this indiscriminate plunder. The sovereign claimed for himself the "Jus Spoli" in the case of deceased bishops, while the smaller feudal lords laid similar claim to the property of all clerics who died in their domains. Councils (Tribur, 895; Troyes, 909; Clermont, 1095; II Lateran, 1129) of the Church legislated against these abuses, finally obtaining a renunciation of this so-called right. In the thir- teen century the Roman Church put forth in a modified way the same claim, and it eventually be- came a "Gospel of canon law that the goods of benefic- ecd ecclesiastics, dying intestate, belonged of right to the papal treasury. This right however was not allowed in France, Germany, Belgium, or Portugal. In the Kingdom of Naples a compromise was made at the close of the sixteenth century, whereby the right was ren- owing for an annual pension to the papal treasury.


ANDREW B. MEEHAN.

Jushe —The name conventionally applied to a family of Italian sculptors, whose real name was Berti, originally from San Martino a Mensola, near Florence. Giusto, whose name was afterwards given to the whole family, and Andrea are the first two known to us. Neither seems to have gone out of Italy. But Andrea had three sons—Anthony (1479-1519), Andrew (b. about 1483), and John, the most illustrious of the house (1485-1549). All of whom early emigrated to France and figured prominently during the Renaiss- ance. With Florence and Rome as the most brilliant representatives and the most active emissaries of Italian art beyond the Alps.

As early as 1504 the three brothers were in Brittany, at Dol, executing the monument of Bishop Thomas James. Later, they separated. Anthony worked for the Cardinal d'Arezzo at Florence, then at Fies- olon; while John, attracted to Tours, spent a few years in the atelier of Michel Colombe, famous as the sculptor of the "Entombment" in the Abbey of Solesmes. Colombe was the last representative of the Dijon School, founded by Claus Sluter under the first dukes of Burgundy. At this school John Juste became im- bued with the realism of Flanders, slightly softened and tempered with French delicacy. Through this combination of qualities, he created for himself a style whose charm consisted in its flexibility and complexity. At the death of Michel Colombe (1512) the Justes worked again in concert and inherited his fame. Francis I commissioned them to execute the famous mausoleum of Louis XII at St-Denis, and this occupied almost fifteen years (1516-31). But Anthony's share in this work was slight, as he died in 1519. The honour of this magnificent masterpiece belongs entirely to his brother John.

The original conception seems to have been Per- réal's, and yet it was not wholly his. The iconography of tombs was extremely rich in France in the fiftieth century. Its main theme consists of a gigant or recumbent effigy of the deceased, laid upon a funeral couch surmounting the sarcophagus, upon the sides of which a procession of mourners is represented. The most celebrated example of this style is the monument of Philip the Bold by Claus Sluter, at Dijon (1405), of which there have been several variants, down to the monument of Philippe Pot (1480) in the Louvre. The tomb of Louis XII inaugurated a new tradition, or rather a colossal development of the subject. The hero is represented kneeling on a cata- falque beneath which the gigant appears as a naked, emaciated corpse, "such as death has made it for us". This striking contrast is in itself a most eloquent funeral oration. The monument is an incomparable expression of the idea of death, as the ideal or- dinary, and would, alone, be sufficient to bring glory to an artist; but it is not the only work we have of John Juste. He also executed the tombs of Philippe de Montmorency and of Artus Goffier in the church of Oiron (Deux-Sèvres), that of Jean Rieux, at Ancenis, and Thomas Bohan, at St-Saturnin, etc. The Abbé Louis de Crèvent at the Trinité, Vendôme. He had one son, John the second, the last sculptor of the family, who died in 1577, and of whom some works are to be seen in the churches of Oiron and Champeaux.

Dermire, Comptes de Guillon (1850); Nouvelles archives de l'Art français (1872 and 1876): Montardier, La famille des Justes (1876); Lebœuf, Comptes des bâtiments du roi (1880); Fauru- dell, La Renaissance en France, II, 84, 98, III, 86, 91; Ger- fat, Leçons professées à l'Ecole du Louvre, II (1901), 867 sqq.; Viriay, Michel Colombe (1901), 854 sqq.; Malla, L'art religieux de la fin du Moyen-Age en France (1909), 472.

LOUIS GILLET.

Justice is here taken in its ordinary and proper sense to signify the most important of the cardinal virtues. It is a moral quality or habit which perfects the will and inclines it to render to each and to all what belongs to them. Of the other cardinal virtues, prudence perfects the intellect and inclines the prudent man to act in all things according to right reason. Fortitude controls the irascible passions and temperance moderates the appetites according as reason dictates. While fortitude and temperance are self- regarding virtues, justice has reference to others. To- gether with charity it regulates man's intercourse with his fellow men. But charity leads us to help our neighbour in his need out of our own stores, while
Justice teaches us to give to another what belongs to him.

Because man is a person, a free and intelligent being, created in the image of God, he has a dignity and a worth vastly superior to the material and animal life which he has left. Man is to know, love, and worship his Creator; he was made for that end, which he can only attain perfectly in the future, immortal, and never-ending life to which he is destined. God gave him his faculties and his liberty in order that he might freely work for the accomplishment of his destiny. He is in duty bound to use all the means at his disposal, so that he can to the utmost exercise his faculties and conduct his life according to the intentions of his Lord and Master. Because he is under these obligations he is consequently invested with rights, God-given and primordial, antecedent to the State and independent of it. Such are man's natural rights, granted to him by nature herself, sacred, as is their origin, and inviolable. Beside these he may have other rights given him by Church or State, or acquired by his own industry and exertion. All these rights, whatever be their source, are the object of the virtue of justice. Justice requires that all persons should be left in the free enjoyment of all their rights.

A right in the strict sense in which the term is used in this connexion is not a mere vague and indefinite claim against others, which others are bound to respect, on any grounds whatever. We sometimes say that the unemployed have a right to work, that the needy have a right to assistance, and it may be conceded that these phrases are quite correct, provided that such a right is understood as a claim in charity, not as a claim in justice. For, at least if we confine our attention to natural law and ordinary circumstances, the assistance to which a man in need has a claim does not belong to him in justice before it is handed over to him when it becomes his. His claim to it rests on the fact that he is a brother in distress, and his brotherhood constitutes his title to our pity, sympathy, and help. It may, of course, happen that these are insufficient, and that a claim in justice, or a right in the strict sense, is a moral and lawful faculty of doing, possessing, or exacting something. If it be a moral and lawful faculty of doing something for the benefit of others, it belongs to the class of rights of jurisdiction. Thus a father has the natural right to bring up and educate his son, not for his own, but for the son's benefit. A lawful sovereign has the right to rule his subjects for the common good. The largest class of rights which justice requires that we should render to others are rights of ownership. Ownership is the moral faculty of using something subordinate to us for our own advantage. The owner of a house may dispose of it as he will. He may live in it, or let it, or leave it unoccupied, or pull it down, or sell it; he may make changes in it, and in general he may deal with it as he likes, because it is his. Because it is his, he has a right to all the uses and advantages which it possesses. It is his property, and as such its whole being should subsist against the claims of others. Because this belongs to him he must be preferred to all others as to the enjoyment of the uses to which it can be put. He has the right to exclude others from the enjoyment of its uses, it belongs with all the advantages which it can confer to him alone. Were anyone else to make use of the same or any part of it without the owner's consent, he would offend against justice, he would not be rendering the owner what belongs to him.

The right of ownership may be absolute or qualified. Absolute ownership extends to the substance of the property and to all its uses. Qualified ownership may, in the language of divines, be direct or indirect. The former is ownership of the substance of a thing, without its uses, such as the landlord has over a house which he owns; but the latter, using, but not of disposing of, a thing. When anything definite and determinate is owned by anyone so that he can say—"This is my property"—he is said by divines to have a right in re. On the other hand if the thing has not yet come into existence though it will come, or it is not separate and determinate, so that he cannot say that this is his, but he nevertheless has a strict claim in justice that it should become his, he is said to have a right ad rem. Thus a farmer has a right ad rem to the harvest of the coming year from his land; when he has harvested his crop he will have a right in re.

Ownership in the sense explained is the principal object of the virtue of justice as it regulates the relations of man with man. It sharply distinguishes justice from charity, gratitude, patriotism, and other virtues whose object is a claim against others indeed, but a claim of a less strict and more indefinite character. Justice thus differentiates individual, particular, or commutative justice, because it is chiefly concerned with contracts and exchange. Individual justice is distinguished from social, for not only individuals have claims in justice against other individuals, but a subject has claims against the society to which he belongs, as society has claims against him. Justice requires that all should have what belongs to them, and so the just man will render to the society, or State, of which he is a member, what is due to it. The justice which prescribes this is called legal justice. On the other hand, the individual subject has claims against the State. It is the function of the State to protect its subjects in their rights and to govern the whole body for the common good. Authority for this purpose is given to the State by nature and by God, the Author of man's social nature.

The power of the State is limited by the end for which it was instituted, and it has no authority to violate the natural rights of its subjects. If it does this it commits injustice as individuals would do if they acted in like manner. It may indeed levy taxes, and impose other burdens on its subjects, as far as is required by the common necessities and advantage, but no further. For the common good it has the authority to compel individual citizens to lead such a life for the common good of their country when it is in peril, and to part with a portion of their property when this is required for a public road, but as far as possible it must make sure compensation. When it imposes taxes, military service, or other burdens; when it distributes rewards, offices, and honours; when it metes out confinements, punishment for offences, it is bound to do so according to the various merits and resources of the persons concerned; otherwise the State will sin against that special kind of justice which is called distributive.

There is a controversy among authorities as to whether commutative, legal, and distributive justice are so many species of one common genus, or whether commutative justice is in reality the only species of justice in the strict sense. There is much to be said for the latter view. For justice is something which is due to another; it consists, as Aristotle said, in a certain equality between the just and the unjust, and it is the duty of another, neither more nor less, is satisfied. If I have borrowed a horse and cart from my neighbours, justice requires that I should return that particular horse and cart. The debt in its precise amount must be paid. Consequently, justice in the full and proper sense of the term requires a perfect debt of the debtor and creditor. No one can be bound in justice towards himself; justice essentially regards others. However, between the State and the individuals who
compose it there is not this perfect distinction, and so there is something wanting to the proper and complete notion of the virtue in both legal and distributive justice.

The rights which belong to every human being inasmuch as he is a person are absolute and inalienable. The right to life and limb, the essential freedom which is necessary that a man may attain the end for which he is destined by God, the right to marry or remain single, such rights as these may not be intrinsically divested. If it is the law of nature that each man himself even has no right to dispose of his own life and limbs; God alone is the Lord of life and death. But a man has the duty and the right to use and develop his faculties of soul and body, and if he chooses he may dispose of his right to use these faculties and whatever advantage they can procure him in favour of another.

No person can thus become the property of another human being, slavery in that sense is repugnant to the dignity of human nature. But a man may by various titles have the right to the labour of another.

All things inferior to man were created for his use and benefit, they fulfill the end of their being by ministering to his needs. If man has or will have the power of disposing of the earth, therefore, pertains to the animal, vegetable, or inorganic world may be brought under the ownership and made the property of man. The right thus to acquire property which is useful and necessary for an orderly human life, is one of man's natural rights, and it cannot be taken away by any law made by a State; it may indeed make reasonable laws regulating and defining the property rights of its subjects for the common good, but it cannot abrogate them altogether. Such rights are antecedent to the State, and in their substance independent of it; the State was instituted to protect and defend them, not to take them away.

Rights are the appannage of intelligent beings as such, beings who can reflect on themselves, know their own wants, and who can will to supply them by permanently appropriating to themselves objects which are subordinate and which will satisfy those wants. Every human being, therefore, is the subject of rights, even before he has been brought into the world. The unborn child has a right to its life; it may even have property rights as well. Justice then is violated if such rights are interfered with unwarrantably. Minor law and personal defense rights are other but positive law frequently modifies their property rights for the common good. In the past ages the property rights of women especially were largely modified by positive law on their being married, the husband acquiring more or less extensive rights over the property of his wife. In modern times, even in English-speaking countries, the tendency has been to do away with such positive enactments, and to restore to married women all the property rights which unmarried women possess.

Not only individuals, but societies of men as such are the subjects of rights. For men cannot singly and independently concern themselves with that which is necessary for the security and dignity of human existence. For this end man needs the cooperation of his fellows. He has then a natural right to associate himself with others for the attainment of some lawful end, and when such societies have been formed, they are moral persons which have their rights similar to those of natural persons. Such societies then may own property, and although the State may make laws which modify those rights for the common good, it is beyond its power altogether to abrogate them. Men have power to form themselves into societies especially for the purpose of offering to God the public and personal worship in which is due to Him. The Catholic Church, founded by God Himself, is a perfect society and independent of the State. She has her rights, God-given, and necessary for the attainment of her end, and justice is violated if these are unwarrantably interfered with.

As we have seen, human nature, its wants and aims, are the source of the fundamental and natural rights of man. By his industry he earns a livelihood, and appropriates to his person material things which are of use to him and which belong to nobody else. He thus acquires property by the title of occupation. Property once acquired remains in the possession of its owner; all that it is or is capable of is ordained to his use and enjoyment by himself. If it is brought about by giving birth to offspring, the increase belongs to the original owner. By the same law of accession increase in value, even unearned increment as it is called, belongs to the owner of that which thus increases—"Res fructiflcat domino". Positive law may, as we have seen, modify property rights for the common good. It may also further determine those that are indeterminate by the law of nature; it may even create rights which would not exist without it. Thus a father may by law acquire certain rights over the property of his children, and a husband may in the same way have certain rights over the property of his wife. 

The foregoing is in very brief outline the doctrine of justice which has been advanced by Catholic philosophers and divines. The foundations of the doctrine are found in Aristotle, but the noble, beautiful, and altogether rational edifice has been raised by the labours of such men as Aquinas, Molina, Lessius, Lugo, and a host of others. The doctrine as it appears at large in their stately folios is one of the chief and most important results of Catholic thought. It fully accounts for the peremptory, sacred, and absolutely binding character with which justice is invested in the minds of men. It was never of greater importance than it is nowadays to insist on these characteristics of justice. They disappear almost if not altogether in the modern theories of the virtue. Most of these theories derive rights and justice from positive law, and when socialists and anarchists threaten to abrogate those laws and make new ones which will regulate men's rights more equitably, no mention is made of the need of order which becomes a mere question of might and brute force. Even if some with Herbert Spencer endeavour to find a deeper foundation for justice in the conditions of human existence, it is easy to answer that their interpretation of those conditions is essentially individual and selfish, and that human existence thus conditioned is not worth having; that the new social order peremptorily demands their abolition. The Catholic doctrine of justice will be found one of the main safeguards of order, peace, and progress. With even balance it equally favours all and presses unduly on none. It gives the State ample authority for the attainment of its legitimate ends while it effectually bars the road to tyranny and violence.
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T. Slater.

Justification (Lat. justification; Gr. δικαιοποίησις), a biblically-ecclesiastical term, which denotes the transferring of the sinner from the state of holiness and sonship of God. Considered as an act (actus justificationis), justification is the work of God alone, presupposing, however, on the part of the adult the process of justification and the co-
operation of his free will with God's preventing and helping grace (gratia preveniens et cooperans). Considered as a state or habit (habitus justificationis), it defined the content of justification and the condition of the human soul, which theologians aptly term sanctifying grace. Since the sixteenth century great differences have existed between Protestants and Catholics regarding the true nature of justification. As the dogmatic side of the controversy has been fully explained in the last chapter, we shall here consider it more from an historical point of view.

I. THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE ON JUSTIFICATION.

The ideas on which the Reformers built their system of justification, except perhaps fiducial faith, were by no means originally their own. They had been conceived long before either by heretics of the earlier centuries or by isolated Catholic theologians and had been quietly scattered as the seed of future heresies. It was especially the representatives of Antinomianism (q.v.) during the Apostolic times who welcomed the idea that faith alone suffices for justification, and that consequently the observance of the moral law is not necessary either as a prerequisite for obtaining justification or as a means for preserving it. For this reason St. Augustine (De fide et operibus, xiv) was of the opinion that the Apostles James, Peter, John, and Jude had directed their Epistles against the Antinomianism of the time, who claimed to have taken the doctrine of justifying grace as dangerous to the doctrine of the writings of St. Paul. Until quite recently, it was almost universally accepted that the Epistle of St. James was written against the unwarranted conclusions drawn from the writings of St. Paul. Of late, however, Catholic exegetes have become more and more convinced that the Epistle in question, so remarkable for its insisting on the necessity of good works, neither aimed at correcting the false interpretations of St. Paul's doctrine, nor had any relation to the teaching of the Apostle of the Gentiles. On the contrary, they believe that St. James had no other object than to emphasize the fact—already emphasized by St. Paul—that only such faith as is active in charity and good works (fides formata) possesses any power to justify man (cf. Gal., v, 6; I Cor., xii, 2), whilst faith devoid of charity and good works (fides informis) is a dead faith and in the eyes of God insufficient for justification (Rom. 1:16 sqq.).

According to this generally correct opinion, the Epistles of both Apostles treat of different subjects, neither with direct relation to the other. For St. James insists on the necessity of works of Christian charity, while St. Paul intends to show that neither the observance of the Jewish Law nor the works of any kind whatsoever, if they are not of any value for obtaining the grace of justification (cf. Bartmann, "St. Paulus u. St. Jacobus und die Rechtfertigung", Freiburg, 1897).

Whether Victorinus, a neo-Platonist, already defended the doctrine of justification by faith alone, is immaterial to our discussion. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that in the Middle Ages there were a few Catholic theologians among the Nominalists (Octam., Durandus, Gabriel Biel), who went so far in exaggerating the value of good works in the matter of justification that the efficiency and dignity of Divine grace was unduly relegated to the background. Of late, Fathers Denifle and Weise have shown that Martin Luther was acquainted almost exclusively with the theology of these Nominalists, which he naturally and justly found repugnant, and that the "Summa" of St. Thomas and the works of other great theologians were unknown to him. Even Ritschl ("Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Sühnung", I, 3rd ed., Bonn, 1889, pp. 105, 117) admits that neither the Church in her official teaching nor the majority of her theologians ever sanctioned, much less adopted, the extreme views of the Nominalists. Nevertheless it was not a healthy reaction against Nominalism, but Luther's own state of conscience that caused his change of views. Frightened, tormented, worn out by constant reflections on his own sinfulness, he had finally found a solace in the contemplation only in the thought that man cannot overcome concupiscence, and that sin itself is a necessity. This thought naturally led him to a consideration of the fall of man and its consequences. Original sin has so completely destroyed our likeness to God and our moral faculties in the heart of every creature, that it is lost and corrupted by it. Concupiscence as an intrinsically evil disposition, has instilled its deadly poison into the soul, its faculties, and its action (cf. Möhler, "Symbolik", § 6). But here we are forced to ask: If all our moral actions be the outcome of an internal necessity and constraint, how can Luther still speak of sin in the true meaning of the word? Does not original sin become identical with the "Evil Substance" of the Manichaeans, as later on Luther's follower, Flacius Illyricus, quite logically admitted?

Against this dark and desolate background there stands out the more clearly the man of God who, for the sake of the Redeemer, is lovingly offered to a despairing man a righteousness (justitia) already complete in itself, namely the exterior righteousness of God or of Christ. With the "arm of faith" the sinner eagerly reaches out for this righteousness and puts it on as a cloak of grace, covering and concealing there-with his misery and his sins. Thus on the part of God, justification is, as the Formulary of Concord (1577) avows, a mere external pronouncement of justification, a forensic absolution from sin and its eternal punishments. This absolution is based on Christ's holiness which God imputes to man's faith. Cf. Solid. Declar. III de fide just., § xi. "The term justification in this instance means the declaring just, the freeing from sin and the eternal punishment of sin in consideration of the justice of Christ imputed to faith by God."

What then is the part assigned to faith in justification? According to Luther (and Calvin also), the faith that justifies is not, as the Catholic Church teaches, a firm belief in God's revealed truths and promises (fides theoretica, dogmatica), but is the infallible conviction (fides fiducialis, fiducia) that God for the sake of Christ will no longer impute to us our sins, but will consider us, as his children, and absolve us from all guilt and holy, although in our inner selves we remain the same sinners as before. Cf. Solid. Declar. III, § 15: "Through the obedience of Christ by faith the just are so declared and reputed, although by reason of their corrupt nature they still are and remain sinners as long as they bear this mortal body."

This so-called "fiducial faith" is not a religious-moral preparation of the soul for sanctifying grace, nor a free act of cooperation on the part of the sinner; it is merely a means or spiritual instrument (instrumentum, δραστικόν) granted by God to assist the sinner in laying hold of the righteousness of God, thereby to cover his sins in a purely external manner as a mantle. For this reason the Lutheran formularies of belief lay great stress on the doctrine that our entire righteousness does not intrinsically belong to us, but is something altogether exterior. Cf. Solid. Declar., § 48: "It is set-...
efficacy cause (causa efficiae) and merited by Christ as meritorious cause (causa meritoria), become an internal sanctifying quality or formal cause (causa formalis) in the soul itself, which it makes truly just and holy in the sight of God. In the Protestant system, however, remission of sin is no real forgiveness, no blotting out of guilt. Sin is merely cloaked and concealed by the imputed merits of Christ; God no longer is conscious of its very existence, and it continues under cover of its miserable existence till the hour of death. Thus there exist in man side by side hostile brothers as it were—the one just and the other unjust; the one a saint, the other a sinner; the one a child of God, the other a slave of Satan—and this without any prospect of our being justified. For the assurance of the sinner, the merely judicial absolution from sin does not take away sin itself, but spreads over it as an outer mantle His own righteousness. The Lutheran (and Calvinistic) doctrine on justification reaches its climax in the assertion that "fiduciary faith," as described above, is the only requisite and means of obtaining salvation. Neither repentance nor obedience nor any other virtue is required, in the just they may either attend or follow as a result of justification. (Cf. Solid. Decl., § 23; "Indeed, neither contrition nor love nor any other virtue, but faith alone is the means by which we can reach forth and obtain the grace of God, the merit of Christ and the remission of sin.") It is well known that Luther in his German translation of the Bible falsified Rom., iii, 28, by interpolating the word "alone" (by faith alone), and to his critics gave the famous answer: "Dr. Martin Luther wants it that way, and says: Papist and ass are the same thing: sivolo, sive jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas." 

Since neither charity nor good works contribute anything towards justification—inasmuch as faith alone justifies—their absence subsequently cannot deprive the just man of anything whatever. There is only one thing that might possibly divert him of justification, namely, the loss of fiduciary faith or of faith in general. From this point of view we get a psychological explanation of numerous objectionable passages in Luther's writings, against which even Protestants with deep moral sense, such as Hugo Grotius and George Bull, earnestly protested. Thus we find in one of the first letters of Calvin in the Montcalm (1549) the following words: "Be a sinner and sin boldly, but believe and rejoice in Christ more strongly, who triumphed over sin, death, and the world; as long as we live here, we must sin." Could anyone do more to degrade St. Paul's concept of justification than Luther did in the following biblical passage, thus meeting Calvin's outcry could not have committed in faith, it would not be a sin?" (Cf. Möhler, "Symbolik", § 16.) The doctrine of justification by faith alone was considered by Luther and his followers as an incontrovertible dogma, as the foundation rock of the Reformation, as an "article by which the church must stand or fall" (articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae) and which of itself would have been a sufficient cause for beginning the Reformation, as the Smalkaldic Articles emphatically declare. Thus we need not wonder when later on we see Lutheran theologians declaring that the Sola-Fides doctrine, as the principium materiale of Protestantism, deserves to be placed by side by side the dogma of Sola-Scriptura ("Bible alone", with the exclusion of Tradition) as its principium formale—two maxims in which the contrast between Protestant and Catholic teaching reaches its highest point. Since, however, neither maxim can be found in the Bible, every Catholic is forced to conclude that Protestantism from its very beginning and foundation is based on self-deception. We assert this of Protestantism in general; for the doctrine of justification as defended by the reformed Churches differs only in non-essentials from Lutheranism. The most important of these differences is to be found in Calvin's system, which taught that only such as are predestined infallibly to eternal salvation obtain justification, while all those not predestined God produced on the appearance of faith and righteousness, and this in order to punish them more severely in hell (Cf. Möhler, "Symbolik", § 12). 

From what has been said it is obvious that justification as understood by Protestants, presents the following qualities: First and above all, its being certain (certainitas). Its equality in all (aequitas), and finally the impossibility of ever losing it (immeminibilitas). For if it be essential to fiduciary faith that it infallibly assures the sinner of his own justification, it cannot mean anything but a firm conviction of the actual possession of grace. If, moreover, the sinner be justified, not by an interior righteousness capable of increase or decrease, but through God's sanctity eternally the same, it is evident that all the just from the common mortal to the Apostles and the Blessed Virgin Mary possess one and the same degree of righteousness and sanctity. Fiduciary faith alone sufficiently (according to Calvin, not even that) can deprive us of justification, it follows that justification once obtained can never be lost. Incidentally, we may here call attention to another significant fact, namely that it was Luther who laid the foundation for the separation of religion and morality. For, by stating that fiduciary faith alone suffices for obtaining both justification and eternal happiness, he minimized our moral faculties to such an extent that charity and good works no longer affect our relations with God. By this doctrine Luther opened a fundamental breach between religion and morality, between faith and law, and assigned to each its own distinct sphere of action, in which each can attain its end independent of the other. Prof. Paulsen of Berlin was therefore justified in delineating Kant, who followed Luther in this matter, as the "Philosopher of Protestantism." (Cf. Möhler, "Symbolik", § 25.) 

The harshness, with its harmony, intrinsic improbability, and contradiction of Holy Writ contained in the system soon brought about a reaction in the very midst of Protestantism. Osianeder (d. 1652), at once an enthusiastic admirer of Luther and an independent thinker, emphatically stated (in opposition to Luther and Calvin) that the inner man (mente) of the Christian is one, real, intrinsic union of Christ with the soul, an opinion for which, as being Catholic, he was censured freely. Butzer (d. 1551) likewise admires, in addition to an "imputed exterior righteousness", the idea of an "inherent righteousness" as a partial factor in justification, thus meeting Calvin's opinion by the way. Luther's most dangerous adversary, however, was his friend Melanchthon, who, in his praiseworthy endeavour to smooth over by conciliatory modifications the interior difficulties of this discordant system, laid the foundation for the famous Synergisten-Straf (Synergist Dispute), which was so soon to become embittered. In general it was precisely the denial of man's free will in the moral order, and of the impossibility of his full co-operation with Divine grace that repelled so many followers of Luther. No sooner had Pfeffinger in his book, "Delibero arbitrio," (Leipzig, 1555) taken up the defence of man's free will than many theologians and jurists (e.g. Strigel) boldly attacked the Lutheran Kloster-Stock-und-Steintheorie (log-stick-and-stone theory), and tried to force from their adversaries the concession that man can co-operate with God's grace. The theological quarrel soon proved very annoying to both parties and the desire for peace became universal. "The Half-Melanchthonians" had succeeded in
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Smuggling Synergism into the "Book of Torgau" (1576); but before the "Formulary of Concord" was printed in the monastery of Bergen (near Magdeburg, 1580), His own faith was eliminated as heterodox and the harsh doctrine of Luther substituted in the symbols of the Lutheran Church. The new breach in the system formed by the Syngagnosten-Streit was enlarged by a counter movement that originated among the Pietists and Methodists, who were willing to admit the infallible assurance of salvation given by Lutherian faith—only in case that that assurance was confirmed by internal experience. But what probably contributed most of all to the crumbling of the system was the rapid growth of Socinianism and Rationalism which during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries gained so many adherents among the Lutherans. Fiduciary faith was no longer considered a spiritual means to assist man in reaching out for the righteousness of God, but was identified with a disposition which is upright and pleasing to God. Latterly, A. Ritschl defined justification as the change in the consciousness of our relation to God and amplified this in sixteenth century by saying that the certainty of our salvation is further determined by the consciousness of our union with the Christian community. Schleiermacher and Hengstenberg deviated still further from the old doctrine. For they declared contrition and penance as also necessary for justification, thus making man's free will an essential part of the Divine and human action, of grace and moral freedom of election, in such a manner, however, that the will can resist, and with full liberty reject the influence of grace (Trent, I, c., can. IV: "If any one should say that free will, moved and set in action by God, cannot cooperate by assenting to God's call, nor dissent if it wish... let him be anathema"). By this decree the Council not only condemned the Protestant view that the will in the reception of grace remains merely passive, but also forestalled the Jansenistic heresy regarding the impossibility of resisting actual grace. (See Jansenius.)

With what little right heretics in defence of their doctrine appeal to St. Augustine, may be seen from the following brief extract from his writings: "He who made you without your doing does not without your action justify you. Without your knowing He made you, with your willing He justifies you; but it is His doing He justifies you (Serm. clix, c. xi, n. 13). Regarding St. Augustine's doctrine cf. J. Maubach, "Die Ethik des hl. Augustinus," II, Freiburg, 1909, pp. 208-38.

We now come to the different stages in the process of justification. The Council of Trent assigns the first and most important place to the so-called styled "the beginning, foundation and root of all justification" (Trent, I, c., cap. viii). Cardinal Pallavicini (Hist. Conc. Trid., VIII, iv, 18) tells us that all the bishops present at the council fully realized how important it was to explain St. Paul's saying that man is justified through faith. Comparing Biblic and Tradition they observed that the notion of justification as an application of the Redemption to the individual presupposes the fall of the entire human race, the Council of Trent quite logically begins with the fundamental statement that original sin has weakened and deflected, but not entirely destroyed or extinguished the freedom of the human will (Trent, III, c. I, cap. I: "Liberae arbitrium minime extinctum, viribus licet attenuatum et inclinatum"). Nevertheless, as the children of Adam were really corrupted by original sin, they could not of themselves arise from their fall nor shake off the bonds of sin, death, and Satan. Neither the natural faculties left in man, nor the observance of the Jewish Law could achieve this. Since God alone was able to free us from this great misery, He sent in His infinite mercy and love His only Son, Jesus Christ, to expiate the bitter passion and death on the cross redeemed fallen man and thus became the Mediator between God and man. But, if the grace of Redemption merited by Christ is to be appropriated by the individual, he must be "regenerated in God", that is he must be justified. And therefore what there is of salvation in man only—denotes that change or transformation in the soul by which man is transferred from the state of original sin, in which as a child of Adam He was born, to that of grace and Divine sonship through Jesus Christ, the second Adam, our Redeemer (I. c., cap. iv: "Justificatio impi., translatio sub novo statu, in quatuor aspectus, nascitur filius primi Adam, in statum gentium, et adoptionis filium Dei per secundum Adam, Jesum Christum, Salvatorem nostrum"). In the New Law this justification cannot, according to Christ's precept, be effected except at the fountain of regeneration, that is, by the baptism of water. While in Baptism infants are taught that they are cleansed from the sin of Adam without any preparation on their part, the adult must pass through a moral preparation, which consists essentially in turning from sin and towards God. This entire process receives its first impulse from the supernatural grace of vocation (absolutely independent of the human will) of God by which the will is disposed to the Divine and human action, of grace and moral freedom of election, in such a manner, however, that the will can resist, and with full liberty reject the influence of grace (Trent, I, c., can. IV: "If any one should say that free will, moved and set in action by God, cannot cooperate by assenting to God's call, nor dissent if it wish... let him be anathema"). By this decree the Council not only condemned the Protestant view that the will in the reception of grace remains merely passive, but also forestalled the Jansenistic heresy regarding the impossibility of resisting actual grace. (See Jansenius.)
original and personal) and its punishments, and is made a child of God. The same process of justification is repeated in those who by mortal sin have lost their baptismal innocence; with this modification, however, that the Sacrament of Penance replaces baptism. Considering merely the psychological analysis of the concept of justification given by Aquinas, it is once evident that faith alone, whether fiduciary or dogmatic, cannot justify man (Trent, I. c., can. xii: "Si quis dixerit, fedem justificantem nihil afluat esse quam fiduciam divinam misericordiae, pecam remittentem propter Christum, vel eam fiduciam solam esse, quae justificantem. Sicut etiam divina gratia et friendship with God is based on perfect love of God or charity (cf. Gal., v, 6; I Cor., xiii; James, ii, 17 sqq.), dead faith devoid of charity (fides caritatis) cannot possess any justifying power. Only such faith as is active in charity and good works (fides caritatis formata) can justify man, and this even before the actual reception of baptism or penance, although not without the desert of the sacrament (cf. Trent, SS. VI, cap. iv, xiv). But, not to close the gates of heaven against pagans and those non-Catholics, who without their fault do not know or do not recognize the Sacrament of Penance, theologians unanimously hold that the desire to receive these sacraments is implicitly contained in the serious resolve to do all that God has commanded, even if His holy will shall not become known in every detail.

2) The Formal Cause of Justification.—The Council of Trent decreed that the essence of active justification comprises not only forgiveness of sin, but also "sanctification and renovation of the interior man by means of the voluntary acceptation of sanctifying grace and other supernatural gifts" (Trent, I. c., cap. viii: "Non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renationem et vivificationem et sanctificationem et donorum"). In order to exclude the Protestant idea of a merely forensic absolution and exterior declaration of righteousness, special stress is laid on the fact that we are justified by God's justice, not that whereby He himself is just but that whereby He makes us just, in so far as He bestows on us the gift of His grace which renovates the soul interiorly and adheres to it as its own holiness (Trent, I. c., cap. vii: "Unica formalis causa [justificationis] est justitia Dei, non qua ipse justus est, sed qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati, renovamus spiritualiter et nostrae conscribemur in nobis recipientes uniusquae suam"). This inner quality of righteousness and sanctity is universally termed "sanctifying (or habitual) grace", and stands in marked contrast to an exterior, imputed sanctity, as well as to the idea of merely confessing and concealing sin. By this, however, we do not assert that the "justitia extra nos" is of no importance in the process of justification. For, even if it is not the formal cause of justification (causa formalis), it is nevertheless its true exemplar (causa exemplaria), imitating in the soul the very act of God in sanctification of the soul's own holiness. The Council of Trent (I. c., cap. vii), moreover, did not neglect to enumerate in detail the other causes of justification: the glory of God and of Christ as the final cause (causa finalis), the mercy of God as the efficient cause (causa efficientiae), the Passion of Christ as the meritorious cause (causa meritoria), and the concomitant concept of the Sacrament of Justification (causa instrumentalis). Thus each and every factor receives its full share and is assigned its proper place. Hence the Catholic doctrine on justification, in welcome contrast to the Protestant teaching, stands out as a reasonable, consistent, harmonious system of beliefs, the essence of sanctifying grace, see GRACE. Regarding the false doctrine of the Catholic theologian Hermes, cf. Kleutger, "Thesellie der Vorsait", II (2nd ed., Münster, 1872), 254-343.

According to the Council of Trent sanctifying grace is not merely a formal cause, but "the only formal cause" (una causa formalis) of our justification. By this important decision the Council excluded the views of Butzer and the other Catholic theologians (Federic, Seripando, and Albert Pighius) who maintained that an additional "external favor of God" (favor Dei externus) belonged to the essence of justification. The same decree also effectually set aside the opinion of Peter Lombard, that the formal cause of justification (i.e. sanctifying grace) is nothing else than the "Person of the Holy Ghost, Who is the hypostatic holiness and charity, or the uncreated grace (gratia in-creata). Since justification consists in an interior sanctity and renovation of spirit, its formal cause evident must be a created grace (gratia creatura), a permanent quality, a supernatural modification or accident (accidentia) of the soul. Quite distinct from this is the question whether the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost, although not required for justification (inasmuch as sanctifying grace alone suffices), be necessary as a prerequisite for Divine adoption. Several great theologians of the church have vigorously opposed the view, as for instance Lessius ("De summo bono", II); "De perfecta moribusque divin.", XII, ii; Petavius ("De Trinit.", viii, 4 sqq.); Thomassin ("De Trinit.", VIII, 9 sqq.); and Hurter ("Compend. theolog. dogmat.", III, 6th ed., pp. 162 sqq.). The solution of the lively controversy which has centered around this point is found in the Fierz Cranach ("Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie", 1881, pp. 283 sqq.; 1883, 491 sqq.; 593 sqq.; 1884, 545 sqq.) and Professor Scheeben ("Dogmatik", II, 169; "Katholik", 1883, I, 147 sqq.; II, 561 sqq.; 1884, I, 18 sqq.; II, 455 sqq.; 610 sqq.) seems to lie in the following distinction: the Divine adoption, inseparably connected with sanctifying grace, is not in the act of indwelling by the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost, but re- ceives therefrom its full development and perfection.

(3) The Effects of Justification.—The two elements of active justification, forgiveness of sin and sanctification, furnish at the same time the elements of habitual justification, freedom from sin and holiness. According to the Catholic doctrine, however, this freedom from sin and this sanctity are effected, not by two distinct and successive Divine acts, but by a single act of God. For, just as light dispels darkness, so the infusion of sanctifying grace eo ipso disperses from the soul the sin (cf. of Trent, I. c., cap. vii). The same decision of the Council of Trent is expressed in another way as follows (Trent, I. c., can. xii: "Si quis dixerit, homines justificari vel sola imputazione justitiae Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione, excluda gratia et caritate, quae in cordibus eorum per Spiritum Sanctum diffundatur atque ills inhereat... a.s.") In considering the effects of justification it will be useful to compare the Catholic doctrine of real forgiveness of sin with the Protestant theory that sin is merely "covered" and not imputed. By declaring the grace of justification, or sanctifying grace, to be the only formal cause of justification, the Council of Trent intended to emphasize the fact that in possessing sanctifying grace we possess not only the essence of the state of justification with all its formal effects; that is, we possess freedom from sin and sanctity, and indeed freedom from sin by means of sanctity. Such a remission of sin could not consist in a mere covering or non-imputation of sins, which continue their existence out of view; it must necessarily have the effect of remitting the guilt of sins. This genuinely Biblical concept of justification forms such an essential element of Catholicism, that even Antonio Rosmini's theory, standing half way between Protestantism and Catholicism, is quite irreconcilable with it. According to Rosmini, there are two categories of sins: (1) sins which God may forgive (Ps. xxxi, 1); (2) sins which God does not impute (Ps. xxxi, 1); (2) such as God really forgives and blots out. By the latter Rosmini
understood deliberate sins of commission (culpa actuales et libera), by the former indeferrible sins (pecos naturales liberales), which "do no harm to those who are of the peace of God." This opinion was canvassed by the Holy Office (14 Dec., 1887), not only because without any reason it defended a twofold remission of sin, but also because it stamped indelible acts as sins (cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, "Enchir.", n. 1925).

Although it is a Catholic dogma that sanctifying grace and sin (original and mortal) do never exist simultaneously in the soul, there may be, nevertheless a diversity of opinion regarding the extent of this incompatibility, according as it is considered as either moral, physical, or metaphysical in character. According to the now universally rejected opinion of the Noricans (Dominus Briel) and the Scotists (Mastricius, Henno) the contrast between grace and sin is based on a free decree and acceptance of God, or in other words, the contrast is merely moral. This would logically imply in contradiction to the "unica causa formalis" of the Council of Trent, a twofold formal cause of justification (cf. Pohle, "Dogmatik", II, 4th ed, Paderborn, 1909, p. 512). Suares (De gratia, VII, 20) and some of his followers in defending a physical contrast come nearer the truth. In their explanation grace and sin exclude each other with the same necessity as do fire and water, although in both cases God, by the action of his omnipotence, could suspend the general law and force the two hostile elements to exist peacefully side by side. This opinion might be safely accepted were sanctifying grace only a physical ornament of the soul. But since in reality it is an ethical form of sanctification by which even an infant in receiving baptism is necessarily made just and pleasing to God, there must be between the concepts of grace and of sin a metaphysical and absolute contradiction, which not even Divine omnipotence can alter and destroy. For this last opinion, defended by the Thomists and the majority of theologians, there is also a solid foundation in Holy Writ. For the contrast between grace and sin is as great as between light and darkness (II Cor., vi, 14; Eph., v, 8), between life and death (Rom., v, 21; Col., ii, 13; I John, iii, 14), between God and idols, Christ and Belial (II Cor., vi, 15 sqq.), etc. Thus it follows from Holy Writ that by the infusion of sanctifying grace sin is determined as being an absolute necessity; that the Protestant theory of "covering and not imputing sin" is both a philosophical and a theological impossibility. Besides the principal effect of justification, i.e., real obliteration of sin by means of sanctification, there is a whole series of other effects: beauty of the exterior, vivification, and Divine adoption. In the article on Grace these are described as formal effects of sanctifying grace. In the same article is given an explanation of the supernatural accompaniments—the three theological virtues, the moral virtues, the seven gifts, and the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost. These, as freely bestowed gifts of God, cannot be regarded as formal effects of justifying grace.

(4) The Qualities of Justification.—We have seen that Protestants claim the following three qualities for justification: certainty, equality, the impossibility of ever losing it. Diametrically opposed to these qualities are those defended by the Council of Trent (sess. VI, cap. 9-11) — uncertainty (incertitude), inequality (inaequitatem), amissibility (amissibilitatem). Since these qualities of justification are also qualities of sanctifying grace, see Grace.

Justin de Jacobis, BLESSED, Vicar Apostolic of Abyssinia and titular Bishop of Nilopolis, b. at San Fele; Province of Potenza, Italy, 9 October, 1800; d. 31 July, 1860, in the plain of Eydele between the mountains Chedene and Hamamo in Abyssinia, while on his way to Balay where he hoped to regain his health. On 17 October, 1819, he entered the Congregation of the Lazarists and took his vows on 18 October, 1820, and was ordained priest at Brindisi, 12 June, 1824. After spending some time in the care of souls at Oria and Monopoli, he became superior, first at Lecce, then at Naples. In 1839 he was appointed first Prefect Apostolic of Abyssinia, and entrusted with the foundation of Catholic missions in that country. After labouring with great success in Abyssinia for eight years, he was made titular Bishop of Nilopolis in 1847, and shortly afterwards Vicar Apostolic of Abyssinia, but he refused the episcopal dignity until it was finally imposed upon him in 1849. Despite imprisonment, exile, and every other kind of persecution from heretics and heretics, he founded numerous Catholic missions, built various schools for the training of a native clergy, and in many other ways laboured for the conversion of Abyssinia. The process of his beatification was introduced at Rome, 23 July, 1874. Dinem. Vita del Venerabile Justin de Jacobis (Paris, 1905); Acta Sanctorum Saba (Rom., 1904), XXXVII, 158-90.

Michael Ott.

Justinian I, Roman Emperor (527-65).—Flavius Anicius Julianus Justinianus was born about 483 at Tauresium (Taor) in Illyricum (near Uskup); d. 565. The theory that he was a slave by race is now abandoned (Krummacher, "Das Leben der Basiliskeni", 1855). Justinian was the nephew of Justin I (518-27), being the son of Justin's sister Vigilantia and a certain Sabatius. Already during his uncle's reign he became the chief power in the state. Justin was an old man, weak in body and mind; he gradually handed over all power to his nephew. In 521 Justinian was proclaimed consul, then general-in-chief, and in April, 527, Augustus; in August of the same year Justin died, and Justinian was left sole ruler.

The thirty-eight years of Justinian's reign are the most brilliant period of the later empire. Full of enthusiasm for the memories of his ancestors, he achieved, the task of reviving their glory. The many-sided activity of this wonderful man may be summed up under the headings: military triumphs, legal work, ecclesiastical polity, and architectural activity. Dominating all is the policy of restoring the empire, great, powerful, and united. Of these many features of his reign—each of them epoch-making—it is impossible to give more than the merest outline here. (1) Justinian carried on the unending war against the Persians with mixed success. His general Belisarius lost a battle at first in 528, then completely routed the Persians at Dara, near Ctesiphon (June, 530); but on 19 April, 531, the Romans were defeated near Callinicum on the Euphrates; in September a peace was arranged on fairly equal terms. The emperor then conceived the plan of reconquering Africa and Italy, lost to the empire by the Vandal and Gothic invasions from 496 to 535. In 533 a fleet of 100 ships was sent for Africa under Belisarius. In two battles the Romans annihilated the Vandal kingdom, took the king, Gelimer, prisoner to Constantinople, and re-established the authority of Cæsar in Africa. In 535 Belisarius sailed for Sicily. The island was conquered at once. After a reverse in Dalmatia that province was also subdued. Belisarius in 536 took Rhegium and
Naples, entered Rome in triumph, seized Ravenna, sustained a siege in Rome till 538, when the Goths retired. A second general, Narses, then arrived with reinforcements from Constantinople; Milan and all Liguria were taken in 539, and in 540 all Italy up to the frontier of the Frankish Kingdom was reunited to the empire. In 542 the Goths revolted under their king, Totila; by 553 they were again crushed. Narses became the first Exarch of Italy. Verona and Brescia (Brescia), the last Gothic strongholds, fell in 552. The Roman armies then marched on Spain and conquered its south-eastern provinces (lost again in 623, after Justinian’s death). Meanwhile the Crimean Goths and all the Bosporus, even the Southern Arabs, were forced to acknowledge the rule of Rome. A second war against the Persians (560–45) pushed the Roman frontier beyond Edessa. From 549 to 566 a long war in Armenia and Colchis (the Lazic War) again established the empire without a rival on the shores of the Black Sea. So Justinian ruled once more over a colossal world-empire, whose extent rivaled that of the greatest days before Diocletian. Meanwhile the emperor was no less successful at home. In 552 a very dangerous revolt (the Nika revolt) broke out among the factions of the Circus (the Blues and Greens), was put down severely. Bury says that the result of the suppression was “an imperial victory which established the form of absolutism by which Byzantine history is generally characterized.” Later Roman Empire, I, 345).

(2) The most enduring work of Justinian was his codification of the laws. This, too, was an important part of his general scheme. The great empire he was reconquering must have the strength of organized unity. He says in the edict of promulgation of his laws that “a state rests on arms and law” (“De Justin. Cod. confirmando”, printed in front of the codex). The legal and judicial decrees of his predecessors must be collected in a well-ordered and complete code, logically arranged, so that every Roman citizen could learn at once the law of the empire on any subject. This codification was Justinian’s great work. He made many new laws himself, but his enduring merit is rather the classification of scattered older laws. The legal code was the result of the work of a number of jurists, and in outline this:—First, a commission of ten lawyers (including the famous Tribonianus and Theophilius) reduced the bulky and rambling Theodosian Code (published in 438) to a orderly compendium, inserting into it the laws made since it was written. So the “Codex” was completed in 529. Second, a mass of answers given by authorities (the “responsa prudentum” that formed acknowledged precedents) were arranged (omitting all superfluities) in fifty books, whereby a law library of a hundred and six volumes was reduced to about one-fifth. This is the “Digest”, or “Pandects”, published in 530. Third, a manual of law for students was compiled from the commentaries of Gaius (second century). This, the Institutes”, was published in the same year, 530. In 532 the whole work was revised, and a fourth part, the “Authentic”, or “Novels”, was added, containing later decisions made by Justinian’s own court. So the immortal “Corpus Juris Civilis” was produced, consisting of four parts: (a) Digesta seu Pandecta, (b) In- stitutio, (c) Codex, (d) Novellae. An excellent account of its composition is found in Bury’s Gibbon, ed. cit., IV, 461–510. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this “Corpus”. It is the basis of all canon law (ecclesia vivit lege romana), and the basis of civil law in every civilized country. Catholic cannot applaud the great emperor’s ecclesiastical policy, though in this, too, we recognize the statesman’s effort to promote peace and union within the empire. It was a matter of course that this union was to be that of the “most holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ” (5 c., De s. tr., I, 1). The Corpus Juris is full of laws against paganism (apostasy was punished by death, 10 c., “De pag.” I, 11). Jews, Samaritans (who began a dangerous revolt in 539), Manicheans, and other heretics. The decrees of the four general councils were incorporated in the civil law. There was no toleration of dissent. True to the ideal of Constantinople, the emperor conceived himself as “priest and king”, supreme head on earth in matters ecclesiastical as well as in the State. He filled his codex with canon law and assumed the most outspoken Erastianism as the law of the empire. And all through his reign he fell foul of the authority of the Church by his attempts to conciliate the Monophysites. Ever since Chalcedon (451) those heretics filled Syria and Egypt, and were a constant source of disunion and trouble to the empire. Justinian was one of the many emperors who tried to reconcile them by concessions. His wife Theodora was a secret Monophysite; influenced by her, the emperor, while maintaining Chalcedon, tried to satisfy the heretics without compromising the Church. Ever since the Theopaschite question, Peter Fulo of Antioch had introduced into the Trisagion the clause: “Who didst suffer for us.” Pope Hormisdas (514–23) refused to admit it, as savouring of Monophysitism. But Justinian approved it and promoted a Monophysite, Anthimus I (536), to the See of Constantinople. Then followed the great quarrel of the Three Chapters, the lamentable attitude of Pope Vigilius (540–55),

Section of the Pandects of Justinian
From a seventh-century MS. in the Laurentian Library, Florence
and the Second Council of Constantinople (553). In all this story Justinian appears as a persecutor of the Church, the place, unhappily, among the semi-Monophysite tyrants who caused the long series of quarrels and schisms that were the after-effect of Monophysitism. His ecclesiastical tyranny is the one regrettable side of the character of so great a man.

(4) Justinian also acquired immortal fame by the immense public edifices he erected. Any style can ever be ascribed to one man, what we call Byzantine architecture, at least in its perfect form, owes its origin to Justinian and the architects he employed. His activity in building was prodigious. He covered his empire from Ravenna to Damascus with superb monuments. All later buildings in Byzantium are based on his models: two most famous schools, our medieval (Gothic) and the Moslem styles, are the lineal descendants of Justinian’s architecture. Of his many buildings may be mentioned the two most famous, the church of Our Lady (now the El-Aqsa mosque) at Jerusalem and, by far the most splendid of all, the great church of the Holy Wisdom (Hagia Sophia) at Constantinople. This church especially, built by Anthemius of Tralles and Isidore of Miletus, and consecrated on 27 December, 537, remains always one of the chief monuments of architecture in the world.

Church building, which required great expense, was magnificently in times of calamity, earthquake, and famine, the imperial purse was opened to the sufferers with unlimited generosity.

The emperor’s private life is somewhat clouded by the scandals told of his wife, Theodora. She had been a dancing-girl; there is no doubt that she had led an immoral life before her marriage in 523. She was also a Monophysite. But most scholars now reject the scandalous account of her married life given by Procopius in his ‘Secret History’. And in January, 532, at the time of the Circus revolution that nearly wrecked the state, it was Theodora’s courage and presence of mind that saved the situation. For she held, in a hand in her husband’s policy: administration, diplomacy, church affairs, etc., felt her influence for twenty-one years. If she did not honour Justinian by infidelity she certainly led him into semi-Monophysitism (see Dichi, ‘Théodora, impératrice de Byzance’, Rev. Archéol., 1904).

Justinian died in November, 565 (succeeded by his nephew, Justin II, 565–78). He was undoubtedly the greatest emperor after Constantine, perhaps the greatest of all the long line of Roman Caesars. Indeed one may question whether any state can show in its history a man of greater capacity to rule gloriously, or to so long a reign, or to lead the people through so many public reverses. His memory has lasted through all the ages after him (see Dante, ‘Paradiso’, vi), and his portrait gleams still from the mosaic in S. Vitale at Ravenna, where he stands in his toga and diadem, surrounded by his court, with a bishop at his side—the very type of the majesty of Christian Rome on the Bosporus.

The literature on the various sides of Justinian’s activity is naturally enormous. His reign is equally important to the historian, the lawyer, the theologian, and archivist. These are a few of the most serviceable modern works only: GIBSON (ed. BURY), The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 1869–1908, xi–xlvii (an excellent general work, with copious bibliography in Bury’s appendix); BURY, A History of Alexander the Great, 1889; GIBSON, 333–429 (supplements Gibson); DIBON, Justinien et l’histoire byzantine au Ve siècle (Paris, 1901); SCHULZ, Gesch. des Uebrigen des Byzantinischen Reiches, I, Gnesen, 1887, 434–59; HUTTON, The Church of the Sixth Century (London, 1917); JONES, Die Reichspolitik Kaisers Justinians (Giesen, 1885); KANTZEL, Die Kaiserpolitik des Justinian (Wiener-Liber, 1886); DREßKAMP, Die erstenleichen Streifzüge (Minster, 1909). Further bibliography is given in Dichi, Storiche byzantine (Paris, 1903), i and ii.

ADRIAN FORTESSER.
"Argument" he gives many personal details, e. g. about his studies in philosophy and his conversion; they are not, however, an autobiography, but are partly idealised, and it is possible, that he changed some of the details in his poetry and truth; they furnish us however with several precious and reliable clues. For his martyrdom we have documents of undisputed authority. In the first line of his "Argument" he calls himself "Justin, the son of Priscus, son of Bacheo, of Flavia Neapolis, in Africa." His resting place is unknown. His "city" was founded, by Vespasian (A.D. 72), was built on the site of a place called Mabortha, or Mamortha, quite near Siegeh (Guérin, "Samarue", I, Paris, 1874, 390-423; Schürer, "History of the Jewish People", tr., I, Edinburgh, 1885). Its inhabitants were all, or for the most part, pagans. The name of the city and the speech of Justin suggest a pagan origin, and he speaks of himself as uncircumcised (Dialogue, xxxvii). The date of his birth is uncertain, but would seem to fall in the first years of the second century. He received a good education in philosophy, an account of which he gives at the beginning of his "Discourse with the Jews Trypho"; he placed himself in the first under a Stoic, but after some time found that he had learned nothing about God and that in fact his master had nothing to teach him on the subject. A Peripatetic whom he then found welcomed him at first but afterwards demanded a fee from him; this provoked him to begin to study by himself. A Pythagorean refused to teach him anything until he should have learned music, astronomy, and geometry. Finally a Platonist arrived on the scene and for some time delighted Justin. This account cannot be taken too literally; the facts seem to be arranged with a view to showing the weakness of the pagan philosophies and of contrasting them with the teachings of the Prophets and of Christ. The main facts, however, may be accepted; the works of Justin seem to show just such a philosophic development as is here described, Eclectic, but owing much to Stoicism and more to Platonism. He was still under the charm of the Platonic philosophy when, as he walked one day along the seashore, he met a mysterious old man; the conclusion of their long discussion was that the soul could not arrive through human knowledge at the idea of God, but that it needed to be instructed by the Prophets and by the Word of God and could make Him known ("Dialogue", iii, vii; cf. Zahn, "Dichtung u. Wahrheit in Justin's Dialog mit dem Juden Trypho" in "Zeitschr. für Kirchen-gesch.", VIII, 1886-1887, 37-66).

The "Argument" throw light on another phase of the conversion of Justin: "When I was a disciple of Plato", he writes, "hearing the discussions against the Christians and seeing them intrepid in the face of death and of all that men fear, I said to myself that it was impossible that they should be living in evil and in the love of pleasure (II Apol., xviii, 1). Both accounts exhibit the two aspects of Christianity that most impressed the pagan: the love of the Prophet and the truth of God and could make Him known ("Dialogue", iii, vii; cf. Zahn, "Dichtung u. Wahrheit in Justin's Dialog mit dem Juden Trypho" in "Zeitschr. für Kirchen-gesch.", VIII, 1886-1887, 37-66).

The "Argument" throw light on another phase of the conversion of Justin: "When I was a disciple of Plato", he writes, "hearing the discussions against the Christians and seeing them intrepid in the face of death and of all that men fear, I said to myself that it was impossible that they should be living in evil and in the love of pleasure (II Apol., xviii, 1). Both accounts exhibit the two aspects of Christianity that most impressed the pagan: the love of the Prophet and the truth of God and could make Him known ("Dialogue", iii, vii; cf. Zahn, "Dichtung u. Wahrheit in Justin's Dialog mit dem Juden Trypho" in "Zeitschr. für Kirchen-gesch.", VIII, 1886-1887, 37-66)."
nack, "Die Ueberliefcrung der griech. Apologeten" in "Texte und Untersuchungen", I, Leipzig, 1883, i, 73-89; Archambault, "Justin, Dialogue avec Tryphon", Paris, 1909, p. xii-xxxviii). There are many large gaps in this manuscript, thus II Apol., ii, is almost entirely wanting, but it has been found possible to restore the manuscript text from a quotation of Eusebius (Hist. eccl., IV, xvii). The "Dialogue" was dedicated to a certain Marcus Pompeius (cxl, viii); it must therefore have been preceded by a dedicatory epistle and probably by an introduction or preface; both are lacking. In the seventy-fourth chapter a large part must also be missing, comprising the end of the first book and the beginning of the second, "Zeitschrift f. Kirchengesch.", VIII, 1885, 37 sq., Bardenhewer, "Gesch. der altkirchl. Litter.", I, Freiburg im Br., 1902, 210). There are other less important gaps and many faulty transcriptions. There being no other manuscript, the correction of this one is very difficult; conjectures have been often quite unhappy, and Krüger, the latest editor of the "Apologeticus", has scarcely done more than return to the text of the manuscript.

In the manuscript the three works are found in the following order: second "Apologeticus", first "Apology", the "Dialogue". The second "Apologeticus" preserves the original order, and all other editors have followed him. There could not be as a matter of fact any doubt as to the proper order of the "Apologeticus", the first is quoted in the second (iv, 2; vi, 5; viii, 1). The form of these references shows that Justin is referring, not to a different work, but to that which he was then writing (II Apol., ix, 1, cf. vii, 7; I Apol., lxxiii, 16, cf. xxxix, 14; lxiii, 4, cf. xxi, 1; ix, 6, cf. lxiv, 2). Moreover, the second "Apologeticus" is evidently not a complete work independent of the first, but rather an appendix, owing to a new fact that came to the writer's knowledge, and which he wished to utilize without retaining the rest. It has been remarked that Eusebius often alludes to the second "Apologeticus" as the first (Hist. eccl., IV, viii, 5; IV, xvii, 1), but the quotations from Justin by Eusebius are too inexact for us to attach much value to this fact (cf. Hist. eccl., IV, xi, 5; Bardenhewer, op. cit., 201). Probably Eusebius also erred in making Justin write one apology under Antoninus (161) and another under Marcus Aurelius. The second "Apologeticus", known to no other author, doubtless never existed (Bardenhewer, loc. cit.; Harnack, "Chronologie der christl. Litter.", I, Leipzig, 1897, 276). The date of the "Apologeticus" cannot be determined with any certainty, but it can be established with the aid of the following facts: it is 150 years since the birth of Christ (I, xiv, 1); Marcion has already spread abroad his error (I, xxvi, 5); now, according to Epiphanus (Hieres., xlii, 1), he did not begin to teach until after the death of Marcion (A.D. 140). The Prefect of Egypt, Felix (I, xxxi, 2), occupied this charge in September, 151, probably from 150 to about 154 (Grenfell-Hunt, "Oxyrhynchus Papyri", II, London, 1899, 163, 175; cf. Harnack, "Theol. Literaturzeitung", XXII, 1897, 77). From all this we may conclude that the "Apologeticus" was written somewhere between 153 and 155. The second "Apologeticus", as already said, is an appendix to the first and must have been written shortly afterwards. The Prefect Urbinus mentioned in it was in charge from 144 to 160. The "Dialogue" is certainly earlier than the "Apologeticus" to which it refers ("Dial.", cxx, cf. "I Apol.", xxvi); it seems, moreover, that the same reference to whom the "Apologeticus" was addressed were still living when the "Dialogue" was written. This places it somewhere before A. D. 161, the date of the death of Antoninus.

The "Apologeticus" and the "Dialogue" are difficult to analyse, for Justin's method of composition is free and capricious, and defies our habitual rules of logic. The content of the first "Apologeticus" (Veil, "Justinus des Phil. Rechtfertigung", Strasbourg, 1894, 58 sq.) is somewhat as follows: i-iii: exordium to the emperor; Justin is about to enlighten them and free himself of responsibility, which will now be wholly theirs. iv-viii: first part or introduction: the anti-Christian procedure is iniquitous, the persecutors in the name of Christians a name only (iv, v); Christians are neither Atheists nor criminals (vi, vii); they allow themselves to be killed rather than deny their God (viii); they refuse to adopt idols (ix, xii); conclusion (xii). xi-xvii: Second part: exposition and demonstration of Christ's divinity, ascension of our Lord to heaven, and triumph of Christ, as well as God (xiii); Christ is the only true mediator; moral precepts (xiv-xvii); the future life, judgment, etc. (xviii-xx). Christ is the Incarnate Word (xvi-xix); comparison with pagan heroes, Hermes, Asclepius, etc. (xxi-xxii); superiority of Christ and of Christianity: hatred of men and of demons (xxiii-xxvi); purity of morals (xxvii-xxix).—Proofs of Christianity from the prophecies (xxx-iii); two digressions: on the agreement between liberty and prophecy (xxxiii-xliv); on philosophy considered as Christianity before Christ (xlv).—The similarities that we find in the pagan worship and philosophy are but a feeble reflection of the Christian worship: baptism (Ixxi); the Eucharist (Ixxv-lixii); Sunday-observance (Ixxvii). Second "Apologeticus"—Recent injustice of the Prefect Urbinus towards the Christians (i-iii). Why is it that God permits these evils: Providence, human liberty, last judgment (iv-xvi).

The "Dialogue" is much longer than the two apologies taken together ("Apol.", I and II in P. G., VI, 328-460; "Dialog.", ibid., 472-800), the abundance of exegetical discussions makes any analysis particularly difficult. The following points are noteworthy: i-ix. In this "Dialogue" which was the result of his philosophic education and of his conversion, one may know God only through the Holy Ghost; the soul is not immortal by its nature; to know truth it is necessary to study the Prophets. x-xxx: On the law. Tryphon reproaches the Christians for not observing the law. Justin replies that according to the Prophets themselves the law should be abrogated, it had only been given to the Jews on account of their hardness. Superiority of the Christian circumcision, necessary even for the Jews. The eternal law laid down by Christ. xxxi-xxvIII: On Christ: His two comings (xxxII sqq.); the law a figure of the new law; the kingdom of Christ proved above all by the Old Testament apparitions (theophanies) (Ixxi-lixii); inanition and virginal conception (lxv sqq.); the death of Christ foretold (lxxviii sqq.); His resurrection (evi sqq.). evii to the end: On the Christians. The conversion of the nations foretold by the Prophets (xxvIII sqq.); Christians are a holier people than the Jews (exix sqq.); the promises were made to them (exxxi); they were prefigured in the Old Testament (exxxiv sqq.).—The "Dialogue" concludes with wishes for the conversion of the Jews.

Besides these authentic works we possess others under Justin's name that are doubtful or apocryphal.

(1) "On the Resurrection", "On the Resurrection" (for its numerous fragments see Otto, "Corpus Apol.", 2nd ed., III, 210-48 and the "Sacra Parallela", Holl, "Fragmente vornehmlicher Kirchenverhae aus dem sacra Parallela", in "Texte und Untersuchungen", nos. 1 and 2, 1877). It is generally supposed that these fragments are taken to attribute to St. Justin by St. Methodius (early fourth century) and was quoted by St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, who definitely, have never done, name the author. The attribution of the fragments to Justin is therefore probable (Harnack, "Chronologie", 608; Bouisset, "Die Evangelieninterpretation Justinian", Göttingen, 1891, 123 sq.; Archambault, "Le témoignage dé
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l'ancienne littérature chrétienne sur l'autenticité de "sur un traité sur la resurrection attribué à Justin l'Apologiste" in "Revue de Philologie", XXXIX, 1905, 73-93. The chief interest of these fragments consist in the introduction, which is explained with much force the transcendent nature of faith and the proper nature of faith. (3) "Oration (Greeks)" (Otto, op. cit., III, I, 2, 18), an apoecrptic tract, dated by Harnack (Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, 1896, 627-646), about Ad 180-240. Later it was altered and enlarged in Syria: text and English translation by Cureton, "The Oration of Justin", London, 1862, 61-66; the "Apologia" in "Exhortation to the Greeks" (Otto, op. cit., 18-126). The authenticity of this has been defended without success by Widman ("Die Echterheit der Makroden Justins an die Heiden", Main, 1902); Puech, "Sur le Λόγος απεριστάτηθα attribué à Justin" in "Melanges Well", Paris, 1898, 395-406, dates it about 260-300, but most critics say, with more probability, Ad 180-240 (Gaul, "Die Abfassungsverhältnisse der pseudojustinischen Cohortatio ad Grecos", Potsdam, 1902). (4) "On Monarchy" (Otto, op. cit., 126-158), tract of uncertain date, in which are freely quoted Greek poets altered by some Jews (Ad 6). Exposition of the Psalms in the NT in a long tract on the Trinity and the Incarnation preserved in two copies of the longer of which seems the more ancient. It is quoted for the first time by Leontius of Bysantium (d. 543) and refers to the Christological discussions of the fifth century; it seems, therefore, to date from the second half of that century. (6) "Letter to Zenas and Serenus" (Otto, op. cit., 66-98), attributed by Batifol in "Revue Biblique", VI, 1896, 114-22, to Sisinnius, the Novatian Bishop of Constantinople about Ad 400. (7) "Answers to the Orthodox." (8) "The Christian's Questions to the Greeks." (9) "Refutation of certain Aristotelian theses" (Otto, op. cit., IV, 100-222; V, 4-366). The "Answers to the Orthodox" was re-edited in a different and more primitive form by Papadopoulos-Kerameus (St. Petersburg, 1895), from a Constantinople manuscript which ascribed the work to Theodoret. Though this assumption was adopted by the editor, it has not been generally accepted. Harnack has studied profoundly these four books and maintains, not without probability, that they are the work of Diodorus of Tarsus (Harnack, "Diodor von Tarsus, vier pseudojustinische Schriften als Eigentum Diodors nachgewiesen" in "Theol. Zeitschr.", XXII, 4, new series, VI, 4, Leipzig, 1901).

DOCTRINE.—Justin and Philosophy.—The only pagan quotations to be found in Justin's works are from Homer, Euripides, Xenophon, Menander, and especially Plato (Otto, II, 593 sq.). His philosophical development has been well examined by Dury ("The Testimony of Justin Martyr to early Christianity", London, 1882, 132): "He appears to have been a man of moderate culture. He was certainly not a genius nor an original thinker." A true eclectic, he draws inspiration from different systems, especially from Stoicism and Platonism. Waissicker (Jahrbücher f. Protestant. Theol., XII, 1867, 75) thought he recognized a Peripatetic idea, or inspiration, in his conception of God as immoveable above the heavens (Dial., xxvii); it is much more likely an idea borrowed from Alexandrian Judaism, and one which furnished a very easy key to the Irenian's Oecumenism. In I Apol., xx, 1x; II, vii, he adopts, but at the same time transforms, their concept of the seminal Word (Logos ωριστάτηθα) of Philo and Pneumatism (II Apol., vii) and their Atheism (Dial., ii). His sympathies are above all with Platonism. He likes to compare with Christianity: apropos of the last judgment, he remarks, however (I Apol., vii, 4), that according to Plato the punishment will last a thousand years, whereas according to the Christians it will be eternal; speaking of creation (I Apol., xx, 4, lx), he says that Plato borrowed from Moses his theory of an elementary matter. He is more receptive of Christianity apropos of human responsibility (I Apol., xlv, 8) and the Word and the Spirit (I Apol., lx). However, his acquaintance with Plato was superficial; like his contemporaries (Philo, Plutarch, St. Hippolytus), he found his chief inspiration in the Timeans. Some historians have criticized that pagan philosophy already dominated Justin's Christianity (Ad 166, s. Justin, Paris, 1861), or at least weakened it (Engelhardt, "Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers", Erfangen, 1878). To appreciate fairly this influence it is necessary to remember that in his "Apology" Justin is seeking above all the points of contact between Hellenism and Christianity. It would certainly be wrong to conclude from the first "Apology" (xxii) that Justin actually likens Christ to the pagan heroes or semi-heroes, Hermes, Perseus, or Æsculapius; neither can we conclude from his first "Apology" (iv, 8 or vii, 3, 4) that philosophy played among the pagans a role which it did not have among the barbarians, but only that their position and their reputation were analogous.

In many passages, however, Justin tries to trace a real bond between philosophy and Christianity: according to him both the one and the other have a part in the Logos, partially disseminated among men and wholly manifest in Jesus Christ (I, v, 4; I, xlv; II, viii; II, xiii, 5, 6). The idea developed in all these passages is given in the Stoic form, but this gives to its expression a greater worth. For the Stoics the seminal Word (Logos ωριστατηθα) is the form of every being and the ase of all existence. In the Stoic sense of God. This theory of the full participation in the Divine Word (Logos) by the sages has its full value only in Stoicism (see Logos). In Justin thought and expression are antithetic, and this lends a certain incoherence to the theory; the relation established between the integral Word, i.e. Jesus Christ, and the partial Word disseminated in the world, is more obscure than profound. Side by side with this theory, and quite different in its origin and scope, we find in Justin, as in most of his contemporaries, the conviction that Greek philosophy borrowed from the Bible: it was by stealing from Moses and the Psalms that Plato and the other philosophers developed their doctrines (I, xlv, ix, lx). Despite the obscurities and incongruities of this thought, he affirms clearly and positively the transcendent character of Christianity: "Our doctrine surpasses all human doctrine because the real Word became Christ who manifested himself for us, body, word and soul." (II, Apol., x, 1) This Divine origin assures Christianity an absolute truth (II, xii, 2) and gives to the Christians complete confidence; they die for Christ's doctrine; no one died for that of Socrates (II, x, 8). The first chapters of the "Dialogue" complete and correct these ideas. In them the rather complaisant syncretism of the "Apology" disappears, and the Christian thought is stronger.

Justin's chief reproach to the philosophers is their mutual divisions; he attributes this to the pride of the heads of sects and the servile acquiescence of their adherents: he also says a little later on (vi): "I care neither for Plato nor for the Pythagoras nor for other prophets. I concludes that for the pagans philosophy is not a serious or profound thing; life does not depend on it, nor action: "Thou art a friend of discourse," says the old man to him before his conversion, "but not of action nor of truth" (iv). For Platonism he retained a certain feeling as for a study useful only for the youth. Yet he attacks it on two essential points: the relation between God and man, and the nature of the
scul (Dial, iii, vi). Nevertheless he still seems influenced by it in his conception of the Divine transcen-
dency and the interpretation that he gives to the aforesaid theophanies.

Justin and Christian Revelation.—That which Justin declares in the words through which he is now sure of possessing through Jewish and Christian reve-
lation. He admits that the soul can naturally compre-
prehend that God is, just as it understands that virtue is beautiful (Dial, iv); but he denies that the soul without the assistance of the Holy Ghost can see God or comprehend Him directly through ecstasy, as the Platonik philosophers contended. And yet this knowl-
edge of God is necessary for us: “We cannot know God as we know music, arithmetic or astronomy” (iii); it is necessary for us to know God not with an abstract knowledge but as we know any person with whom we have relations. The problem which it seems impossible to solve is settled by revelation; God has spoken directly to the Prophets, who in their turn have made Him known to us (viii). It is the first time in Christian theology that we find so concise an explana-
tion of the difference which separates Christian revela-
tion from human speculation. It does away with the contradiction of the less implicit manner in which the truth is taken from the “Apolo
gy”, of the partial Logos and the Logos absolute or entire.

The Bible of Justin.—A. The Old Testament.—For
Philo the Bible is very particularly the Pentateuch
(Ryle, “Philo and Holy Scripture”, XVII, London, 1886, 1-10). In keeping with the desire of his purpose, Justin has other preferences. He quotes the Pentateuch often and liberally, especially Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy; but he quotes still more frequently and at greater length the Psalms and the Books of Prophecy—above all, Isaiah. The Books of Wisdom are seldom quoted, the historical books still less. The books that we never find in his works are Judges, Esdras (except in one passage which is attributed to him by mistake—Dial, lxxii), Tobias, Judith, Esther, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Abigab, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus. It has been noticed, too (St. John Thackeray in “Journal of Theol.
Study”, IV, 1903, 265, n. 3), that he never cites the last chapters of Jeremias (apropos of the first “Apol-
ogy”, xlvii, Otto is wrong in his reference to Jer., 1, 3). Of these omissions the most noteworthy is that of Wisdom, precisely on account of the similarity of ideas. It is to be noted, moreover, that this book, although the New Testament has not preserved the
tement of Rome (xxvii, 5) and later by St. Irenaeus (Eu-
seb., Hist. eccl., V, viii, 8; V, xxxvii) is never met with in the works of the apologists (the reference of Otto to
talian, vii, is inexact). On the other hand one finds in Justin some apocryphal texts: pseudo-Esdras (Dial, lx), Pseudo-Jerome (Dial, lxvi), Ps. xvi (Dial, xlii; I Apol, xii, xvi, xxxv, lxxi, viii, li, lxxvii, lxvii), but he does not assert that he found them in the memos. It is quite probable that Justin used a concordance, or harmony, in which were united the three synoptic Gospels (Lip-
pel, op. cit., 14, 94) and it seems that the text of this concordance more closely resembled the otherwise called Western text of the Gospels (cf. ibid., 97). Jus-
tin’s dependence on St. John is indisputably established by the facts which he takes from him (I Apol, lxi, 4; 5; Dial, lxxix, lxxxvii), still more by the very strik-
ing similarity in vocabulary and doctrine. It is cer-
tain, however, that Justin does not use the fourth
Gospel as abundantly as he does the others (Purves,
op. cit., 233); this may be owing to the aforesaid con-
cordance, or harmony, of the synoptic Gospels.
He seems to use the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (I Apol., lxxxv, 8; cf. Dial, xii, 2; Revue Biblique, III, 1894, 531 seq.; Harnack, “Betrachtungen des Evang. des Petrus”, Leipzig, 1893, 37). His dependence on the Protev-
gelium of James (Dial, lxxxviii) is doubtful.

Apologetical method.—Justin’s attitude towards phi-
losophy, described above, reveals at once the ten-
dency of his polemics; he never exhibits the indigna-
tion of a Tattian or even of a Tertullian. The aim of
the Christians he sometimes answers, as do the other apologists, by taking the offensive and attacking pagan morality (I Apol., lxxvii; II, xii, 4, 5), but he dislikes to insist on these columns: the interlocutor in the “Dialogue” does not care to believe them, nor does Justin wish to
(enter into discussion with the “deluded mob” whom he barely mentions (II Apol., iii, 2); in the “Dialogue” (ix) he is careful to ignore those who would trouble him with their loud laughter. He has not the elo-
quence of Tertullian, and can obtain a hearing only in a small circle of men capable of understanding religion and of being convinced of the ideas. His chief method of proving the Gospels, and one calculated to convert his hearers as it had converted him (II, Apol., xii), is the great new fact of
Christian morality. He speaks of men and women who have no fear of death (I Apol, ii, xi, xiv; II, xii, Dial, xxx, who prefer truth to life (I Apol, xii, xiv) and are ready to wait the time allotted by God (II, iv, 1); he makes known their devotion to their children (I, xxxvii, their continency (I, xxxi), their love of peace (I, xxxix), their charity even to-
wards their enemies, and their desire to save them (I Apol, lvi; Dial, xxxixi), their patience and their
prayers in persecution (Dial, xvi), the words of man-
ifestation which are another name for the life that they led in paganism with their Christian life (I Apol, xiv), he expresses the same feeling of deliv-
ever, seems subordinate, as does the worship which is rendered to Him (I Apol., vi; cf. lxi, 13; Teder, "Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus"); Freiburg im Br., 1906, 103-10). The Father envisaged Him after an incalculable volume of time (I Apol., lii, c, xxvii, xxviii; cf. Teder, op. cit., 104), at the beginning of all His works (Dial., lxii, lxiii, II Apol., vi, 3); in this last text certain authors think they distinguished in the Word two states of being, one intimate, the other outspoke, but this distinction, though found in discussing the Logos, is very doubtful. Through the Word God has made everything (II Apol., vi; Dial., cxiv). The Word is diffused throughout all humanity (I Apol., vi; II, viii; xiii); it was He who appeared to the patriarchs (I Apol., lxii; lxiii; Dial., lxii, lx, lx etc.) and who inspired the prophets (I Apol., xxiii; xxvi; II, x, etc.). He became incarnate and is Jesus Christ (II Apol., viii, 3; x, 1; etc.). Two influences are plainly discernible in the aforesaid body of doctrine. It is, of course, to Christian revelation that Justin owes his concept of the distinct personality of the Word, His Divinity and Incarnation; but philosophic speculation is responsible for his understanding of the temporal and voluntary generation of the Word, and for the subordinationism of Justin's theology. It must be recognized, moreover, that the latter ideas stand out more boldly in the "Apologetic" than in the "Dialogue." The Holy Ghost occupies the third place in the Trinity (I Apol., vi). He inspired the prophets (I Apol., vii; Dial., vii). He gave seven gifts to Christ and descended upon Him (Dial., lxxxxvi, lxxxviii). For the real distinction between the Son and the Spirit see Teder, op. cit., 119-23. Justin insists constantly on the virgin birth (I Apol., xxxii; xxxiii; Dial., xxxiii, lxxvi, lxxviii, etc.) and the reality of the flesh of Christ (Dial., lxviii, lxxxvii, ciii; cf. II Apol., x, I). He states that among the Christians there are some who do not admit the Divinity of Christ but they are a minority; he differs from them because of the authority of the Prophets (Dial., lxxvi), the entire dialogue, moreover, is devoted to proving this thesis. Christ is the Master whose doctrine enlightens us (I Apol., xxxiii, 3; xxxiii, 2; xxxiii, 2; II, vii, 5, xii, 2; Dial., vii, lxxvii, lxxxviii, c, cxxii), also the Redeemer whose blood saves us (I Apol., xxxviii, 10, 18; Dial., xxxii, xl, xvi, cvi, etc., cf. "Historie du dogme de la Trinite," Paris, 1905, 115, and tr., London, 1908). The rest of Justin's theology is less personal, therefore less interesting. As to the Eucharist, the baptismal Mass and the Sunday Mass are described in the first "Apologetic" (lxxvi-lxvii), with a richness of detail unique for that age. Justin here explains the dogma of the Real Presence with a wonderful clearness (lxvi, 2): "In the same way that through the power of the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour took flesh and blood for our salvation, so the nourishment consecrated by the prayer formed of the words of Christ... is the flesh and blood of this incarnate Jesus.") The word "Logos" (cfr. xvi) completes this doctrine by the idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice as a memorial of the Passion. The role of St. Justin may be summed up in one word: it is that of a witness. We behold him in one of the highest and purest pagan souls of his time in contact with Christianity, compelled to accept its irresistible truth, its pure moral teaching, and to admire its superhuman constancy. He is also a witness for the second-century Church which he describes for us in its faith, its life, its worship, at a time when Christianity yet lacked the firm organization that it was soon to develop (see IANUARIUS, SANS), but the larger energies whose constitution and spirit were clearly luminously drawn by Justin. Finally, in consecration and confirmation of the aforesaid, Justin was a witness for Christ unto death.
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JULES LEBRETON.

JUSTUS, Saint, fourth Archbishop of Canterbury; d. 627 (?). For the particularities of his life we are
almost entirely dependent on Venerable Bede’s “Hist-
oria Ecclesiastica,” the additions of medieval writers,
such as William of Malmsbury or Elnham, possessing
no authority. Justinus was one of the second band of
missionaries sent by St. Gregory the Great, the com-
pany which arrived in 601 to reinforce St. Augustine
and his See. It is said that he was richly dressed
and other gifts sent by the pope. It is not certain
whether he was a secular priest or a monk. St. Bede
is silent on the point and only later monastic writers
from Canterbury claim him as one of their own order.
In 604 he was consecrated by St. Augustine as first
Bishop of Rochester, on which occasion he died the
next day. St. Bede bestowed on the new see, by charter, a territory
called Priestfield and otherlands. Other charters in
which his name occurs are of dubious authenticity.
After the death of St. Augustine, Justinus joined with the
new Archbishop, St. Laurence, and with Mellitus of
London in addressing letters to the recalcitrant Brit-
ish bishops, but without effect. During the heathen
reaction which followed the death of Ethelbert, Justinus
was expelled from his see and took refuge in Gaul for a
year, after which he was recalled by Eadwald who
had been converted by St. Laurence. On the death of
St. Laurence (24 April, 624) who had succeeded St.
Laurence as archbishop, St. Justinus was elected to
the vacant primacy. The letter which Pope Boniface
addressed to him when sending him the pallium is pres-
served by Venerable Bede (H. E., I, 8). He was already an old man, and little is recorded of his ponti-
cate. His only surviving work is a historical, descriptive
phraseology as Bishop of Rochester and St. Paulinus as Bishop for the North.
His anniversary was kept at Canterbury on 10 November,
but there is uncertainty as to the year of his death, though 627, the commonly received date, would appear to be correct, especially as it fits in with the period of three years usually assigned by Ak-
chroniclers to his archiepiscopate. He was buried with his predecessors at St. Augustine’s Abbey, Can-
terbury, and is commemorated in the English supple-
ment to the Missal and Breviary on 10 November.

Archbishops, I 29 3-4; HOOK, Lives of the Bishops, I, 29 4-5; STUBBS, in Dict. Christ.
Bishop, in this vol.; HUNYDI, in Dict. Nat. Biog., v. v.; POLLANDIUS, Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina, I (Brus-
sele, 1836-1869).

EDWIN BURTON.

JUSTUS von LANDSEB, JOHANNES. See LAND-
PERGUS.

Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem. See JERUSAL,
sub-title I.

Juvenalus, C. VETTUS AQUINUS, Christian Latin poet
of the fourth century. Of his life we know only what St. Jerome tells us (De viris, lxxxi; cf. Chron.,
ad gr. 2345; Erist. iv, 5; In Matt. 1, 8, 11) He was a Spaniard of very good birth, became a priest,
and wrote in the time of Constantine. From one
passage in his work (II, 806, sq.) and from St. Je-
rome’s Chronicle it must be inferred that he wrote
about the year 330. His poem, in daecylic hexam-
ers, is entitled “Evangeliorum libri” (The Gospels).
It is a history of Christ according to the Gospels, particularly that of St. Luke. He goes to the
other Evangelists for what he does not find in St.
Matthew—as the story of the Infancy, which he takes
from St. Luke. He follows his model very closely,
“almost literally,” as St. Jerome says. The whole
problem for him is to render the Gospel text into easy
language conformable to the tradition of the Latin
Church, and borrowed especially from Cyprian and
Barnabes, Gesch. der altkath. Liturgie, I (Freiburg im
Br., 1907), 240-42.
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ably at Washington and Denver, jurisdiction is added to try adults charged with contributing in any way to the degrading or wrongdoing of a child, and husbands or fathers who fail to support or who desert their wives and children in destitute or necessitous circumstances. At Washington, regulating child labour are enforced through these courts.

By the common law, a child under the age of seven years was conclusively presumed to be incapable of committing a crime. Between seven and fourteen years of age, criminal intent, which there can be no crime, must be shown by the prosecution. Malice would supply age, was the maxim. At fourteen, the age of puberty, when the child had all the powers it would ever possess, the law cast upon it full responsibility for its criminal acts. It was sentenced, upon conviction, to the jail or the penitentiary, where enforced association with adult criminals brought about most deplorable results. Society has been slow to awaken to the mistake, nay more, the criminal folly, of this policy, and now, under the operation of juvenile-court laws, all this is being changed. The juvenile-court laws more than any other means a new method in dealing with children who commit offences. It is the manifestation of a new and more rational spirit on the part of the State towards children who violate its public law. The State by its punishment of the adult for crime committed, endeavors on one hand, to restrain the criminal, and on the other, to deter by the severity of its punishment others from transgressing the law. Now it is recognized that the character of children is yet unformed, that, instead of reformation, they stand in need of formation of good habits and character, and so the aim of the juvenile court becomes correction rather than punishment.

In some States, the juvenile-court movement has commenced by holding for the trial of children a separate session of the ordinary criminal court of first instance. In other States, juvenile courts are established, but judges of other tribunals act successively, in turn, as judges of the juvenile court. Elsewhere, as in Colorado, Maryland, Indiana, and the District of Columbia, there are judges appointed as judges of the juvenile court only, and this is claimed to be the best method by those who have given the movement close study. The juvenile court soon becomes a judge in its work, but the demands of the important problem of the child, which is his, require in himself the combined qualities of the jurist, the teacher, the sociologist, and the philanthropist. The juvenile courts of the United States may be grouped under two classes: juvenile courts where the procedure is according to that of the English Court of Chancery, and juvenile courts where the procedure approximates that of the ordinary criminal court. The Juvenile Court of Chicago is presided over by one of the judges of the Circuit Court. The proceedings conform as nearly as may be to the practice in Chancery. The plaintiff is usually a petition, usually a petition, and the process used is a summons. Such proceedings by the State of Illinois, in dealing with the child who has broken one of its laws, consists of a declaration that the child needs the parental care of the State, which has always been exercised over children through the medium of the Court of Chancery, and that it thus requires the parental care of the State, which is patria patria, by reason of the failure of the father and mother, first as they are, in the order both of nature and of time, to fulfill their obligations towards this child. Accordingly the State does not brand the child as a criminal child, but seeks, in his name as defendant, before the court, requiring the parental correction of the State, not its punishment. Chicago had the earliest juvenile court, and this is the furthest advance in the movement. In fact, it smacks strongly of paternalism on the part of the State; but we should remember that it is paternalism exercised where it is badly lacking. Practically, the power is invoked not to interfere with the normal family, but to succour the poor little waifs of fortune out of unfilled homes, starved and weatherworn, the companions, oftentimes, of thieves and worse.

To the other class belongs the Juvenile Court of New York City, presided over in rotation by the judges of the Court of Special Sessions, which is a criminal court for the trial of misdemeanours without a jury. But even here the court has power and authority to extend relief to children who have unfilled homes or are otherwise abused by their parents—under our system of jurisprudence, an incident of chancery jurisdiction. New York City is the principal gateway of our country, and the problems of this court are made heavy by the presence in its jurisdiction of many who are strangers both to our language and our customs, and by the acute conditions accompanying an enormous population in which are the extremes of wealth and want. The juvenile court at Washington has a criminal procedure. This court was established by the Act for the purpose of giving original and exclusive jurisdiction of all crimes and offences of persons under seventeen years of age, not capital or otherwise infamous and not punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary. The court is also given jurisdiction over those adults referred to it by the criminal courts for parents or guardians who fail or refuse to provide food, clothing, or shelter for their children, the criminal court of the district having concurrent powers in the latter class of cases. Nor can a dependent child be admitted to any institution supported wholly or in part out of public funds, until the fact of dependency is first ascertained and proved, in the juvenile court. In this court are tried all cases arising under the child labour law. Provision is made by the Act for a jury and for appeals in matters of law to the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. The juvenile court is empowered to defer sentence, at its discretion, in the case of any juvenile offender under seventeen years of age, and to place such child on probation, during which it shall be under the jurisdiction of the court.

The probation officers are generally employed by the court to make a preliminary investigation before the child is arraigned. This investigation usually results in a helpful data about the child's home, its environment, its habits and its behavior. It is comparatively easy to affix a statutory punishment in the case of the adult found guilty of crime. It is a far more difficult matter to correct a wayward child; so that the previous history of the child is most helpful to the judge. Then, too, the services of the physician, the surgeon, the chemist, and others are often brought into requisition, to cure some physical ill, such as adeno-ideal growths, which may in a measure account for the delinquency of the child. In both classes of juvenile courts—those whose procedure is after the manner of chancery or equity courts, and those whose procedure is that of the ordinary criminal courts—the treatment of the child and the attitude of the judge towards the child are the same. In the treatment, the underlying purpose is the saving of the child, not its punishment, nor even its restraint. And the personality of the judge is an element of vast importance in any juvenile court. "I have always felt and endeavored to act in each case", said Judge Tuthill, of Chicago, "as I would were it my own son who was before me in my library at home charged with misconduct". The Supreme Court of Utah, in the case of Mill v. Brown, 88 Pacific Reporter, 609 (1907) succinctly summed up the matter in accordance with their true spirit and intent requires a man of broad mind, of almost infinite patience, and one who is the possessor of great faith in humanity and thoroughly imbued with that spirit. The judge
of any court, and especially a judge of a juvenile court, should be willing at all times, not only to respect, but to maintain and preserve, the legal and natural rights of men and children alike."

The juvenile court must not commit to the jail or the workhouse or the penitentiary the children who can be dealt with in any other way. The court must not commit children to so-called reform schools, institutions that sprang into existence some seventy-five years ago, or to some other place provided for their kindly but custodial care. In the case of Mill v. Brown, supra, we read: "Before the State can be substituted to the right of the parent, it must affirmatively prove that the parent has forfeited his natural and legal right to the custody and control of the child by reason of his failure, inability, neglect, or incompetency to discharge the duty and thus to enjoy the right. Unless, therefore, both the delinquency of the child and the incompetency, for any reason, of the parent concour, and are so found, the court exceeds its power when committing a child to any of the institutions contemplated by the act."

Instead of so committing the child, the court may either impose a fine or, what is done in a large percentage of the cases, place the child upon probation. Probation is a more gentle and less custodial method of dealing in favor of the best method to handle or discipline, not only children who violate the law, but adults as well. Probation means that, with confidence in the promises of the offender to offend no more, the court suspends sentence and enforces him under the care of the probation officers attached to the court, with a view to releasing him in the future, when his conduct and progress justifies it, from the jurisdiction of the court. The management of penal institutions release prisoners from time to time in a similar manner, but in such cases the release is more accurately and more properly termed parole. The nomenclature employed in the method is, however, far from settled.

On probation, the child remains in its home, in its natural environment, where the expense, too, of its nurture and education should properly be borne. This has resulted in a substantial saving, even from a pecuniary point of view, to the communities where it has been tried, often amounting to as much as sixty thousand dollars per annum, it is estimated, in cities of two hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants. It has been demonstrated that "it is wiser and less expensive to save children than to punish criminals." To do this probation imposes certain positive duties upon both probation officer and judge, especially where the function of the judge is confined to the juvenile court. In such a case the best results are obtained when the judge becomes in practice his own chief probation officer, carefully supervising the system himself. The judge and the probation officers must labour to develop good character in the child. The aim of probation is character-building. Hereby is brought about the saving of the child, the "citizen of to-morrow," to himself and to his country. Probation is of such importance that it has been termed the keystone of the juvenile court system. By the patient, painstaking efforts of the probation officers, much ignorance is dispelled, and yet the helpful agencies in a community are drawn upon to serve the legitimate needs of the child, mentally, morally, and physically. An account of the juvenile court would be incomplete without at least a passing reference to Judge Ben B. Lindsey, of Denver, Colorado, whose name is to many articles and public addresses throughout the United States upon the juvenile court, is so intimately associated with the institution in the public mind. His excellent service to the children of Denver, his many speeches, addresses, and published articles, have been potent in the steady spread of the movement for juvenile courts.

As above mentioned, to Chicago belongs the honour of having established the first juvenile court, on 1 July, 1899. The pressing need was generally felt, the country was ripe for the movement, and there quickly followed the inauguration of juvenile courts in Denver, Indianapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, until some thirty cities have them, and almost all the cities are considering the question. This American movement has appealed to England, who had been adopted in Germany, France, Belgium, Sweden, Hungary, Italy, and England. Canada and Australia now have juvenile courts, also South Africa and India. The English law follows closely the legislation to protect child life that has been enacted throughout the United States. England the religious belief of the child, by having the court select, if possible, a person of the same religious persuasion or some person who will give an undertaking that the child or young person shall be brought up in accordance with its own religious persuasion. This act is to be cited as the Children's Act, 1908. It is technically 8 Edward VII, Chapter 67, and is popularly known as "the Children's Charter." Thus it is recognized as entering into the fabric of the British Constitution. By it child is defined to mean a person under the age of fourteen years, while the expression young person is rapidly increasing to years of age. With the necessary modifications, the act is applied to Scotland and to Ireland. When the court is satisfied of the guilt of the child, it may, in its discretion, deal with the case by dismissing the charge; by placing the offender under the care of a probation officer; by committing the offender to the care of an institution, either of a relative or of some institution; by ordering the offender to be whipped; by ordering the offender to pay a fine, damages, and costs; by ordering the parent or guardian of the offender to make payment of a fine, damages, or costs; and, where the offender is over fourteen years of age, by sending him to prison.

Thus has grown and spread the most remarkable development in jurisprudence of the past decade, a development that is carried on the wings of mercy, kindness, and love, in whose scales of justice are balanced the inexperience of the child and its environment with the responsibility of the parent and the adult, now, for the first time, recognized and enforced by the law of the land. The juvenile court has its origin in the needs of the time. These needs are largely the result of the industrial revolution consequent upon the use of steam and the establishment of factories and of child labor. Practically, there are no industries in the United States where the concentration of workers in factories has promoted the growth of communities and cities. The trend is from the country, with its peace and simple life, to the cities, with their turmoil and dissipations. The conditions in the cities growing out of congestion of population, the use as habitations of flats and tenement houses, have all weakened family life and forced the nervous and mental development of the children into precocity. There is some truth in the saying that there are no children nowadays, and this is a prolific source of the need for juvenile courts. But, as demanded by conditions, the work of these courts is remedial rather than vindictive and punitive. They aim to conserve child-life. All this is in harmony with the spirit of the Catholic Church, whose Divine Founder said: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." In the spirit of the Master, she early set her face against the exposure of sad and deplorable abuses. Creches and infant asylums have in all Christian ages been offered as an alternative to child-murder. Devoted sisterhoods and brotherhoods have always maintained orphan asylums, refugees, and hospitals for the protection, safeguarding and training of the orphaned, abandoned, and suffering children of Christ. The spirit that created the juvenile court is closely akin to the spirit of the Catholic Church, which, in its canonical punishments, has
never been moved by a vindictive spirit. Recognizing in the meanest and the weakest, a soul purchased by the Blood of Christ, her sanctions are chiefly correctional and medicinal. This is also the motive of the juvenile court, the essence of which is correction, conservation, remedy; not retaliation or vindictive punishment.


William H. Dr. Lacy.
K

Kabbala. — The term is now used as a technical name for the system of esoteric theosophy which for many generations played an important part, chiefly among the Jews, after the beginning of the tenth century of our era. It is a transcript of the Heb. עניין, itself an abstract noun derived from the pi’el עניין. It primarily signifies reception, and, secondarily, a doctrine received by oral tradition. Its application has greatly varied in the course of time, and it is only since the eleventh or twelfth century that the term Kabbala has become the exclusive appellation for the system of Jewish religious philosophy which claims to have been uninterruptedly transmitted by the mouths of the patriarchs, prophets, elders, etc., ever since the creation of the first man. The two works which the advocate of this system treat as the authoritative exposition of its doctrines are: (1) the “Book of Creation” and (2) the “Zohar”. The former is a short treatise consisting of six chapters subdivided into thirty-three very brief sections. It is written in Mishnic Hebrew, and is made up of oracular sentences. It professes to be a monologue of the patriarch Abraham, who enumerates the thirty-two ways of wisdom by which God produced the universe, and who, shows, by the analogy which is assumed to exist between the visible things and the letters which are the signs of thought, the manner in which all has emanated from God and is inferior to Him. The “Zohar”, or second expository work of the Kabbala, has justly been called the “Bible” of the Kabbalists. It is written in Aramaic, and its main portion is in the form of a commentary on the Pentateuch according to the latter’s division into fifty-two weekly lessons. Its title “Zohar” (light, splendour) is derived from the words of Gen., i, iii (Let there be light), with the exposition of which it begins. It is a compulsory work, wherein several fragments of ancient treatises can still be noticed. The following is a brief account of the chief contents: doctrinal, hermeneutical, and theurgical, of the “Zohar”.

Considered in Himself, the Supreme Being is the En-Soph — Endless, Infinite—and, in a certain sense, the En—Non-existent—since existence is in human conception a limitation which as such should not be predicated of Him. We can conceive and speak of God only in so far as He manifests and, as it were, actualises Himself in or through the Sephiroth. His first manifestation was by way of concentration in a point—the first Sephira, “the Crown”, as it is called—which is hardly distinguishable from the En-Soph from Whom it emanates, and which is expressed in the Bible by the name Ehyeh (I am). From the first Sephira proceeded a masculine or active potency called wisdom, represented in the Bible by Yah, and an opposite, i.e. a feminine or passive potency, called intelligence, and represented by Yahweh. These two opposite potencies are coupled together by the “Crown”, and thus yields the first triunity of the Sephiroth. From the junction of the foregoing opposite tendencies emanated the masculine potency called love, the fourth Sephira, represented by the Biblical El, and the feminine one justice, the fifth Sephira, represented by the Divine name Eloah. From them again emanated the uniting potency, beauty, the sixth Sephira, represented in the Bible by Elohim. And thus is constituted the second triunity of the Sephiroth. In its turn, beauty beamed forth the seventh Sephira, the masculine potency firmness, corresponding to Yahweh Sabaoth, and this again produced the feminine potency splendour, represented by Elohe Sabaoth. From splendour emanated the ninth Sephira, foundation, which answers the Divine name El-Hai and closes the third triunity of the Sephiroth. Lastly, splendour sends forth kingdom, the tenth Sephira, which encircles all the others and is represented by Adonai. These ten Sephiroth are emanations from the En-Soph, forming among themselves and with Him a strict unity, in the same way as the rays which proceed from the light are simply manifestations of one and the same light. They are infinite and perfect when the En-Soph imparts His fullness to them, and perfect unto infinity from them (Ginsburg). In their totality, they represent and are called the archetypal man, without whom the production of permanent worlds was impossible. In fact, they constitute the first world, or world of emanations, which is perfect and immutable because of which however, these are forever reproducing.

Emanating immediately from this first world is the world of creation, the ten Sephiroth of which are of a more limited potency, and the substances of which are of the purest nature. From the world of creation proceeds the world of formation, with its less refined ten Sephiroth, although its substances are still without matter. Finally, from this third world proceeds the world of action or of matter, the ten Sephiroth of which are made of the grosser elements of the other worlds. Of these worlds, the second, that of creation, is inhabited by the angel Metatron, who governs the visible world, and is the captain of the hosts of good angels who in ten ranks people the third world, that of formation. The demons or bad angels inhabit the fourth world, that of action, the lowest regions of which constitute the seven infernal halls wherein the demons torture the poor mortals whom they betrayed into sin in this life. The prince of the demons is Samael (the “angel of poison or of death”), he has a wife called the Harlot; but both are treated as one person, and are called “the Beast”. Man was directly created not by En-Soph, but by the Sephiroth, and is the counterpart of the archetypal man. His body is merely a garment of his soul. Like God, he has a unity and a triunity, the latter being made up of the spirit representing the intellectual world, the soul representing the sensuous world, and the life representing the material world. Souls are pre-existent, destined to dwell in human bodies, and subjected to transmigration till at last they return to God. The soul finds also in the Sephiroth, which represent the mind, a spiritual equivalent—viz. at the advent of the Messiah born at the end of days—to the bosom of the Infinite Source. Then Hell shall disappear and endless bliss begin.

All these esoteric doctrines of the Kabbals are supposed to be contained in the Hebrew Scriptures, in which, however, they can be properly only by those initiated into certain hermeneutical methods. The following are the three principal methods of discovering the heavenly mysteries hidden under the letters and words of the Sacred Text: (1) The Temurah (change), by means of which each letter of the Hebrew alphabet is interchanged with another according to some fixed process, as when Aleph, the first letter, becomes Lamad by interchange with the twelfth, the second, Beth, becomes Mem, the thirteenth, etc.; or, when the last letter takes the place of the first, the last but one takes...
the place of the second, etc.; (2) the Gematriah (Gr. γεμα-
τρια), which consists in the use of the numerical values of
the letters of a word for purposes of comparison
with other words, which gives the same or similar
combinations of numbers: thus in Gen., xlix, 10,
"Shiloh come" is equivalent to 358, which is also
the numerical value of Messiah, whence it is inferred
that Shiloh is Messiah. The seven chief elements
of the "Zohar," needs no long description here.
It forms part of what has been called the practical
Kabbala, and supplies formulas by means of which the
adapts can enter into direct communication with
invisible powers and thereby exercise authority over
demons, nature, diseases, etc. To a large extent it is
the natural outcome of the extraordinary hidden
meaning ascribed by the Kabbala to the words of
the Sacred Text, and in particular to the Divine names.

Of course, the "Book of Creation" does not go back
to Abraham, as has been claimed by many Kabbal-
ists. It is the inscription by others to Rabba and Raba (d.
A.D. 120) in the former centuries of Christian
history. With respect to the "Zohar," its compilation is justly referred to
a Spanish Jew, Moses of Leon (d. 1035), while some of its
elements seem to be of a much greater antiquity.
Several of its doctrines recall to mind those of Pythagoras,
Plato, Aristotle, the neo-Platonists of Alexandria, the
Oriental or Egyptian Pentateuch and the Coptics of
the earliest Christian ages. Its speculations concern-
ing God's nature and relation to the universe differ
materially from the teachings of Revelation. Finally,
it has decided no right to be considered as an
excellent means to induce the Jews to receive Chris-
tianity, although this has been maintained by such
Christian scholars as R. Lully, Pico della Mirandola,
Reuchlin, Knorr von Rosenroth, etc., and although
many prominent Jewish Kabbalists as R. Riccio,
Con-
rad, Otto, Rittanghel, Jacob Franck, etc., have
embraced the Christian Faith, and proclaimed in their
works the great affinity of some doctrines of the
Kabbala with those of the Bible.

KALISCH, The Book of Creation, text and tr. (New York,
1874); KALISCH, The Book of Creation, Eng. tr. in Lessons
of Jesus (New York, 1884); von Robenroth, Kabbala Demon-
dated, I (Sulzbach, 1877), II (Frankfort, 1884). The latest ed-
ition is that by the Budge, 3 vols. (1873). C. FRANK, La Kabbala
(2nd ed., Paris, 1888); JORD., Midrash Ha-
Zohar (Leipzig, 1849); DROCH, La Cabala des Hebreux (Rome,
1898); Robenroth, Kabbala (London, 1898); IDER et
CHRIS, La Cabala (Paris, 1897); FRISCH, Philosophie,
Qabbalas, und Voltaire (Baltimore, 1902); KOBEL, in
der Zeitschrift der Kabbala (1894); FLORENCE, Essai sur les Origines
et la Nature de la Zohar (Paris, 1901); FLUCK, Philosophie,
Kabala, und Wandel (Baltimore, 1902); KOTLER, Die
Kabbala, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1893); BANELLIE, in VACANT and
MANGERO, Dic. de Théologie Catholique (Paris,
1902), s.v. Cabala.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Kafiristan and Kashmir, Prefecture Apostolic,
of, established (1887) by Leo XIII in the extreme North
of India. As regards India proper, the district was,
from 1857, part of the Capuchin Diocese of Lahore.
In that year it was confided to the Fathers of the Eng-
lish Foreign Missions (Mill Hill). Part of the Prefecture
includes some of the most important British military
stations in North India. The Prefecture is at the mouth of
the Khyber Pass, nowhere and Rawalpindi, the latter
place being the army headquarters of the lieutenant-
general commanding the Northern Army in India.

Rawalpindi is also the residence of the Prefect Apo-
stolic, the Very Rev. Dominic Wagner, nominated 13
March, 1891, consecrated in 1893 in Ireland and
ordained in Salford Cathedral by Cardinal Vaughan on
February, 1889. He was educated at the Jesuit Col-
lege of Culemburg in Holland and at St. Joseph's For-
sign Missionary College, Mill Hill, London. In the
prefecture there are two important convents: the first
is at Murree in the charge of the nuns of the Con-
gregation of Jesus and Mary. This institution com-
prises a boarding school for young ladies, a military
orphanage, and a day school for outsiders. The other
convent is situated at Rawalpindi, and is in charge of
the Presentation of the Most Holy Virgin. They have,
besides, a number of new postulants from Ireland and
have found a convent in Kashmir. They will also help
Doctor Elisabeth Biebl, who under the guidance of
the prefect Apostolic, is about to open (1909) a Cath-
olic hospital for the native women and children of
northern India. At the request of Father Simon, assisted
by a staff of twelve lay teachers, conducts an
important school for native Kashmir boys.

The pupils number three hundred. The prefecture
comprises about fifteen million inhabitants. Twelve
million five hundred thousand of these are Mohammed-
dans, two million are Hindoos, five hundred thousand
are Buddhists and about five thousand are Catholics.
J. A. CUNNINGHAM.

Kafirs, a term popularly applied to nearly all the
natives of South Africa. It was originally imposed
by the Arab traders as the name for an "unbeliever.
" The natives do not use the word, but distin-
guish themselves by the names of their own
tribes. Even in legal phraseology there is some
fusion; but the following is a serviceable list of the
native races of South Africa as known to the law:
Kafir, Zulu, Basuto, Bechuana, Digo, Gri-
idaro, Damara, Korna, Bushman, and Hottentot.
The almost universal language of the South Afri-
can natives is the Bantu, of which the Kafir group has
four subdivisions, Xosa, Zulu, Tabele, Mfengu.
It is likely that many of the tribes evangelized by the
Jesuits and Dominicans from the fifteenth to the
eighteenth centuries were the ancestors of the Kafirs.
When the Catholic missionaries were driven out, the
native converts could not stand alone, and relapsed
into barbarism, although individuals had risen high
in the scale of civilization. The terrible Zulu chief
Chaka carried on an aggressive war against the other
tribes, at the beginning of the nineteenth century,
and over a million have said to be spared. Hence
until 1879 came a series of wars between the Kafirs
and the British or Dutch. To-day there are, south of
the Zambesi, some five million natives, chiefly
Kafirs. In Cape Colony, the state which has the largest
European population of the Union, the Kafirs number
from 100 to 316. The greatest number of Kafirs
occupy the land by tribal or communal tenure.
They are also divided into areas where they are subject to
their own laws and the suzerainty of Great
Britain. Some are squatters on private or govern-
ment lands. There are also mission locations and
labour locations. A few have individual titles to land,
and some are scattered as servants among the whites.
In Cape Colony there are about 5500 regis-
tered voters out of a total of about twenty thousand
non-European voters. In the other South African
states the native voter is a negligible quantity.

The importance of missionary work among the
Kafirs may be gauged from the following remarkable
words of the Native Commission, 1903-5, appointed
by all the South African States: "The commission
considers . . . that no merely secular system of
morality that might be applied would serve to raise
the native's ideal of conduct and the evil influences
that have been alluded to, and is of opinion that hope for the elevation of the native races
must depend mainly on their acceptance of Christian
faith and morals." The tribal system is in many
ways an impediment to missionary enterprise, but it
is a safeguard against political agitation.

The native is incapable of being a moderate drinker,
and abdotion is the policy in all native reserves.
any is decreasing slowly but surely. The dangerous Ethiopian movement (the revolt of native Christians from the control of white missionaries) is felt in all Protestant missions, but has had little footing in Catholic stations. The principal Catholic Kafir missions are now in the hands of Trappists, Oblates of Mary immaculate, and Jesuits. Full statistics are not obtainable. The census of 1904 shows that in Catholic stations of native inhabitants under 5000. The Trappists have 58 priests, 223 lay brothers, and 328 nuns, working among the natives; 82 schools, and 42 mission stations. About 12,000 Kafirs in South Africa to-day have been trained in Trappist missions.

Kager, Johanne Matthias, German historical painter, b. at Munich, 1586; d. at Augsburg, 1834. He was originally a pupil of Pieter de Witte (Candito), but became young and spent years there. On his return, he was called to Munich by the Elector Maximilian, who appointed him to be his principal painter, and granted him a considerable allowance. He settled down in Augsburg, and spent the rest of his years in that place, becoming burgomaster of the city. Many of the palaces and churches at Munich, but his finest work, called "The Last Judgement", is in the Senate Hall at Augsburg. A notable picture by him is a representation of "David and Abigail", now at Vienna. He etched several plates from his own design, representing religious subjects (dating 1600, 1601, 1603), and his pictures were also engraved by two members of the Sadeler family, and by Kilians, the plates numbering altogether over seventy. He practised in architecture, and painted a few miniatures, but his chief work was in fresco and in oil.

Kaiserschick. See Cesarea.

Kaiser, Kajetan Georg von, chemist, b. at Kelheim on the Danube (Bavaria), 5 Jan., 1803; d. at Munich, 28 Aug., 1871. He was appointed professor of technology at the University of Munich in 1851, and in 1868 became professor of applied chemistry at the technical high school in Munich. His scientific researches into the chemistry of fermentation are of importance; a saccharometer invented by him in 1842 serves for the determination of the percentages of the contents of wine. In addition to articles in scientific journals, he published the paper "Ueber Bieruntersuchungen und Fehler, welche dabei gemacht werden können" (Munich, 1846). He also brought out the scientific works of his friend, the chemist and mineralogist, Johann Nepomuk von Fuchs (d. 1856), under the title "Gesammelte Schriften des Joh. Nep. von Fuchs" (Munich, 1856), adding an obituary notice of that scientist. Like Fuchs, Kaiser always remained a faithful and steadfast Catholic, even in the period of 1871–1. It is stated of him in an obituary notice that "his Catholic belief was the invulnerable spot in his heart, in which he always maintained his own individuality under every trial." He was a member of the American Chemical Society (IV (Berlin, 1871); Kniehler, Das Christentum und die Verbreiter der neuen Naturwissenschaft (Freiburg im, 1904).

J. Rompel.

Kaiserschick (der Kaiser und der Künige buch), a German epic poem of the twelfth century. It is at once a kind of "Legend of all the Saints" and a confused but remarkable account of the Roman emperors and also of the German emperors and kings to the crusade of King Conrad III (1147). The language is comparatively good and often quite poetical. The chronicle was written about a work of an ecclesiastic of Ratisbon, an earnest partisan of the Guelphs, the chronicle is not improbably to be referred to Konrad der Pfaffe (q. v.), who composed the well-known "Song of Roland" (Rolandslieder), as a kind of history from the "Chronicon Wirzburgerum", the "Chronicon Regnorum" (see Enkehard IV), and the "Annonial"; it may be that he also drew from some earlier record or mystical chronicle. Judging from the large number of manuscripts still extant (twelve complete and seventeen partial), it must have been very popular, and it was probably continued in the thirteenth century. The original poem, according to the latest authorities, ended with verse 17283; the first addition, called "Bavarian", comprised 800 verses, while the second, the "Swabian", which brought the poem to the Interregnum (1254–75), consisted of 483 lines. The chronicle was first published in full by Maximilian ("Quedlinburg") in 1849–54) in three volumes, under the title: "Das sogenannte Kaiserschick, Gedicht des 12. Jahrhunderts, 18578 Reimzeichen", with careful researches into manuscripts, investigation of authorship, age, etc. The best edition is that of Schröder, "Die Kaiserschick eines Regens" (Haven, 1892), in "Mon. Germ. Deutsche Chroniken", i; Appendix I is the Bavarian, appendix II the Swabian continuation.

Gebot, über die Kaiserschick ein Gedicht des 12. Jahrhunderts. Mit neukatolisch-deutscher Uebersetzung und Anmerkungen (Mainz, 1854); Welsch, Untersuchungen über die deutsche Kaiserschick (Munich, 1874); in Zwei Heften in A. Schopenhauer's Abhandlungen, XIV, XVII, XIX, XXIV, XXXIV.

Patricius Schlager.

Kaiserwilhelmsland, Prefecture Apostolic of, comprises the German part of the island of New Guinea, area about 4,600,000 sq. miles; about 1,000,000 inhabitants. It was only in August, 1896, that the first Catholic missionaries arrived there, three priests and three brothers. On a coast extending about four hundred miles there are now twelve stations established. The small mission is the means of communication along the coast. The Apostolic prefecture was established in 1896 and transferred to the Society of the Divine Word. It had in 1909 twenty-two priests, seventeen lay brothers, and twenty-nine nuns; there are no native priests, the mission being too new. A cathedral is already planned for St. Michael's in Alorot, and the inauguration of the mission there have been 1960 baptisms. There are thirteen parochial schools and 600 pupils; priests instruct in religion, while the sisters (Sisters of Charity) teach reading, writing, arithmetic, singing, and geography. A catechism school has just been started. The principal difficulty is the variety of languages; at St. Michael's about 120 pupils speak twenty-five different languages. The common language is German. Some of the adult pupils learn from the brothers useful trades, e. g. carpentering, joinery, smith-work, boat-building, mason-work, and tailoring. Some farms have been started, so that the lower classes of New Guineans may learn to appreciate and love the work. It is hoped that in time, through the practice of useful occupations, the mission will be entirely self-supporting. Each mission is governed by a priest, who is subject to a dean, whose duty it is to see that the rules are observed. Each mission is held every three or four weeks, and in order to promote the spiritual welfare of the community, an eight-day retreat is given yearly. It was at first proposed to found a leper settlement, but for the present this charitable work has failed, owing to the deep mistrust and superstition of the New Guinean character. Moreover, they have an
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easier way of disposing of these crippled and afflicted creatures; they simply drive them into the great wilderness. All the natives belong to the Papuan race, and speak a very few of a Malay
race; the few Malays and Chinese are mostly artisans in various trades. The centre of navigation is Astrol.
bay and Friedrich Wilhelmshafen. The latter station belongs to the New Guinea Company, which has,
with few exceptions, the monopoly of all land and water trade in the Dutch New Guinea. It is between
Wilhelmshafen, superior in every way to Friedrich Wilhelmshafen.
Missions Catholicae (Rome, 1907); Catholic Missions (1897-98); Annals of the Propagation of the Faith.
E. LIMBROCK.
Kalanda Brethren (KALANDERBRUDER, FRATRES CALENDARII), the name given to religious and charitable
associations of priests and laymen especially numerous in Northern and Central Germany, which held regular
meetings for religious edification and instruction, and also to encourage works of charity and prayers for the
dead. They were originally an extension of the meetings of the clergy of the separate deaneries usually
held on the first day of each month (Kalenda, hence their title Koland). After the thirteenth century
time the movement came into many cases into the hands of organized societies to which both priests and the
laymen, men and women, belonged. Special statutes regulated the conduct of the society, its unions, the
duties of the directors in promoting the religious life and Christian discipline, the services to be held, the
administration of the general funds, and their application to charitable purposes. A dean was at the head
of each association, and a treasurer administered the revenues. The associations were encouraged by the 
bishops, who assigned them particular churches or at least special altars for Divine Service. The offering
of the bread and wine at the Mass for dead members was especially fostered. The oldest known Kalanda
confraternity is that of Ottberg near Höchster (Westphalia), of whose existence in 1226 we have
documentary evidence. The "Calendari" flourished especially in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries,
but later decayed. A banquet was introduced at the meetings, which subsequently degenerated in many
instances into a revel, leading in certain neighbourhoods to abuses. From Germany the Kalanda confrat
ernities spread to Denmark, Norway, Hungary, and France. In the sixteenth century the Reformation
led to the dissolution of the majority; the rest gradually disappeared, only one being now known to
exist, that of Münter in Westphalia.
SCHATZ, Der Kaland, ein Gedicht des 13. Jahrhunderts (Halle
bericht, 1823-1); FELLER, Dissertatio de fraetibus Calendaris (Leipzig, 1851); BLUMMERO, Uber die Kaland,
brother (Chien, 1721); DITTMER, Das Heilig-Gest-Spiadal und
the St. Clemens-Kaland zu Leibach (Lebra, 1838); BURKELING, Die
Kalanderbruderschaft, bes. in der Diözese Paderborn in Zeitschr.
der Kaldanbruderschaften, in Allerheiligenz, Kallenderbruderschaften, X. 3. Auflage (Münster, 1857),
175-237; BOHRMANN, Die gesamte Bruderschaft, insbeson
dere die Kaland- und Kapnerbruderschaft der Stadt Lübeck im Mittel
alter in Zeichner. des histor. Vereins für Lübeck (1886) 142-128; Die norddeutschen Kalandgesellschaften u. der Kaland in
Münster in Hist.-pol. Blätter, LXXXII (1881), 869-90; M abl, Die Kalandbruderschaften, II (Freiburg, 1896), 126-128; RAEUFENSTRAUCH, Die Kalanderbruderschaften, das Kulturbild
der ältesten Konsorten (Dresden, 1905).
J. P. KIRSCH.
Kalocker, Jan Stephanius van (Giovanni da Cal
car and Joannes Stephanus Calcarinus), Flemish
painter, native of the Duchy of Cleves; b. between 1499
and 1510; d. at Naples, 1546. Vasari refers to this
painter several times only with respect to his hav
ing been a pupil of Titian, entering his school in 1538,
and to his faculty for copying the works of that mas
ter with extraordinary accuracy. Kalocker appears
to have worked first at Dordrecht, but the greater part of
his life was spent at Naples, and there, as Vasari tells
us, "the fairest hopes had been conceived respecting
his future progress." He was responsible for the
eleven large plates of anatomical studies which were
engraved for Andrea Vesalius as illustrations for his
work. Vasari praises them very highly. Kalocker is
also said to have drawn the por-
traits of the artists in the early edition of Vassari's
"Lives". By some writers he has been declared
to have been a close imitator of Giorgione; all who write
about him unite in stating that his imitations of the
work of the Italian artists, and, also of Raphael, were so
extraordinary that they deceived many critics of the
day. His pictures are to be seen in
Berlin, Paris, Florence, Vienna, and Prague, and
his original works are, as a rule, portraits, although at
Prague there is a remarkable "Nativity" by him, which
was once the property of Rubens.
Lomazzo, Trattato dell' Arte della Pittura, etc. (Milan, 1684);
van Maner, La Libre des Peintres (Paris, 1585); ed. Hymans;
Vlue de la peinture de nus (Florence, 1585); also ed.
Milanesi (Florence, 1875-85).
GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.
Kalinka, Valerian, Polish historian, b. near 
Cerow in 1826; d. at Jarosław in 1886. He fled from
Poland in 1846 on account of political entanglements,
worked on the "Casa" newspaper in 1848, but finally
took refuge in Paris, where his first work was written
"Galicia und Cracoio", an historical and social pic
ture of the country from 1772 to 1850. He afterwards
thought of writing a history of Polish integra
tion, but eventually chose to edit a weekly peri
odical entitled "Political Polish News", the principal
contributors to which were himself and Klaczko.
Though forbidden everywhere but in Posen, it existed
for four years, and dealt with every aspect of Polish
national life. Kalinka's articles show a very prac
tical acquaintance with law, administration, history,
and statistics, and had mostly to do with the inner
life of Poland. After 1863, when searching for docu
ments for a life of Prince Adam Czartoryski, he stum
bled on important papers which he published in two
volumes as "The Last Years of Stanislaus Augustus"
(1877-95). This work placed him at once in the first
rank of Polish writers. Poland had not yet had such
an historian, especially in the province of diplomacy
and foreign politics. While marking out a new line,
it carefully pointed out the errors of the past, and showed how they might be rectified. He, though
unknown to Kalinka, was at the same time working in the same direction. Both were accused of
undermining patriotic self-respect, of lowering Poland
in foreign eyes, and of destroying veneration for the
past. In the preface to this work, Kalinka had al
ready answered these charges. A Pole is not less a
Pole when he learns from past errors how to serve his
country better. About this time Kalinka entered the
novitiate of the Resurrection Fathers in Rome, where,
save for a few visits to Galicia, he subsequently re
sided until in 1877, after a visit to the Catholic
missions in Bulgaria, he became chaplain of a convent in 
Jaroslaw. Here in 1886 appeared the first volume of
his "Sejmisteroletni" (The Four Years Diet). Polish
literature has no better book, and none whose perusal
is more painful. It exhibits all the weaknesses in the
leading men of Poland, and all their political blunders.
To the many fierce reproaches it called forth Kalinka
replied: "History calls first for truth; nor can truth
harm patriotism." A grave style, artistic grouping,
faithful narrative of facts, profound political insight,
and splendid literary talent make this book the
second volume, even surpassing the first, ap
peared in 1886, and it came to an end in the
thirty years' labour of Kalinka. He was not only
a profound and far-seeing politician and one of Po
land's best historians, but also one of her most ze
alous priests.
S. TARNOWIEK.
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KALISPAL INDIANS, popularly known under the French name of Pend d’Oreilles, “ear pendants”, an important tribe of Salishan stock originally residing about Pend d’Oreille lake and river, in northern Idaho and southeastern Washington, now gathered chiefly upon Flathead reservation, Montana, and Colville reservation, Washington. They are commonly distinguished as Upper Kalispel, on the lake, and Lower Kalispel, on the river. They are mentioned under the name of Coospeal by the explorers Lewis and Clark, in 1805, and they have the habit of crossing the mountains annually to hunt buffalo on the Missouri. Somewhat later they became acquainted with the Hudson’s Bay traders.

In 1844 the work of Christianization was begun by the Jesuit Father Adrian Hoecken, who, four years after the famous Father de Smet had undertaken to carry the Gospel among the Flathead Indians, established St. Ignatius Mission on the east side of Clark’s fork, near the Idaho line in the present Stevens county, Washington. When the Mission of St. Mary, on Bitter Root River, was abandoned in 1850, in consequence of the incursions of the Blackfeet, the Flathead found in St. Ignatius a home of Christian intercourse. In his official report of the commission to the north-western tribes in 1853, Governor Isaac Stevens gives an extended account of Saint Ignatius, of which he says: “It would be difficult to find a more beautiful example of successful missionary labor in this country.” The mission was commenced in 1855, but in the meantime other Jesuit missions had sprung up, and not only the Kalispel, but also the kindred Colvilles, Lakes, Okanagan, and Flatheads were completely Christianized. In 1855 the upper band joined with the Flatheads and part of the Kutenai in a treaty with the government by which they were settled on the Flathead reservation in Montana, where some of the Lower band joined them in 1887. In 1872 a part of the Lower band was gathered upon the Colville reservation in Washington. Still others are scattered in various parts of Washington and Idaho. Lewis and Clark estimated the tribe at 1800 souls in 1805. In 1905 there were officially reported 670 “Pend d’Oreilles” (Upper band) and 192 “Kalispel” (Lower band) on the Flathead reservation, Montana, and 98 “Kalispel” on Colville reservation, Washington, making, with a few not accounted for, a total of about 1000 souls.

The work on both missions is still in charge of the Jesuits, and is recognized by all observers as in the highest degree successful as regards religious observance, general morality, and self-supporting industry. The fathers are assisted at the Flathead mission (St. Ignatius) by Sisters of Providence, Ursulines, and Lemenais Brothers, and at the Colville mission (St. Francis Regis; Ward P. O.) by Sisters of Charity of Providence. The principal industries now are farming and stock raising, with fishing and the gathering of edible roots. The earlier more primitive habit of life is thus summarized in an official report of 1900 upon the non-treaty tribes of north-eastern Washington, now gathered on Colville reservation:

“The habits and manner of living of the tribes in this district are nearly similar. They live mostly in lodges and move from place to place where they can most easily procure subsistence. In the spring, after they put in their crops, they go to the Spokane country to dig couse, bitter-root, and wild onion. The first two they dry in the sun; the wild onion they mix with the black moss and bake under hot stones. About the middle of May they collect at the several camas grounds, which root (resembling an onion, is sweet and insipid) they dig and prepare as follows: They make a bed six or eight feet in diameter, of smooth stones, on which they build a fire; when the stones are red hot they remove the fire and cover them with green grass two or three inches deep on which they place the camas six to twelve inches deep, and over which they spread green grass; then cover all with earth about six inches deep, on which they build a fire and keep it up from twenty-four to forty-eight hours, according to the amount of the water baked it is taken out and dried in the sun. Being thus prepared it will keep for years, and is both nutritious and palatable. Before baking it is white; after, black. There are several camas prairies in this district, but the largest is Kalispel on the Pend d’Oreille river, at which place hundreds of the Indians gather.”

JAMES MOONEY.

Kalisa-Cujavia. See Vladislav, Diocese of.

Kalocsa-Bacs, Archdiocese of (Colocensi et Bachiensis).—This archdiocese embraces within its territories an archdiocese and a diocese founded by St. Stephen of Hungary in 1010. The question of the foundation of, and of the relations between, Kalocsa and Bacs was for a long time uncertain. George Ferjé was of opinion that St. Stephen founded Kalocsa and Bacs as independent sees, and that subsequently St. Ladislaus raised Bacs to archiepiscopal rank in 1013, and united it with Kalocsa. Stephen Katona, on the other hand, held that the Archdiocese of Bacs was founded by St. Ladislaus in 1093 by division of the Archdiocese of Kalocsa, which being afterwards reunited in 1135. To Julius Vársovy we are indebted for the solution of the question: he shows that the Archdiocese of Bacs never existed as an independent see, but that the archbishops of Kalocsa for various reasons changed their residence from time to time to Bacs, so that eventually there arose in town an independent chapter with its own cathedral, etc. In 1135 the union of Kalocsa and Bacs was canonically confirmed, the chapter at Bacs was raised to archiepiscopal rank, and it was decided that in future the election of an archbishop should rest with the united chapters, but should be held in some third locality. It was also decided that the name of the archdiocese should be Kalocsa-Bacs. Bacs remained the residence of the archbishops, and likewise their burial-place, until 1526, when after the battle of Mohács it fell into the hands of the Turks. When first established the archdiocese was very extensive. It embraced the lands between the Danube and the Theiss from Dom-sód, which is situated to the south of Vác (Waten), southwards as far as Titel, including also within its territories a portion of Syrmia. As early as 1229 it suffered its first diminution of territory, when Syrmia was formed into a separate diocese. The history of the archbishops and the archbishop of Kalocsa-Bacs is closely interwoven with that of Hungary. The first archbishop was Aistrak, who later appears as Archbishop of Gran. It is not quite clear whether the title of archbishop was personal to Aistrak,
or was also transmissible to his successors, for, while his immediate successor, George, is spoken of as archbishop, his second successor, Desiderius, is spoken of only as bishop. Then again Desiderius's successor, Paulinus, is called archbishop. The Archbishop of Kalocsa from the beginning was next in rank to the Archbishop of Gran. In 1175, when Gran was vacant, the Archbishop of Kalocsa was chosen to crown Béla III; likewise in 1204, Archbishop John crowned Ladislaus III. Supported by these two predecessors the archbishop claimed the right to crown the kings of Hungary. In 1212 the question was so far settled that, in case Gran should be vacant, or its archbishop should decline to act, the right to crown the sovereign belonged to Kalocsa. Archbishop Saul (1192–1202) was held in great esteem by the Holy See, which sought his opinion on many questions. Under Ugrin (1219–41) occurred the foundation of the great hospital in Kalocsa, and the establishment of the Diocese of Syrmia in 1229. In his time also the wars against the Patarenes in Bosnia broke out, and, more especially after the establishment of the See of Syrmia, these wars against the Patarenes and other unbelievers were carried on with great zeal. Ugrin also took part in the coronation of Andrew II. He fell in the battle of Muhi against the Tatar hordes in 1241. Archbishop Ladislaus (1317–37) was distinguished for great theological learning. Andrew Brenti (1413–31) took an important part in the preparation of the Canons of Constance. Stephen Várdai (1456–71) was distinguished for his humanistic culture. He had studied at Italian universities, and brought back with him a taste for the splendour of the Renaissance. As chancellor and intimate friend of King Matthias Corvinus, he was one of the most zealous promoters of humanism and the Renaissance in Hungary. Thanks to the recommendation of the king, he had the distinction of being the first archbishop of Kalocsa to be named cardinal, but died before receiving the insignia. Peter Váradi (1480–1501) was also one of Matthias's confidants, but for some unknown reason forfeited the royal favour, was imprisoned in 1494, and regained his freedom only after the king's death in 1490. He thenceforth devoted his energies mainly to the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline. To this end he held a diocesan synod, instituted canonical visits of the parishes, turned his attention to the education of the clergy, sent young ecclesiastics to the universities for more extensive study, and founded a library. He also regulated the temporalties of the archdiocese.

Archbishop Paul Tomori (1523–26) led the Hungarian army in the decisive struggle against the Turks, meeting his death in the disastrous battle of Mohács in 1526. The territories of the archdiocese were now overrun by the Turks, who prevented the archbishops from exercising their authority. The Holy See continued to appoint to the archdiocese, but the archbishops possessed only the title without being able to exercise any real jurisdiction. George Dras (1572–92) took part in the Council of Trent, and received the cardinal's hat. The population diminished at first under Turkish rule, but as early as 1550 Dalmatian Catholics began to immigrate, and the number of Catholics subsequently increased. To satisfy the religious requirements of the population, the Holy See adopted the expedient of treating the archbishopric as missionary territory, and turned over the care of the faithful to the Franciscans. This condition lasted through the whole period of Turkish domination. Leopold Kollonits (1691–5) was first in a position to enter into personal acquaintance of the archdiocese, and to re-exercise jurisdiction, whereupon the archdiocese ceased to be a missionary district. Still, for a time it was governed by vicars. Paul Szechényi (1696–1710), the second of this family to become archbishop of Kalocsa (the first, George Szechényi, was archbishop from 1668 to 1685), played an important part as mediator between Prince Francis Rakóczi II and the Viennese Court, but his efforts to effect a reconcentration were fruitless. A new archiepiscopal curia at Kalocsa was begun in his time, and also the reconstruction of the parish church, etc. Count George Caky (1710–32), successor of the last-mentioned, laid the foundation of the new cathedral. His successor, Count Gabriel Patachich, may be looked upon as the second founder of the archdiocese. He removed the archiepiscopal residence permanently to Kalocsa, and concentrated all his efforts on the reorganization of the archdiocese. He built the seminary and restored the cathedral chapter. Among the recent archbishops, one may be especially mentioned Count Franz Nadaady, whose short reign (1845–51) was devoted mainly to charitable works, but who also played an important part in the political events of those years; Joseph Kunst (1852–68), who has perpetuated his name in various religious institutions. Archbishop Lajos Haynald is treated in a separate article. The present archbishop is Julius Városy. St. Stephen is now the patron saint of the archdiocese, although it was originally under the protection of St. Paul the Apostle, and the metropolitan church is dedicated to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

The archiepiscopal chapter of Kalocsa was founded at the same time as the archdiocese. At first it was richly endowed, but in time became so impoverished that Innocent VI reduced the number of canons from twelve to six, but Gregory XI, in 1376, raised the number to ten, where it remained until the battle of Mohács in 1526. There was another chapter at Bacs, already mentioned, but Turkish rule put an end to both. The chapter at Bacs was never re-established, but that of Kalocsa was revived by Archbishop Count Gabriel Patachich in 1738. Clement XII gave the members the right to wear the cappe magna, and the chapter also recovered its right as locus celebrantis. There were four canons until 1763, when another stall was established, with which, in memory of the archiepiscopal chapter of Bacs, the title of Provost of Bacs was associated. Finally, in 1776, the number of canons was increased to ten, a figure which obtains to the present day. In 1779 Maris Theresia granted to the canons the badge which they still wear. The Archbishopric of Kalocsa-Bacs has to-day as suffragans the bishops of Transylvania, Csanád, Grosswardein (Lat. Rite), and the (titular) See of Knin (Timin). The archbishopric is divided into three archdioceses—the metropolitan and those of Bacs and Thess—subdivided into 16 vicariate-archdeaconries. Besides the 10 regular cathedral canons, the archdiocese contains 8 titular stalls, 9 titular abbeys, and 10 titular provostships. The number of parish churches is 126; of chapels-of-ease, 226; of parish priests, 105; of curates-in-charge, 23.
The total number of priests in the archdiocese is 284; of clerics, 46. There are 5 orders in the diocese, 6 monasteries with 143 monks, and 32 convents with 548 nuns. The right to give benefices is still exercised by 27 patrons. The population numbers 95,000 Catholics, 647,642 non-Catholics, 26,379 Jews, while 409 are attached to no denomination.

In Latin: Kalona, Historia Metropolit., ecclesia Colombaria (Kalona, 1800), Prat, Specimen Hierarchia Hungarica, I-III (Benedict, 1778-79), Veyo, Descriptione Historica de unitate ecclesiarum Colombariae et Bischofni in Schematismiss actibus. Coloc, et Bohemiae. (1855 and 1901). In Hungarian: Kára, Historia Ecclesiae Hungaricae iis usque temporum (Nagl-Vark, 1878), Károlyi: Catholic Church (Budapest, 1892); Monograph on the County of Bacs, II (Budapest, 1896), with bibliography. A. LÁDAY.

Kamenetz. See Leemberg, Diocese of; Lutze, Diocese of.

Kamerun (Cameroons), Vicariate Apostolic of, in German West Africa, between British Nigeria and French Congo, stretching north-east from the coast of the southern shore of Lake Chad. The territory was ceded to England by a treaty of 13 July, 1884, and given in charge of the Pious Society of Missions (Pallottini). Father Henry Vieter was nominated the first prefect Apostolic. The area is about 191,130 square miles, and the native population (Bantu negroes near the seacoast, Sudan negroes inland) is, according to recent estimates, about 800,000. There are about 100,000 whites, mostly Germans. The chief exports are palm kernels and palm oil, rubber, ivory, and cocoa. The climate is hot and moist, and malarial fever abounds, especially in the lowlands. The natives generally are addicted to fetishism, and there are a few Mohammedians. In 1892 the German Government allowed the missionaries to open a preparatory house of studies at Linsburg (Nassau), and later at Ehrenbreitstein and Vallendaal (Rhineland). The first missionary station was opened at Marienberg on the river Sanaga, nearly 4000 feet broad. Other stations were opened (1891) near the Falls of the Sanaga, and at Kribi on the Batanga coast. From the beginning the missionaries suffered much from malaria; in 1894, therefore, they opened the station of Engelberg in the Kamerun Mountains, at an altitude of nearly 1400 feet, both as a sanatorium and a missionary centre. In 1898 was opened the station of Duala (22,900), the capital of Kamerun, where the French missionaries had preceded the Catholics (there are between seven and eight thousand native Protestantists). The mission of St. Peter Claver at Big-Batanga was opened in 1900, and in 1901 that of Yannde, twelve days' walk into the interior. Iressa on the upper Rio del Rey was founded in 1905, and in 1917 the station of Einsiedeln was opened in Kamerun mountains, at an altitude of about 2800 feet. Another station is almost ready at Victoria; it bears the name of the Blessed Trinity. Einsiedeln serves as a seminary for schoolmasters; it is hoped also that eventually it may give rise to a centre for the mission. Nonever, however, will receive Holy orders before the age of thirty.

In September, 1906, the first synod was held at Duala. The prefeeture was raised to the rank of a vicariate Apostolic (21 Dec., 1904), and the first prefect Apostolic made first vicar Apostolic; he was consecrated titular Bishop of Paraleion on 22 January, 1905. On the arrival of the missionaries they found 5 Catholics; in the vicariate there are now 18 priests, 21 brothers, and 30 sisters for the education of natives. Since October, 1890, death has claimed twenty-four of the little band of missionaries, and several have been sent home in time to save their health, which continued to be gloomy, i.e., then the entire period there have been about 8027 baptisms. There are at present about 3819 catechumens, each of whom has two years of probation. There are in the mission schools about 5675 boys and girls. All these, however, are not in the schools of the missionary station; many of them are taught in the village schools by black schoolmasters, directed and paid by the missionaries. After leaving the schools, many of the boys are taught useful trades by the lay brothers of the missions.

Missions Catholica (Rome); Street, Kultur Missionale (Steyl, 1906); Statistiker's Year-Book (London, 1912). H. VIETER.

Kandy, Diocese of (Kandenser), formerly part of the Vicariate of Southern Colombo, Ceylon, India, from which it was cut off as a vicariate Apostolic on 14 April, 1883, and erected into a diocese on 1 September, 1886. Its only vicar and first bishop is Dom Clement Pagnani, a Sylvestrine Benedictine, b. at Fabriano, near Ancona, Italy, 24 June, 1854; consecrated 25 December, 1879, at which time he was appointed to the Vicariate of Southern Colombo.

The Vicariate of Southern Colombo had been in the hands of the Sylvestrine Benedictines since 1855, but the needs of the country demanding a greater supply of missionaries than the Sylvestrines could meet, the country in the time of the diocese in a more temperate than throughout the rest of the island.

From the palm-groves and sweltering heats of Colombo the railway line threads its way a distance of seventy-five miles through tea-plantations, wild bush, and forest, across mountain streams and under crags of limestone overhanging in great boulders, with Adam's Peak looming conspicuous in the distance, until at an elevation of 1734 feet above the sea it reaches the town of Kandy (in Singhalese, Ma Hartoo the Great City), former capital of the island, now the residence of the British governor-agent. It stands on the shore of an artificial lake in an amphitheatre of beautifully wooded hills. Its population in 1901 was 26,522.

Kandy is first mentioned in the fourteenth century, when the Dalada Maligawa, or "Temple of the Tooth", was built to contain that famous relic of Buddha brought to Ceylon for safety about 311. In 1582 the town became the capital of Ceylon, and the king's palace was built about the year 1600. Kandy was the last stronghold of the old dynasty, and kings continued to rule there up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the last king, Vikrama Raja Sinha, was taken prisoner by the British (1815) and sent to Yellore. The Temple of the Tooth still remains, and is the scene of annual festivities (Perahera) in honour of this precious relic of the Buddha. The sacred tooth itself, however, was taken by the Portuguese to Goa in 1660, and publicly burned there in presence of the viceroy. The Buddhists claim to possess it, and on this show in an ivory about two inches long by one inch in diameter, which is said to resemble the tooth of a crocodile rather than of a man. It reposes in the temple on a lotus flower of pure gold set with seven concentric bell-shaped metal shrines. In the vicinity of Kandy is an immense cemetery where were deposited the bodies of the mighty kings and heroes of Ceylon; about five miles away are the botanical gardens of Peradeniya, covering one hundred and fifty acres with the most luxuriant exotic vegetation. Indeed the vegetation all around Kandy is luxuriant, and when the white flower of the cinnamon tree is in blossom the effect is very wonderful, i.e., then the entire period there have been about 4527 baptisms. There are at present about 3819 catechumens, each of whom has two years of probation. There are in the mission schools about 5675 boys and girls. All these, however, are not in the schools of the missionary station; many of them are taught in the village schools by black schoolmasters, directed and paid by the missionaries. After leaving the schools, many of the boys are taught useful trades by the lay brothers of the missions. Missions Catholica (Rome); Street, Kultur Missionale (Steyl, 1906); Statistiker's Year-Book (London, 1912). H. VIETER.
the fruit itself, which is not very palatable, a strong
intoxicant is distilled. Serpents are numerous, espe-
cially the cobra and the carambola. Kandy has a
municipal council partly elected by the ratepayers and
partly by the governor-agent. A figure of extreme
interest among the inhabitants for many years now
has resided in Kandy, the Egyptian Pasha Dr. Im-
prisoned or exiled there since the Battle of Tel-el-Kebir
in 1882.

Besides being the seat of the diocese and the
residence of the governor-agent, Kandy is also the
residence of the Apostolic delegate to the East Indies,
Missionaries from Archbishop of Athens. The town
has a seminary known as the "Leonianum" for native
students of India and Ceylon. It is under the care
of the Jesuits and numbers eighty-eight students;
the course of studies includes philosophy and theology.

The population of the Diocese of Kandy, which is
made up of various races including Sinhalese and
Tamils, amounts to 806,506, of whom 27,938 are
Catholics; 11,871 are Protestants; 403,909 are Bud-
dhists; 321,350 Hindus; 43,867 Mohammedans; and
the remainder unaccounted for. The languages
spoken include Cingalese, Tamil, and English. The
town has a church with resident priests, besides
the Episcopal city, are Ampitami, Panvitile,
Matale, Vahacotte, Gampola, Mavalthipitiya, Hatton,
Dirubula, Nuvarra-Eliya, Badulla, and Bandara-
wellas.

Matale, a hundred miles from Ceylon, is the north-
ermost limit of European civilization. It is a large
village and is the centre of a flourishing tea and coc-
oca plantation; it is famous for its native bazaar, and
for a splendid avenue of rain-trees, so called from the
circumstances that at night the leaves fold into a
kind of sack in which the moisture condenses and at
sunsine when the leaves open this is discharged in quite
a heavy dew. The eastern parts of Matale are
Christians are to be found with Portuguese names, des-
cendants of converts made on the island 400 years
ago.

Hatton (414 feet above the sea-level) is a resting-
place for tourists or pilgrims on their way up Usumas,
or Adam's Peak (7400 feet), where Buddha is said to
have left the imprint of his foot. Hatton is also the
centre of a great tea-growing district. Nuvarra-Eliya
(8210 feet above the sea) is famous for its cool climate,
and has been chosen as the summer residence of the
governor-agent. In the neighborhood is Pidurawu
(1000 feet), which is near to Cingalese, and Badulla is
an attractive old town. Dambulla, near Hatton, is
famous for its rock temples and natural caves, to which
access is obtained along a steep stair-
way cut about 500 feet up the face of a rock.

Besides the churches with resident priests, there
are fifteen churches and thirty-two stations in
the diocese. The mission work is done by three secu-
lar priests, one native priest, twenty-one regulars, and
twelve catechists. There are in the diocese six el-

cementary schools for boys with 668 pupils; nine for
girls with 921 pupils; one college for boys with fifty-
five pupils; two for girls with 163 pupils. There are,
moreover, four orphanages containing 126 children.
The girls are looked after by the Sisters of the Good
Shepherd of whom there are seventeen, and by native
sisters of whom there are ten. The regular clerisy
consists of twenty-five Sylvestrine Benedictines and
eleven Jesuits. By an ordinance of 1898 the bishop
is constituted sole, vice-regal, and hold property, and to sue and be sued in courts of
justice in relation thereto. The management of the
schools is in the hands of the missionaries, but the
Government sends its inspector every year to hold an
examination, on the results of which a grant is made
for the upkeep of the school. The Church Missionary
Society and the Wesleyan Methodist Mission Society
are very active in and around Kandy.

KANSAS

November, 1860; BIRDWOOD, Buried Cities
of Ceylon (London, 1899); CAYE, Ruined Cities of Ceylon
(London, 1900); MURRAY, Handbook of India (London, 1897);
KRANE, India Impressions (New York, 1907); BARTOLOTTI, Pearl of
India (Boston, 1864); POLO, Les Missions (Paris, 1903);
Missiones Catholicas (Rome, 1897).

J. C. GREY.

KANSAS—PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—Geography.

—Kansas, one of the United States of America, is the
central state of the Union, to which it was admitted 29
Jan., 1861. It has an area of 82,144 square miles,
approximately 400 miles from east to west, and 200
miles from north to south. It is bounded on the
north by Nebraska, on the east by Missouri, on the
west by Colorado, and on the south by Oklahoma. The
Territory of Kansas was organized in 1854 with
the following limits: beginning at a point on the west-
ern boundary of the State of Missouri, where parallel
37° N. crosses the same; thence west on said parallel to
the eastern boundary of New Mexico; thence north on said
boundary to 38° N.; thence follow-
ing said boundary westward to the
eastern boundary of the Territory of
Utah on the summit of the Rocky
Mountains; thence northward on said
summit to 40° N.; thence east on said
parallel to the western boundary of
the State of Mis-
souri; thence south with the western boundary of
said state to the place of beginning. It was, however,
provided in the organic Act of the Territory that the
United States Government should not be inhibited
thereby from dividing the Territory of Kansas or from
attaching any portion of said territory to any other
territory or state of the United States. The State of
Kansas is not as large as the territory organized under
the same name; in area it ranks the eleventh among
the states in the Union, and it is nearly ten times as
large as Massachusetts.

Surface.—The general surface of Kansas is undula-
ting. It slopes gently from an average height of about
3650 feet above sea level at its western boundary to
850 at its eastern; the average slope is about seven
feet to the mile. There is also an inclination from
north to south. The mean elevation of the state is
about 2000 feet. As for timber, along the waterways
in the eastern part are found black hickory, locust,
cherry, maple, and hickory. Artificial forests are
found in almost every county.

The state is drained by the Missouri River that
forms the north-eastern boundary, and by the Kansas
and Arkansas Rivers and their tributaries—all of
which belong to the Mississippi system.

CLIMATE.—The climate of Kansas is mild and
healthful. In the higher altitudes of western Kansas
the air is dry, and wholesome for persons with a ten-
dency to pulmonary diseases. The annual range
of temperature is about 120° F. The average tempe-

rature of the winter months for twenty years has been
75° F.; of the three months in summer 90° F. The
mean temperature for the year is thus 53° F. The
annual average precipitation, which includes rainfall and
the water from melted snow, ranges from fifteen inches
in the extreme west to forty-four inches in the extreme
south-east. Irrigation is applied in parts of the west-
ern counties.

HISTORY.—It is supposed by some grave writers
that the "Cow Country" through which Cabezah de
Vasa passed in 1555 was the country north of the Arkansas River and the Old Santa Fé trail, now a part of Kansas. The Spaniards under Coronado entered the limits of the present State of Kansas in 1541, and traversed it to the plains, the limit of the expedition with a cross. This was on the bank of a great tributary of the Mississippi River. Another large river which was crossed by the Spaniards was named Sta. Peter and Paul; Coronado was accompanied by several friars. Among them was Father Juan de Padilla, who remained to convert the Indians. After the departure of Coronado, was here slain by the aborigines. Father Marquette's map of the Mississippi region in 1673 designates various Indian tribes that dwelt within the borders of Kansas. Thus he is the first to mention the Kanza—the tribe from whom the state derives its name. The French in 1705 ascended the Missouri River as far as the Kansas River. Du Tisnènet erected a cross with the arms of the King of France in the country of the Padoucas, on 27 September, 1719. According to Du Pratz, in 1721 a band of Spaniards, having a Dominica for their chaplain, went, all, with the exception of the four or five who were misled by the Missouri whom they had mistaken for Osages, their allies. This happened probably on the present site of Leavenworth. In 1724 M. de Bourgement made a journey across the territory of Kansas, but during his absence in the following year the entire garrison he had left at Fort Orleans was massacred by the Indians. Louisiana, of which Kansas was a part, was subject to France until 3 November, 1762, when it became a Spanish possession; only to be retroceded to France in 1800; it was purchased by the United States 30 April, 1803. Lewis and Clark explored the region in 1804, 1805, and 1806. In 1806 Zebulon M. Pike explored the south of Kansas; at his instance (29 Sept., 1806) the United States flag replaced the Spanish flag at the Pawnee Indian village in the present Republic County.

For some years previous to this the Chouteau family carried on the fur trade in Kansas. In 1819 and 1820 Long's scientific exploration of the country lying west of the Allegheny and east of the Rocky Mountains between 35° and 42° N., embraced the state of Kansas. Ft. Leavenworth was established by the Federal government in 1827. Except a few missionaries, Indian traders, hunters and trappers, there were no whites in Kansas until 1854. In 1844 Captain Fremont explored the valleys of the Kansas and Republican Rivers. In June, 1846, General Kearney set out from Fort Leavenworth for the conquest of New Mexico and California. In 1804 Kansas became a part of the District of Louisiana, for which reason was located in the Governor of Indian Territory, acting with the judges of that territory. In 1805 Congress changed the District of Louisiana to the Territory of Louisiana, still embracing Missouri and Kansas. When in 1812 the Territory of Orleans became the Territory of Louisiana, what was known as the Territory of Louisiana was called Missouri Territory. The 7776 square miles lying south of the Arkansas River and west of longitude 100° W., now within the limits of Kansas, were not a part of the Louisiana Purchase, but were acquired from Mexico. In 1820 Congress passed an Act enabling the people of Missouri Territory to become a state, but prohibiting slavery in all of the Louisiana Purchase north of 36° 30'. By the organization of Missouri as a state in 1821, Kansas received an eastern boundary. In 1823 the wagon-trains from Missouri to Santa Fé passing through Kansas opened the interior of the plains. Besides the Santa Fé trail there was the Oregon trail leading to the valley of the Platte in Nebraska. Property worth millions of dollars was transported by the pack-trains and wagon-trains. An army of men, Americans and Mexicans, were employed as teamsters and packers. In addition to the native Indian tribes, Osages, Pawnees, Kansas, and Papous or Comanches, Indians of eastern states were given reservations in Kansas, designated Indian Territory until 1854 when it was organized as Kansas Territory. The first settlement of Kansas was in 1854, westward to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, including a large portion of the present State of Colorado under the name of 'Ararapaho County. In 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska Act abrogated the Missouri Compromise of 1820, and left the question of slavery to the people of the territory. The result was the war governors of Kansas State constitution. In consequence, the North and South entered into a contest to people the Territory of Kansas. It led to acts of violence and bloodshed between the pro-slavery and anti-slavery parties that resulted in the loss of two hundred human lives and in the destruction of two millions of dollars. The cities of Leavenworth, Atchison, Topeka, and Lawrence were founded in 1854.

The interminable struggle in Kansas, in which John Brown was a prominent factor, was potent in forcing the great war that followed between the Northern and Southern States. In 1860, Kansas showed a white population of 8601. In 1860, according to the United States census, there were 107,206 inhabitants; the country in this year was a severe calamity. Kansas was admitted as a free State on 29 January, 1861. The motto of the State is "Ad astra per aspera." In 1861, Topeka was made the permanent capital. The State furnished 20,151 men to the Union army, though the proper quota would have been but 12,930. Out of her military force, Kansas lost 472 officers and 7345 private soldiers. On 21 August, 1863, the notorious guerrilla Quantrill attacked Lawrence in revenge for the destruction of the city, killing its citizens slain, and 43 others wounded. Property worth $2,000,000 was destroyed. In October, 1864, some 20,000 Kansas men were under arms to oppose Gen. Sterling Price, who with a large force of Confederates threatened the eastern border of the state. He was decisively beaten on Kansas soil in the battle of Mine Creek following the Battle of the Blue and the Battle of Westport, near Kansas City. Kansas troops were mainly engaged in Missouri, Arkansas, and Indian Territory (now Oklahoma), but saw service as far south as Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. Charles Robinson and Thomas fitted out a railroad in 1867, making the building of railroads, as early as 1867, there were 523 miles of railroads in the state. These were of material aid in the development of the great natural resources of Kansas. The early settlers in remote places were justly in dread of the Indians who made their last raid in 1876, when 20 white people were killed by the savages. Since then the red men have left no mark on the pages of Kansas history, and their number within the state has been reduced to about 2000. The legislature of 1863 located the Insane Asylum at Osawatomie, accepted the congressional grant of lands for an agricultural college at Manhattan, and provided for the state university at Lawrence and the state normal school at Emporia. In the following year the deaf and dumb asylum, the blind asylum, and the penitentiary were located, and suitable buildings were erected for these institutions. There were followed the State Normal School for women, the Normal School for girls, a hospital for epileptics, a school for feeble-minded youth and the Soldiers' Orphans' Home, besides an additional hospital for the insane at Topeka. The state makes liberal appropriations for the maintenance of each of them.
A great number of European immigrants settled, largely in colonies, in the state in the decade following 1870. In 1880 the state constitution was amended by the adoption of the law prohibiting in Kansas the miscegenation which in the law of Indiana has never been strictly enforced for any length of time. In 1877, the municipal suffrage bill conferred on women in Kansas the right to vote at school, bond, and municipal elections. About 26,000 women voted in the spring election of 1878. In 1884 the constitutional amendment conferring on women the full exercise of suffrage was defeated by 35,000 votes.

Economics.—Agriculture and Trade.—The soil is very productive. It consists in the eastern part of heavy black loam of greatest depth along the streams; and in the western part, of a sandy formation.

Kansans is essentially an agricultural state. Wheat and corn are the two most important grain products. In 1908, Kansas raised 150,640,516 bushels of corn, with a value of $82,462,461; 76,808,922 bushels of wheat, with a value of $33,855,146. The value of sorgum was $10,258,998; of tame hay $9,534,360; oats $7,760,314; barley $3,941,805; peaches $4,431,864. The field products from 32,216,702 acres under cultivation had a value of $189,059,626. Alfalfa increases annually in acreage and value of crop. The value of animals slaughtered or sold for slaughter was $76,705,158. Poultry and eggs sold $9,306,651. Butter and cheese sold $1,006,312. Milk sold $1,145,922. Garden and horticultural products marketed $786,879. The total value of all farm products in 1908 reached the sum of $277,733,925, without considering the live-stock retained by the farmers and returned by assessors to the value of $197,510,579. In 1906 the value of farm products and live-stock aggregated $532,685,745, which was $57,404,414 in excess of 1908.

Bituminous coal is found in most of the counties of the eastern part of the state. It is mined profusely in Crawford, Cherokee, Leavenworth, and Osage Counties. The coal-bearing area of a county usually exceeds 5,000,000. Natural gas and petroleum are found in large quantities. The former is piped and used in the principal cities for fuel and lighting purposes. Salt is mined at Hutchinson, Kanopolis, Lyons, Kingman, Anthony, Wellington, and Sterling. The veins are about 1000 feet deep. All pupils residing in places are 300 feet thick. The salt area of Kansas is estimated at one million acres. The annual production is about 2,000,000 pounds. The lead and zinc mines are a source of profit and give employment to many in the southeastern part of the state. In the production of these ores Kansas is second only to Missouri. There are quarries of superior limestone, sandstone, and rock gypseum. The limestone, especially in the more central counties, is excellent building material. Cement, lime, clays for brick, tile, and pottery are among the products that contribute to the industries and wealth of the state. According to the United States census of 1900 the manufactured products of the state attained a value of $172,129,298. In 1903 the mineral production of the state had a value of $27,164,007.85; natural gas a value of $1,115,375.

Kansas City is the seat of the second largest packing industry in the world. Here also is one of the largest stock markets. Car-shops, flour-mills, -paper-mills, iron foundries, furniture factories, soap factories, printing and publishing establishments are found in nearly all the centres of population. Even before the first railway was laid in these parts, there was a commercial route extending from the eastern to the western border of Kansas. The Santa Fé trail, the great overland route of the pioneer days, was established in 1824, and extended from Independence, Missouri, to Santa Fé, New Mexico. Kansas has 1,800 miles of railroads connecting all the principal cities with one another and affording excellent shipping facilities. Four of the great transcontinental systems cross the state from east to west. A two-cent fare rate obtains. There are also interurban electric railways. The Board of Railroad Commissioners has supervisory control over common carriers.

SOCIOMETRY.—Population.—The following compilation contains the results of the fifth decennial census taken in 1905. Total population of the 105 counties of the state 1,544,495. Males 802,704; females 741,791; sex not given 1045. Native 1,400,441; foreign 113,378; birth-place not given 26,149. While 157,256; colour 51,073; colour not given, 6518. The number of families was given as 345,956, and the average number of persons in family 4.47. Of the foreign population there were born in Germany 43,124; Sweden, Norway, and Denmark 17,929; Great Britain and Ireland 10,216; Russia 13,536; Ireland 11,536; Liberia 10,536; British-American 7444; Southern Europe including Austria, France, Italy, and Spain about 12,000. There are 532,835 persons of school age; i.e. between the ages of 5 and 20 years. There are 410,289 men 21 years old and over. Engaged in agriculture 251,856; engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries 53,991; engaged in mining, trade and transportation 66,923; engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries 54,991 engaged in mining 10,991. There are 120 towns that have over one thousand inhabitants each; 13 of these have over ten thousand people. Atchison has 20,000, Leavenworth 25,000, Wichita 50,000, Kansas City 90,000, Topeka, the capital of the state, has 45,000. In 1900 the aggregate in cities of above 10,000 was 340,570, or 19.9% of the total population.

Education.—Parents, guardians or others having control of children between the ages of eight and fourteen years are required by law to send such children to a public or private school taught by a competent instructor. 

Ample provision is made for graded schools in towns and districts. At the discretion of the county commissioners or on petition of one-third of the electors of the school district, the school may be taken over by any county if the majority of the electors of the county favour it. In the high-schools provision is made for three courses of instruction, each requiring three years' study for completion; namely, a general course, a normal course, and a collegiate course. Tuition is free for all pupils residing in places having in their midst a public school. The state constitution provided for the establishment by law of a state university for the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences, including a normal and an agricultural department. "All funds arising from the sale or rent of lands granted by the United States to the state for the support of a state university and other grants, donations or bequests either by the state or by individuals, for such purpose, shall remain a perpetual fund to be called the university fund; the interest of which shall be appropriated to the support of the state university." Kansas ranks third, in the United States, in the minimum percentage of illiteracy. Of the 392,009 pupils enrolled in the public schools of the state in 1907-1908, 178,893 were in the rural schools taught by 12,908 teachers. The text-books to be used in the public schools are determined by a text-book commission appointed by the governor. The average cost of these public schools in 1908 was $7,935,443.

The state educational institutions are the following: University of Kansas at Lawrence, with 2250 students; Kansas State Agricultural College at Manhattan, with 2166 students; State Normal School at Emporia, and the State Manual Training School, at
Pittsburg. The Industrial and Educational Institute at Topeka, and the Western University at Quindaro for coloured youth, receive support from state funds. To these should be added the Kansas State School for the Deaf at Olathe, the Kansas School for the Blind at Kansas City. The Orphans' Home at Atchison, the Girls' Industrial School at Beloit, and the Boys' Industrial School at Topeka are also educational institutions. The following non-Catholic denominational colleges are accredited by the State Board of Education: Bethany College, Hesston; Bethany University, Baldwin; Bethany College, Holton; College of Emporia, Emporia; Cooper College, Sterling; Fairmount College, and Friends University, Wichita; Kansas City University, Kansas City; Wesleyan, Salina; Ottawa University, Ottawa; Southwestern College, Winfield; Washburn College, Topeka. To these may be added institutions invested in equipment and endowment about $3,000,000. They represent faculties of 500 persons, instructing 8000 students at an annual expense of $300,000. Some denominations beside the Catholics, particularly the Lutherans, have a goodly number of private schools within the state. In 1898 there were more than 300 private and denominational schools in Kansas. The Board of Control of State Charitable Institutions consists of three electors of the state who are appointed by the governor, and thus become the trustees for the following institutions: Industrial School for Girls; the Kansas Industrial School for Boys; the Kansas School for the Deaf; the Kansas Mental Asylum at Topeka; the Kansas School for the Blind; the Kansas Industrial School for Boys; the School for the Deaf; the Soldiers' Orphans Home, and all other state charitable institutions. It is the duty of the board to visit and inspect, without notice, all in the state within the 24 months the term of office. All private institutions of a charitable nature receiving state aid are subject to the same visitation by the Board of Control. In 1897 the Legislature made appropriations to seventeen private hospitals, nine of which are Catholic, and to ten private children's institutions, including the Catholic orphanages, though the sums granted were small compared with the benevolent work done by these institutions.

The state penitentiary is governed by a warden and a board of three directors appointed by the governor of the state. Prisoners who have received an indeterminate sentence are not to be discharged until the expiration of their minimum sentence. Prisoners under twenty-five years of age may be sentenced to the State Reformatory at Hutchinson. The juvenile court has jurisdiction over dependent, neglected, or delinquent children under sixteen years of age. According to the U. S. Census of 1900 the church property in the state was valued at $2,000,000. The Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterians, Baptist, Christian (Campbellite), Congregational, and Episcopal are the leading Protestant denominations. The Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Friends were established on the new territory before the Territorial government was opened to white settlers in 1854. In 1880, the ten principal Protestant denominations had an aggregate membership of 80,415; there was then about an equal number of Catholics. The latter have in thirty years increased thirty per cent. At Haskell Institute, a Federal school for Indians, Catholic pupils receive religious instruction regularly from the priest. The state prison has a Protestant chaplain, but a priest ministers to the Catholic convicts. At the W. B. Military Home in Leavenworth County and at the Federal and Military prisons at Fort Leavenworth, the Catholic parson is not present, but the state Legislature are opened with prayer. Candidates for office are nominated in primary elections. Cities may choose the "Commission" form of government.

LEGISLATION. — Concerning Religion. — The State Constitution provides among other things as follows: "The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or support any form of worship; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of pupils, or of religious organizations be required. No religious test or property qualification shall be required for any office of public trust, nor for any vote at any election; nor shall any person be incompetent to testify on account of religious belief or practice. All religious tests or qualifications shall be abolished from any part of the common school or university funds of the state. . . . All property used exclusively for religious purposes, for the benefit of the state, or for the benefit of any religious society, or for the benefit of any religious institution shall be exempt from taxation. . . . The title to all property of religious corporations shall be vested in trustees, whose election shall be by the members of such corporations." The title to the various Catholic Churches and schools is actually vested in the respective bishop of the diocese as trustee. "All oaths shall be administered by laying the right hand upon the Holy Bible or by the uplifted right hand. Any person having conscientious scruples against taking an oath, may affirm with like effect." Concerning Marriage. — The marriage contract is to be considered in law as a civil contract, to which the same rules of evidence apply, and the marriage ceremony may be regarded either as civil or as a religious sacrament, but the marriage relation shall only be entered into, maintained, or abrogated as provided by law. All marriages between parents and children, including grandparents and grandchildren of any degree, between brothers and sisters of the half as well as the whole blood, between cousins of the first and second degrees, and nieces, aunts and nephews, and first cousins, are declared to be incestuous and absolutely void. Every judge, justice of the peace, or licensed preacher of the Gospel, may perform the marriage ceremony in this state, when a licence issued by the proper judge of any county in the state has been issued. The consent of parent or guardian is required for a licence when the contracting male is under twenty-one years, and the female under eighteen years of age. Insanity in near kindred is a bar. Property, real and personal, which any woman may own in this state at the time of her marriage, shall in no way become the property of her husband by the marriage. The district court may grant a divorce for any of the following causes: (1) when either of the parties has a former husband or wife living at the time of the subsequent marriage; (2) abandonment for one year; (3) adultery; (4) impotency; (5) a wife whose marriage was incestuous; (6) extreme cruelty; (7) fraudulent contract; (8) habitual drunkenness; (9) gross neglect of duty; (10) conviction for felony and imprisonment in the penitentiary therefor subsequent to the marriage. When the parties appear to be in equal wrong, the district court may in its discretion refuse to grant a divorce. When a divorce is granted the court shall make provision for guardianship, custody, support and education of the minor children of the marriage. A decree of divorce does not become absolute and take effect until the expiration of six months from the day and date when the judgment was rendered in the cause. The wife may obtain alimony from the husband without a divorce in an action brought for that purpose in a district court for any of the causes for which a divorce may be granted. The latest statistics show 2000 divorces. The legislature is considering a marriage and divorce bill.

Wills. — Any person of full age and sound mind and memory having an interest in real or personal property may give and devise the same to any person by last will and testament lawfully executed. Any married person having no children may devise one-half of
his or her property to other persons than the husband or wife. Either husband or wife may consent in writing, executed in the presence of two witnesses, that the other may bequeath more than half of his or her property. A will made in the last sickness, is valid in respect to personal estate if reduced to writing and subscribed by two competent witnesses within ten days. The legislature of 1909 authorized the assessment of an inheritance tax on estates over $1000, which is, however, not applied to property exempt from taxation under the constitution. Inquests are required before the tax graduated.

Sunday observation.—Labour, except the household offices of daily necessity, if performed on Sunday is deemed a misdemeanour, and is punishable by a fine not exceeding twenty-five dollars. Persons observing another day of the week as the Sabbath are, however, exempt from the provisions of this statute. Horse-racing, and the sales of merchandise except medicines and provisions of immediate necessity, are also prohibited on the first day of the week. There is a rigid anti-lottery law, and also a law against the use of tobacco, one forbidding the sale of tobacco to minors, and another which prohibits the sale of tobacco of a special brand or description. There are schools under the conduct of the Religious of the Sacred Heart, of the Sisters of Loreto, of the Sisters of St. Benedict, and of the Sisters of Charity. These last were also in charge of a hospital and orphanage in Leavenworth. In this year on 8 December, the Leavenworth University, a building of great architectural beauty, was consecrated. Bishop Miege went to Rome for the Vatican Council, and later to South America on a collecting tour. In 1871, the prior of St. Benedict's, Louis Mary Fink, O.S.B., was consecrated Bishop of Euparla, to assist Bishop Miege, whom he succeeded on the latter's resignation in 1874, when there were 35,000 Catholics in the state. Bishop Fink remained Vicer Apostolic of Kansas until Leavenworth was made an episcopal see, in 1877, when he became its first bishop with jurisdiction over the State of Kansas.

The Catholic population within a few years increased to 80,000 souls. Churches and schools multiplied under his fostering hand. In 1887 two other dioceses, those of Concordia and Wichita, were carved out of Leavenworth. New boundaries were established by Apostolic letters in 1897. The first Bishop of Wichita was John James Jerez, who was consecrated before his consecration. The Rt. Rev. John Joseph Hennessy was consecrated Bishop of Wichita, 30 November 1888; his jurisdiction extends over an area of 42,915 square miles, with 765,000 inhabitants, of whom 30,000 are Catholics. Rt. Rev. Richard Scannel, who was transferred to Omaha in 1888, was the first Bishop of Concordia. The second to be preconized was the Rt. Rev. Theodore Butler, D.D., who died in Rome before his consecration. The present bishop is the Rt. Rev. John Francis Cunningham, who was for many years vicar-general of Leavenworth, and was consecrated bishop 22 September, 1898. Concordia diocese has an area of 26,681 square miles, with about one Catholic to every square mile out of a population of 351,000. The Rt. Rev. Louis M. Fink, after a laborious and fruitful episcopacy of thirty-three years, went to his reward 17 March, 1904. His successor as Bishop of Leavenworth, the Rt. Rev. Thos. F. Lillis, was consecrated 27 December, 1904. The Leavenworth diocese has an area of 12,624 square miles, with a Catholic population of 56,000. The three dioceses have 312 priests, including about 100 religious.

Excellent Catholic boarding schools for boys are: St. Mary's College, conducted by the Jesuits, with 400 students; and St. Benedict's, at Atchison, by the Benedictines, with 300 students. There are nine academies, with seven hundred girl pupils, several Catholic high-schools, and ninety parochial
schools with 11,000 pupils. There are ten Catholic hospitals, and four orphanages including one for coloured children. A mission for the conversion of the coloured people has existed in Leavenworth for thirty years. The priests of Kansas have been distinguished from missionaries to the scattered tribes of the plains. They invited immigrants to Kansas. The Church has fostered benevolent societies here as elsewhere; the Knights of Columbus have active councils; the Catholic Mutual Benevolent Association has nearly 12,000 members. Various nationalities are largely represented in the Catholic societies of the parishes; to which they belong. They are mostly of German and Irish extraction, or from South-eastern Europe. The Knights of Father Matthew promote the cause of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors. The State Federation of Catholic Societies represents some five thousand men enlisted in the cause of Christian faith and morality. There is an excellent Catholic paper published with the approbation of the bishops. Parochial schools are found not only in the cities, but in the rural districts, in charge of religious communities of women. Catholics of talent are found among the best professors of the Kansas General Education Board; in Kansas in 1859, for a generation devoted his eminence talents in peace and war to furthering the best interests of the state. Thomas Ewing, Jr., was chief justice of the first supreme court of the state from February, 1851, to 28 Nov. 1852, and was distinguished in the Civil War. He died in Chicago in 1868.

Amundson, History of Kansas (Chicago, 1883); Laws of Kansas (1901); Dassler, General Statutes of Kansas (1902); Kansas Register, Historical Collections, 1821-1906; Biennial Reports of State Board of Agriculture; Biennial Reports of Board of Control for State Charitable Institutions; Cudmore, Kansas (1840); Catholic Cabinet (St. Louis, 1847); Dugan, Catholic Almanac (1858); Sixteenth Biennial Report of State Superintendent of Public Instruction; Hill, Historical Sketches of St. Louis University.

J. A. SHORTER.

KANSAS, DIOCESE OF (KANJANOPOLITANA), established 10 September, 1850, to include that part of the State of Missouri, U. S. A., south of the Missouri River, and west of the eastern boundary of the counties of Moniteau, Miller, Camden, Laclede, Wright, Douglass, and Ozark, an area of 23,539 square miles. At the same time, Bishop John Joseph Hogan, of the Diocese of St. Joseph, which comprises that part of the State of Missouri between the Missouri River, was transferred to the new see and continued also in charge of the Diocese of St. Joseph as administrator. This arrangement continued until 19 June, 1893, when the separate jurisdiction of the Diocese of St. Joseph was established, and the Right Rev. Maurice F. Burke, consecrated Bishop of Cheyenne, in Wyoming, 28 October, 1887, was transferred to the title of St. Joseph. Kansas City is suffragan of St. Louis. When the diocese was established, it had 42 churches, 30 priests, and a Catholic population of 12,000. The first bishop, John J. Hogan, was born at Bruff, County Limerick, Ireland, 10 May, 1829. His early classical studies he pursued in his native land, after which he entered the diocesan seminary at St. Louis, Mo., where he was ordained priest 10 April, 1852. From that date up to his consecration as bishop, 13 September, 1868, he had an active and successful career, building up parishes in a wide and sparsely settled section of north-western Missouri. As soon as he took charge of the Diocese of St. Joseph, his zeal and earnestness gave a new impetus to the affairs of the Church there, and the same was manifest with his advent to Kansas City. The number of priests increased, new churches arose, additional religious communities were established, and in 1896 he asked for a coadjutor, and the Rev. John J. Glennon was consecrated titular Bishop of Pinara, and Coadjutor for Kansas City (29 June, 1896). Bishop Glennon, on 27 April, 1903, was transferred as coadjutor with the right of succession to the See of St. Louis and succeeded to that title 13 October, 1903.


Priests, 101 (31 religious); churches with resident priests, 74; missions with churches, 14; stations, 18; chapels, 30; 1 seminary with 20 students; academies with teachers, 12; 15 girls, 10; 1 who entered religious orders. 2,129 pupils in academies and schools, 5,543; 2 orphan asylums with 245 inmates; 1 industrial and reform school with 60 inmates; total children under Catholic care, 5,773; 6 hospitals; 1 home for aged poor; 1 founding asylum. Catholic population, 55,000.

Catholic Diocesan Annals (St. Louis, 1893); Clark, John, History of Missouri (St. Louis, 1884); Dugan, Thomas, History of the Catholic Church in the State of Missouri; Eastern Wolman (St. Louis) files; Reese, Biog. Cyc. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S. (Milwaukee, 1899).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

KAN-SU, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF SOUTHERN, separated from the Northern Kan-su mission in 1905, and committed to the Belgian Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (Scheutveld, Brussels). It includes the seven southerly towns of Tsing-chou, Ping-liang-fu, Kung-chang-fu, King-chou, Kiao-chou, King-yang-fu and Kung-yuen-fu. It contains about 8,000,000 inhabitants. The first prefect Apostolic is Reverend Everard Joseph Terlaak, dwelling at Tsing-chou. In 1907 the mission consisted of: 1 prefect Apostolic, 10 missionaries, 3 native priests, 26 churches and chapels, 6 schools with 42 students, 1 college with 5 students, 3 orphan asylums with 35 children, 1,031 Catholics. In 1908: 1 prefect Apostolic, 12 missionaries, 3 native priests, and 1,106 Catholics.

Missions Catholiques.

V. H. MONTANAR.

KAN-SU, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF NORTHERN.—This vicariate includes the territory of Ku-ku-nor, northern part of Tibet, and the five northern prefectures of the Chinese province of Kan-su: Lan-chou-fu, Si-ning-fu, Liang-chou-fu, Kan-chou-fu, and Su-chou. The climate varies according to the locality, in general, it is healthy, temperate, and bright. Kan-su is inhabited by Chinese, Turks from Turkestan, Mongols, Tunguses for the part of Sinkiang, and contains about eight million inhabitants; among this number there are 2700 Catholics. The vicar Apostolic dwells at Sung-shu-chang-tsa in the prefecture of Liang-chou-fu. The province of Kan-su formed a part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Shên-si from 1844 to 1875, when it was separated and erected into a prefect Vicariate Apostolic, and entrusted to the Belgian Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (Scheutveld, Brussels). In 1886 the northern civil prefecture of Ning-hia was confided to the Vicariate Apostolic of South-Western Mongolia. In 1888 the new Chinese province of Sin-kiang was formed into an independent mission, bearing the name of I-li or Kul-dja. In 1905 the seven southern civil prefectures were separated to form the Prefecture Apostolic of Southern Kan-su. The present vicar Apostolic is Mgr. Ubert
Otto. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Asseurita 13 Jan., 1891. In 1907 the mission had: 1 bishop, 16 European missionaries, 2 native priests, 24 churches and chapels, 9 schools with 127 students, 1 college with 25 students, 2 orphan asylums with 35 children, and 2498 Catholics. In 1908: 1 bishop, 20 missionaries, 12 native priests, 23 churches and chapels, and 2702 Catholics.

V. H. MONTANAR.

KANT. PHILOSOPHY OF.—Kant's philosophy is generally designated as a system of transcendental criticism seeking to establish dogmatism in theology, and for the view that Christianity is a dogmatic religion. Immanuel Kant was born at Königsberg in East Prussia, 22 April, 1724; d. there, 12 Feb., 1804. From his sixteenth to his twenty-first year, he studied at the university of his native city, having for his teacher Martin Knutzen, under whom he acquired a knowledge of the philosophy of Wolff and of Newton's physics. After the death of his father in 1746 he spent nine years as tutor in various families. In 1755 he returned to Königsberg, and there he spent the remainder of his life. From 1755 to 1770 he was Privatdocent (unariled professor) at the University of Königsberg. In 1770 he may so designate the dogmas of philosophy, a position which he held until 1797. It is usual to distinguish two periods of Kant's literary activity. The first, the pre-critical period, extends from 1747 to 1781, the date of the epoch-making "Kritik der reinen Vernunft"; the second, the critical period, extends from 1781 to 1798.

The Pre-Critical Period.—Kant's first book, which was published in 1747, was entitled "Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte" (Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces). In 1775 he published his doctor's dissertation "On Fire" (De Igne), then prevalent in Germany. The principle of the Universe is his own self says, his purpose is "deduce the a priori, or transcendental, forms of thought. Hence, his philosophy is essentially a "criticism", because it is an examination of knowledge, and "transcendental", because its purpose in examining knowledge is to determine the a priori, or transcendental, forms of thought. Kant himself was wont to say that the business of philosophy is to answer three questions: What can I know? What ought I to do? What may I hope for? He considered, however, that the answer to the second and third depends on the answer to the first; our duty and power to act. He was independent only after a thorough study of human knowledge.

It will be found most convenient to divide the study of Kant's critical philosophy into three portions, corresponding to the doctrines contained in his three "Critiques". We shall, therefore, take up successively (1) the doctrines of the "Critique of Pure Reason"; (2) the doctrines of the "Critique of Practical Reason"; (3) the doctrines of the "Critique of the Faculty of Judgment".

In accordance with his purpose to examine all knowledge in order to find what is and what is not a priori, or transcendental, that is, independent of experience, Kant proceeds in the "Critique of Pure Reason" to inquire into the a priori forms of (a) sensation, (b) judgment, and (c) reasoning. (a) The first thing that Kant does in his study is to distinguish the material, or content, and the form, of sensation. The material of our sense-knowledge comes from experience. The form, however, is not derived through the senses, but is imposed on the material, or content, by the mind, in order to render the material, or content, universal and necessary. The form is, therefore, a priori; it is independent of space, time, or independent of experience. Kant proceeds in the "Critique of Pure Reason" to inquire into the a priori forms of sensation, (b) judgment, and (c) reasoning. The most important forms of sense-knowledge, the conditions, in fact, of all sensation, are space and time. Not only, then, are space and time mental entities in the sense that they are elaborated by the mind out of the data of experience; they are strictly subjective, purely mental, and have no objective entity, except in so far as they are applied to the external world by the mind.

Because of what is to follow, it is important to ask at this point: Do the a priori forms of sensation, since they admitted enhance the value of sense-knowledge by rendering it universal and necessary, extend to reality, or are they confined to the narrow confines of the material, or data, of the senses? Kant holds that they do not. They affect
knowledge, so to speak, qualitatively, not quantitatively. Now, the data of sensation represent only the appearances (Erscheinungen) of things; therefore all sensation is confined to a knowledge of apparent forms. The mode of nature is inseparable from the noumenon, the reality of the thing (Ding-an-sich).

(b) Taking up now the knowledge which we acquire by means of the understanding (Verstand), Kant finds that thought in the strict sense begins with judgment. As in the case of sense-knowledge, he distinguishes here also the form and the content of the judgment, or in other words, that which the understanding joins together in the act of judgment, can be nothing but the sense-intuitions, which take place, as has been said, by the imposition of the forms of space and time on the data of sensation. Sometimes the sense-intuitions (subject and predicate) are joined together in a manner that evidently implies contingency and particularity. An example would be the judgment, "This table is square." With judgments of this kind the philosopher is not much concerned. He is interested rather in judgments such as "All the sides of a square are equal", in which the predicate is necessary and universal. With regard to these, Kant's first remark is that their necessity and universality must be a priori. That nothing which is universal and necessary can come from experience is axiomatic with him. There must be a ground of judgment which is formed of sensation, which are imposed by the understanding, which do not come from experience at all, but are a priori. These forms of judgment are the categories. It is hardly necessary to call attention to the contrast between the Kantian categories and the Aristotelian. The difference is fundamental, a difference in nature, purpose, function, and effect. The important point for the student of Kant is to determine the function of the categories. They serve to confer universality and necessity on our judgments. They serve, moreover, to bring diverse sense-intuitions under some degree of unity. But they do not extend our knowledge. For while representations (or intuitions) without the categories would be blind, the categories without representative, or intellectual, content, would be empty. We are still within the narrow circle of knowledge covered by our sense-experience. Space and time do not widen that circle. The categories. The knowledge, therefore, which we acquire by the understanding is confined to the appearances of things, and does not extend to the noumenal reality, the Ding-an-sich.

It is necessary at this point to explain what Kant means by the "synthetic a priori" judgments. The Aristotelians philosophers distinguished two kinds of judgments, namely, synthetic judgments, which are the result of a "putting-together" (synthesis) of the facts, or data, of experience, and analytic judgments, which are the result of a "taking-apart" (analysis) of the subject and predicate, without immediate reference to experience. The "analytic" category is a synthetic judgment; "All the radii of a circle are equal" is an analytic judgment. Now, according to the Aristotelians, all synthetic judgments are a posteriori, because they are dependent on experience, and all analytic judgments are a priori, because the bond, or nexus, in them is perceived without appeal to experience. This classification does not satisfy Kant. He contends that analytic judgments of the kind referred to do not advance knowledge at all, since they always "remain within the concepts [subject and predicate] and make no advance beyond the data of the concepts". At the same time he contends that the synthetic judgments of the Aristotelians have no scientific value, since, coming as they do from experience, they must be contingent and particular. Therefore he proposes to introduce a third class, namely, synthetic a priori judgments, which are synthetic because the content of them is supplied by a synthesis of the facts of experience, and a priori, because the form of universality and necessity is subject to judgment independently of experience. An example would be, according to Kant, "Every effect must have a cause." Our concepts of "effect" and "cause" are supplied by experience; but the universality and necessity of principle are derived from the a priori endowment of the mind. The Aristotelians, however, and rightly, that the so-called synthetic a priori judgments are all analytic. (c) In the third place, Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" is occupied with the reasoning faculty (Vernunft). Here "idea" play a role similar to that played in sensation and judgment by space and time and the categories, respectively. Examining the reasoning faculty, Kant finds that it has three distinct operations, namely, categorical, hypothetical, and disjunctive reasoning. To these, he says, correspond the three "ideas", the idea of the soul as thinking subject (psychological idea), the idea of matter as the total sum of the subjects (cosmological idea), and the idea of God as the supreme condition of all reality (theological idea). He first takes up the idea of the soul, and, examining the course of reasoning of the psychologist who teaches the substantiality, immanence, and immortality of the human soul, he shows that premises of judgment which are necessary are self-contradictory, because it starts with the false supposition that we can have an intuitive knowledge of the soul as the substantial subject of conscious states. This, he claims, is an erroneous supposition, for, while we can and do know our conscious states, we cannot know the subject of them. Rational psychology, then, makes a wrong start; its way is full of contradictions; it does not conclusively establish the immortality of the soul. Next, Kant subjects the cosmological idea to a similar analysis. He finds that as long as we begin to predicate anything concerning the ultimate nature of matter we fall into a whole series of contradictions, which he calls "antinomies". Thus, the propositions, "Matter had a beginning", "The world was created", are apparently no more true than their contradictory, "Matter is eternal", "The world is uncreated". To every thesis regarding the ultimate nature of matter, Kant replies, the ultimate nature of the world is equally plausible antithesis may be opposed. The conclusion is that by pure reason alone we cannot attain a knowledge of the nature of the material universe. Finally, Kant takes up the theological idea, the idea of God, and criticizes the metaphysics and arguments of rational theology. The specific ground of our belief in the existence of God is ungrounded, he says, because the proofs brought forward to support it are not conclusive. St. Anselm's ontological argument tries to establish an existential proposition without reference to experience; it confounds the order of things with the order of ideas. The ontological arguments are not by the world of experience, where alone it is valid. And the physico-theological argument from design, while it may prove the existence of an intelligent designer, cannot establish the existence of a Supreme Being. Kant, of course, does not deny the existence of God, neither does he deny the immorality of the soul or the ultimate reality of matter. His aim is to show that the three ideas, or, in other words, speculative reasoning concerning the soul, the universe, and God, do not add to our knowledge. But, although the ideas do not extend our experience, they regulate it. The best way to think about our conscious states is to represent them as inhereing in a substantial subject, about which, however, we can know nothing. The best way to think of the external world is to represent it as a multiplicity of appear-
ances, the ground of which is an unknowable material something; and the best way to organize and systematize all our knowledge of reality is to represent everything as springing from one source, governed by one law. If the law has not been established, the means and the end being an unknown and (speculatively) unknowable God. It is very easy to see how this negative phase of Kant's philosophy affected the subsequent course of philosophy in Europe. The conclusions of the first Critique are the premises of contemporary Agnosticism. We can know nothing except the appearances of things; the senses reach only phenomena; judgment does not go any deeper than the senses, so far as the external world is concerned; science and philosophy fail utterly in the effort to reach a knowledge of substance (noumenon), or anything that is or ever was. From this we see what the soul is, what matter is, what God is, have failed and are doomed to inevitable failure. These are the conclusions which Kant reaches in the "Critique of Pure Reason"; they are the assumptions of the Agnostic and of the Neo-Kantian opponent of Scholasticism.

(2) Kant, it has often been said, tore down in order to build up. What he took away in the first "Critique" he gave back in the second. In the "Critique of Pure Reason" he showed that the truths which have always been considered the most important in the history of knowledge are not founded in metaphysical, that is, purely speculative, reasoning. In the "Critique of Practical Reasoning" he aims at showing that these truths rest on a solid moral basis, and are thus placed above all speculative contention and the clamor of metaphysical dispute. He has overthrown the impositions of a doctrine which Cartesian dogmatism had built on the foundation "I think"; he now sets about the task of rebuilding the temple of truth on the foundation "I ought." The moral law is supreme. In point of certainty, it is superior to any deliverance of the purely speculative consciousness; I am more certain that "I ought" than I am that "I am glad," "I am cold," etc. In point of existence, it is superior to any consideration of interest, pleasure or happiness; I can forego what is for my interest, I can set other considerations above pleasure and happiness, but if my conscience tells me that "I ought" to do something, nothing can gainay the voice of the voice itself at once. I can not obey or disobey. This, then, is the one unshakable foundation of all moral, spiritual, and higher intellectual truth. The first peculiarity of the moral law is that it is universal and necessary. When conscience declares that it is wrong to tell a lie, the voice is not merely intended for here and now, not for "just this once," but for all time and for all space; it is valid always and everywhere. This quality of universality and necessity shows at once that the moral law has no foundation in pleasure, happiness, the perfection of self, or a so-called moral sense. It is its own foundation. Its voice reaches conscience immediately, commands unconditionally, and need give no reason for its behests. It is not, so to speak, a constitutional monarch amenable to reason, judgment, or any other faculty. It exacts unconditional, and in a sense unreasoned, obedience. Hence the "hollow voice" of the moral law is called by Kant "the categorical imperative." This celebrated phrase means merely that the moral law is a command (imperative), not a form of advice or invitation to act or not to act; and it is an unconditional (categorical) command, not a command in the hypothetical mood, such as "If you will, as a German you must study theology." One should not bow to hollow words, overlook the peculiar empty character of the categorical imperative. Only in its most universal "hollow" utterances does it possess those qualities which render it unique in human experience. But as soon as the contingent data, or contents of a specific moral precept, are presented to it, it imposes its universality and necessity on them and lifts them to its own level. The contents may have been good, but they could not have been good unless they were of the sort which the moral law in good except good will—the acceptance, that is, of the moral law.

We know the moral law not by inference, but by immediate intuition. This intuition is, as it were, the primus philosophicum. It takes the place of Descartes' primary intuition. We cannot think of this as thought. From it all the important truths of philosophy are deduced, the freedom of the will, the immortality of the soul, and the existence of God. The freedom of the will follows from the existence of the moral law, because the fact that "I ought" implies the fact that "I can." I know that I can do as I wish; I do it consequently from this I infer that I can. In the order of things, of course, freedom precedes obligation. In the order of knowledge, I infer freedom from the fact of obligation. Similarly, the immortality of the soul is implied in the moral law. The moral law demands complete fulfillment of itself in absolute human perfection. It is the highest perfection that man can attain in this life is only partial or incomplete perfection, because, so long as the soul is united with the body, there is always in our nature a mixture of the corporeal with the spiritual; the striving towards holiness is accompanied by the striving towards the unholy. Freedom is a struggle. There must, therefore, be a life beyond the grave in which this "endless progress," as Kant calls it, will be continued. Finally, the moral law implies the existence of God. And that in two ways. The authoritative "voice" of the law implies a lawgiver. Moreover, the nature of the moral law implies that there be somewhere a good which is not only supreme, but complete, which embodies in its perfect holiness all the conditions which the moral law implies. This supreme good is God.

(3) Intermediate between the speculative reason, which is the faculty of knowledge, and practical reason, which is the faculty of voluntary action, is the faculty which Kant calls judgment, and which is the faculty of aesthetic appreciation. As the true is the object of knowledge, and as the good is the object of action, the beautiful and purposive is the object of judgment. By this peculiar use of the word judgment Kant places judgment itself at once. I can not obey or disobey. This, then, is the one unshakable foundation of all moral, spiritual, and higher intellectual truth. The first peculiarity of the moral law is that it is universal and necessary. When conscience declares that it is wrong to tell a lie, the voice is not merely intended for here and now, not for "just this once," but for all time and for all space; it is valid always and everywhere. This quality of universality and necessity shows at once that the moral law has no foundation in pleasure, happiness, the perfection of self, or a so-called moral sense. It is its own foundation. Its voice reaches conscience immediately, commands unconditionally, and need give no reason for its behests. It is not, so to speak, a constitutional monarch amenable to reason, judgment, or any other faculty. It exacts unconditional, and in a sense unreasoned, obedience. Hence the "hollow voice" of the moral law is called by Kant "the categorical imperative." This celebrated phrase means merely that the moral law is a command (imperative), not a form of advice or invitation to act or not to act; and it is an unconditional (categorical) command, not a command in the hypothetical mood, such as "If you will, as a German you must study theology." One should not bow to hollow words, overlook the peculiar empty character of the categorical imperative. Only in its most universal "hollow" utterances does it possess those qualities which render it unique in human experience. But as soon as the contingent
cannot clearly demonstrate that purpose. The teleological concept is, therefore, like the "ideas" (the soul, the world, God) not constitutive of our experience but regulative of it. The highest use of the aesthetic faculty is the realization of the beautiful and the purposive as symbols of moral good. What speculative reason regards as natural (that is, is natural and purposive order, is suggested by the aesthetic judgment and fully attained by religion, which rests on the practical reason.

Kant, as is well known, reduces religion to a system of conduct. He defines religion as "the acknowledgments which are God's commandments" which describes the essence of religion as consisting in morality. Christianity is a religion and is true only in so far as it conforms to this definition. The ideal Church should be an "ethical republic"; it should discard all dogmatic definitions, accept "rational faith" as its guide in all intellectual matters, and establish the kingdom of God on earth by bringing about the reign of duty. Even the Christian law of charity must take second place to the supreme exigencies of duty. In fact, it has been remarked that Kant's idea of religion, in so far as it is at all Scriptural, is inspired more by the New Testament than by the Old Testament. He maintains that those dogmas which Christianity holds sacred, such as the mystery of the Trinity, should be given an ethical interpretation, should, so to speak, be regarded as symbols of moral concepts and values. Thus "historical faith", he says, is the vehicle of rational faith. For the person and character of Christ he professes the greatest admiration. Christ, he declares, was the exemplification of the highest moral perfection.

Critics and historians are not all agreed as to Kant's rank among philosophers. Some rate his contributions to philosophy so highly that they consider his doctrines to be the culmination of all that went before him. Others, on the contrary, consider that he made a false start when he assumed in his criticism of speculative reason that whatever is universal and necessary in our knowledge must come from the mind itself, and not from the world of reality outside us. These opponents of Kant consider, moreover, that while he possessed the synthetic talent which enabled him to build up a system of thought, he was lacking in the analytic quality by which the philosopher is able to observe what actually takes place in the mind. And in a third, all philosophers to an examination of knowledge the lack of the ability to observe what actually takes place in the mind is a serious defect. But, whatever may be our estimate of Kant as a philosopher, we should not undervalue his importance. Within the limits of the philosophical sciences themselves, his thought was the starting-point for Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and Schopenhauer; and, in the contemporary philosophic thought in Germany is concerned, whatever of it is not Kantian takes for its distinguishing characteristic its opposition to some point of Kantian doctrine. In England the Agnostic School from Hamilton to Spencer drew its inspiration from the teachings of the Critique of Pure Reason. In France the Positivism of Comte and the neo-Criticism of Renouvier had a similar origin. Kant's influence reached out beyond philosophy into various other departments of thought. In the history of the natural sciences his name is associated with that of Newton in the formulation of the law of gravitation. In biology it is a natural evolution from primitive cosmic nebula. In theology his non-dogmatic notion of religion influenced Ritschl, and his method of transforming dogmatic truth into moral inspiration finds an echo, to say the least, in the exegetical experiments of Renan.

Some philosophers and theologians have held that the objective data on which the Catholic religion is based are incapable of proof from speculative reason, but are demonstrable from practical reason, will, sentiment, or vital action. That this position is, however, dangerous, is proved by recent events. The Immanentist movement, the Vitalism of Blondel, the anti-Scholasticism of the "Annales de philosophie chrétienne", and other recent tendencies towards a non-intellectual foundation of religion have received from ecclesiastical authority shows plainly that they have no clear title to be considered a substitute for the intellectualistic apologetic which has for its ground the reality of the Scholastics.

Kantische Werke, ed. H. HASTENBET (10 vols., Leipzig, 1838-39); a new ed. 1867-69; 2nd ed. 1892-94 (12 vols., Leipzig, 1838-92); KRINSMANN (8 vols., Berlin, 1856-65); FRMANN Academy of Sciences (Berlin, 1892-93); MÜLLER, Konf's Critique of Pure Reason (New York, 1896); MOENKJOS, same title (London, 1854); Prolegomena, paraphrased and translated by MABEY and BERNARD (London, 1872-73); 2nd ed. 1889); ABBOTT, Critique of Practical Reason (London, 1879; 4th ed., 1889); WATSON, Selection (London, 1888); the literature on Kant is abundant. Of the many expository works the following are to be named: CAIRK, Critical Philosophy of Kant (2 vols., London, 1878); BLACKWOOD'S Philosophical Classics (Edinburgh, 1892); GARNER, Critique on the Philosophy of Kant: a Translation, NETTELSTEIN, II, 1-15, 2nd ed. 1869, Kant and His English Critics (London, 1888); IDEM, The Philosophy of Kant Explained (German, 1898). In German: PATEK, Die Lehren Kant's, 3rd ed. 1899); In French: CHLAK, Kant in Grand Philosophes (Paris, 1900).

Jean-CLERGE, Le movement catholique kantien en France en Kant Studien, 111, II and ill (reprint, Paris, 1902); and FONTAINE, Les influences katienes, etc. (Paris, 1892), give an account of the influence of Kant on contemporary thought and culture.
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from Maribor to Celovec, and from Beljak to Fran-
sensfeste.

The principal towns are: Celovec (24,000), see of the prince-bishop, and head-quarters of the Slovenian literary society of St. Mohor, which circulates 500,000 books annually among its members; St. Vid; Krka; Goram; and Beljak (elevation 4620 feet); Beljak (the old Roman stronghold Santicum); Plajberg; Tržiš Pontafel; Sv. Višarje (5500 feet high). The political administration of the province is in the hands of the governor residing at Celovec. The eastern part of the diocesan district is under the jurisdiction of Beljak, which is an independent district administered by the governor. The country has its own legislature for internal affairs and sends seven delegates to the imperial diet.

To the bishop belong jusa presentationis et investitura, and in some parishes patronatus privatagi; the diocese is coextensive with the province, and is divided into 23 deaneries and 265 parishes. There are, moreover, 15 Protestant parishes. In the year 1856 Lower Karin-
thisa belonged to the Bishop of Maribor, Styria, who in the previous year had moved his see from St. And-
rew's to Celovec, the district was incorporated with the Diocese of Klagenfurt. The diocesan seminary is at Celovec; and there are 12 monasteries. There are 379 schools and 4 colleges. The public schools are supported by the local government; German is used in 210, Slovenian in 129, and in 40 schools both languages are taught. The Benedictines have a college at St. Paul.

History.—The name Karinthia is derived from Karini, a Celtic people. The Slovenian name Koroško, originates from the tribe of the same name, the Koro-
tani, or Gorotani, people dwelling in the mountains. The Celtic people Taurisci were there in the fourth century B.C., and in the first century of our era, the Augustus, Karinthia formed a part of Noricum. At the end of the sixth century of the Christian era the land was peopled by Slovenes flying from the persecutions of the Avars. At that time Noricum was claimed by the Frankish kings, devastated by Germanic migration, and passed into the hands of the dukes of Bavaria. Tassil, Duke of Bavaria, ravaged the country, but in the following year (596) the Slovenes were avenged. Tassil died in 612, and was succeeded by his son Garbaldi II, who was defeated by the Slovenes at Ajunt. In alliance with the prince of Aquitaine, Garbald I, and in the battle of Bagolj, the duke of Bavaria and bishops of St. Vitus, Garbald was elected in king (627). The Franks, Langobardi, and Alamanni did not look with friendly eyes on this new state, and King Dagobert declared war against Garbald; the Slovenes, though victorious, suffered severely, and then invaded Bavaria; they settled themselves, later, up and down Styria, Tirol, and Salzburg. Karinthia had its own princes subject to the governor of Styria, eastern Tirol and Krain, and in 705 successfully defended its boundaries against the Duke of Furlan. The first Slovene Prince of Karinthisa was Borut (748), vassal of the Franks and of St. Vitus the Shah; Borut died and was succeeded by his son Karath, and his grandson Hotimer, who was the last prince of the old ruling family. After the defeat of the Langobardi and Tassil, Duke of Bavaria, Charlemagne took possession of Karinthia, and made it a margravate.

The treasures of Christianity in Karinthia are lost in obscurity, though it is certain that the Gospel came from Aquileia and from Salzburg. In the days of Samo, St. Amand came to preach in south-western Noricum (630). Bishop Rupert of Worms was invited to build churches and to erect monasteries. His successor Vitalis was more successful among the Slovenes than any of his predecessors. All its parishes held in the diocese of Salzburg, especially Tassil (748 to 788) and Virgilus, laboured to Christianize Karinthia. The latter deservestobe called the Apostle of the Slovenes in Karinthia. The oldest churches are Our Lady's, and the church of Paterjion at Turji. Arnus, successor to Virgilus, appointed Theodoric (803) Bishop of Karin-
thisa. In the first half of the ninth century there were three bishoprics on Karinthian soil. From 788 to 970, the See of Salzburg did not have a bishop; the three imperial emperors; by the Treaty of Verdun (843) it passed into the hands of Louis the German, whose grand-
son Arnulf was the first to bear the title of Duke of Karinthia. Louis gave the province to his son Carlo-
man (856), who in a short time allied himself with his father's enemies, the Moravians. In this he was imprisoned by his father, but was afterwards re-
leased and given command of Bavaria, Karinthia, and part of Pannonia. After Carlsman's death, Arnulf joined Upper Pannonia to the ecclesiastical district of Karinthia; about this time the Slavonic liturgy and gospels, as translated by Sts. Cyril and Methodius, were introduced into Karinthia, but the bishops of Salzburg were opposed to the liturgy. The counts of Furlany tried to gain control of Karinthia and Croatia, but were defeated by Louis, Prince of the Pannonian Croats, who repulsed the invasion of Balderie (819). In 829, a Slavone prince (c. 823), was famous for his piety and charity.

Louis the Child, Otto I, and Henry II disregarded the invasion of the Huns, and Karinthia was left to defend itself. The Langobardi of Germany took possession of the Zilll valley; and all the possessions of the natives who fell in battle were given to German settlers, or to churches or monasteries of German origin. From 976 to 1335 Karinthia was the property of various ruling families. Emperor Otto III sepa-
rated it from Bavaria (995). In the twelfth century the noble family of Sponheim held it, and when that family became extinct (1269) the Bohemian King, Charles, annexed it to his dominions. In the year 1072, the Diocese of Karinthia, now known as Klagenfurt or Krisa Skofija, was founded by Arch-
bishop Gebhard of Salzburg. It had six monasteries for Dominican and Benedictine nuns. Henry V tried to gain possession of the church property, but Bishop Konrad censured him, and forced him to desist. Duke Engelbert made a like attempt, but was brought to penance by Leopold the Holy. Ottocar II renounced all his possessions save Bohemia and Moravia; and Karinthia came under the rule of Rudolf of Hapsburg, German Emperor, who handed over its administration to Count Harald of Jemni in 1334. In the year 1307, the Austrian Duke Albrecht took possession of the land, and since then it has been joined to the empire. The "Iron" Duke Ernest (1414), was the last to be appointed Duke of Karinthia ac-
cording to the old usage and right. The Turks plundered the country many times; in 1476 and in 1478 they invaded the villages, and in 1493 laid siege to Beljak. At this time the serfs, to the number of 6000, dissatisfied with the money standard, took up arms under pretense of defending the country against the Turks, but at the first sight of them the Turks flew, and many thousands were captured. The revolt started again in 1515 for better administration of justice, and was settled on 24 April, 1518, and an imperial degree proclaimed the city of Celovec capital of Karinthia.

Three bishoprics, Salzburg, Bamberg, and Goritsa, had possessions in Karinthia. But in 1529 and 1539 one-third of them were secularized, and sold by the governor to meet military expenses. Bamberg sold Maria Theresa its whole property for one million florins, and 4 per cent bonds amounting to 351,000 florins. The Diocese of Salzburg, in 1803 and 1806, sold all its land and property. The first Apostle of Lutheranism in Karinthia was one Vol-
todt, guardian of the Minorites at Volkeberg; and
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after him a rich peasant and mine owner, Veitmooser; later on came more ardent preachers from German universities. The miners were agents in the work of Protestantism, for they were all Germans. Emperor Ferdinand favoured Utraquistism, but he afterwards returned his court to Protestantism and appointed a practical Catholic, Count Nagoral, as governor of Karinthis. A demand was made on Ferdinand for freedom of religion, which he denied, and the repression of Protestantism went on. The Bishop of Seckau, Martin Brenner, with an armed force surrounded Lutheran houses and churches, burned their books, and called on all to swear allegiance to the Catholic Faith or to leave the province. He was a Utraquist, and appointed priests to the vacant parishes, and in a short time nearly all the country was Catholic.

In the year 1604 the Jesuits came to Celovec and were given the church of Holy Trinity. Joseph II. centralised the government. In the war of 1809 Austria ceded to Napoleon the district of Beljak, and he joined it to Illyria. In 1815 it was given back to Austria, and in 1826, together with the district of Celovec, formed part of Austrian Illyria, and was given to the imperial governor at Ljubljana. Karinthis was proclaimed an independent crownland in the year 1849.

GRANT-DUFF, Studies in European Politics (1868); UNOAERSE, Geschichte der österreichischen Kaiserzeit (1868); VLAHOVIĆ, Die Ehre Herzog. Krain (1868); ERBEN, Vojvodstvo Karinthe (Ljubljana, 1868); ONOFSKI, Zemljopis (Ljubljana, 1867).

M. D. KRRNSZTYC.

KARLSBURG. See TRANSYLVANIA, DIOCESE OF.

KARNOWSKI (KARNCOVJUS), STANISLAUS, Archbishop of Gnesen and Primate of Poland, b. about 1526; d. at Lowicz, in the Government of Warsaw, 25 May (a.l., 8 June), 1603. As early as 1563 (according to Wioszawski, Wladislaus, Kalsich), and rendered great service to religion and education by founding, besides several schools, a seminary for priests in his episcopal residence. By order of the Synod of Petrikov (1577), he made a new collection of synodal laws under the title "Constitutiones synodorum metropolitanae ecclesiae Gnesensis provincialium" (Krakow, 1579). His policy of religious influence in Poland was great. Under King Sigismund II Augustus (1548-72) the Reformation made great progress in Poland, especially the Calvinist teaching, while the Lutherans and Socinians bitterly opposed each other. When Sigismund died, Henry of Valois, later Henry III. of France, was elected King of Poland. On his entry into Meseritz, Karnkowski welcomed him in the name of the Polish estates. The archbishop also attended the coronation (1574), and tried to keep the new king in Poland, but in the same year the French throne fell vacant and he returned to France. Karnkowski then urged the election of Stephen Báthori, Prince of Transylvania. The latter was suspected of favouring the Reformation, but under the influence of Karnkowski he declared openly for Catholicism, and was crowned king 1 May, 1576, by Karnkowski, as Uchański, Primate of Poland and Archbishop of Gnesen, had refused to crown him.

Uchański died 5 April, 1581, and Karnkowski was named his successor in the same year (21 April) in the archiepiscopal See of Gnesen and Primary of Poland; as such, he governed Poland after the death of Stephen Báthori (12 Dec., 1586). Eventually he succeeded in electing as king Sigismund III Vasa (1587-1632). Through this young king, formerly Crown Prince of Sweden, and reared a good Catholic by his mother Katharina, Karnkowski hoped to stay the progress of the Reformation in Poland. After Cardinal Hosius, the archbishop was the most prominent opponent of the Polish Reformation. He favoured the Jesuits in every way, built a college for them at Kalisch, and a seminary at Gnesen. He established an institute for twelve noble students, which is still extant, under the direction of the cathedral chapter of Gnesen.

In 1684 he was elected to translate the Holy Scriptures into Polish; this translation was approved by the pope and is still regarded as a classic (Sommerovgel, "Bibl. de la C. de J.", VIII, 1234 sq.). Karnkowski wrote several important works, mostly theological; among them are: "Eucharistia", forty discourses in Polish on the Blessed Sacrament (Krakow, 1602); "De laudes Redemptionis" (Krakow, 1607); "De jure provinciali terrarum civitatumque Prussiae" (Krakow, 1574); "Liber epistolae familiaris et illustrium virorum" (Krakow, 1844). He is buried in the Jesuit church at Kalisch.

KASKASKIA INDIANS, formerly chief tribe of the confederacy of Illinois Indians (q. v.). The name is of uncertain etymology, but may possibly have reference to a "hide scraper". With the other Illinois they probably made their first acquaintance with the French at the Jesuit mission station of Chegoimogen (Lapointe near Bayfield, Wisconsin), established by the noted Father Claude Allouez in 1666. In 1673, Father Marquette, on his return from the lower Mississippi, was kindly received at their village, and on their earnest request returned later and founded among them in April, 1675, the Mission of the immaculate Conception, the first of the Illinois missions, apparently about the present site of Utica, Raisin Co., Illinois. On his death, a month later, the work was suspended until taken up again in 1677 by Alouez, who remained until the arrival of Lasalle in 1679, by whom the mission was turned over to the Recollects, Fathers Gabriel de la Ribourde and Zeno-bius Membré. In consequence of the opposition of the Indians and the attacks of the Iroquois, the murder of Father Ribourde by the Kickapoos, the Recollect tenure was brief. In 1684 Allouez returned, but withdrew a second time on the rumoured approach of Lasalle from the south in 1687. In the latter year also the Jesuit Father James Gravier visited the tribe.

In 1692 the celebrated Jesuit Father Sebastian Rasle restored the mission, which continued thenceforward under Jesuit auspices for a period of eighty years. In 1693 Gravier (q. v.) took charge and with Binneteau, Pinet, Marest, and others laboured with much success until his death in 1706 from a wound received at the hands of a group of Shawnees and Peorias. He compiled the first grammar of the language, and about the year 1700 was instrumental in settling the tribe in a new village about the present Kaskaskia, Illinois, near the mouth of the river of the same name, which remained their principal town and mission station until their final removal from the State. When visited by Charlevoix in 1721 the Kaskaskia were considered Christian, although a considerable portion of the other Illinois still adhered to their old forms.

Notwithstanding the apparent success of the mission, the whole tribe in a period of decline from the hostilities of the northern tribes and the wholesale dissipation introduced by the French garrisons. In 1746 the Kaskaskia, who may have numbered originally 2000, were reported at 800, and in 1778 at 210, including 60 warriors. In 1762 the Jesuits
were suppressed by the French Government, and any later work was carried on by secular priests. In 1795 the Kaskaskia first entered into treaty relations with the United States, and in 1832, together with the kindred Peoria, they ceded all of their remaining original territory in Illinois and were assigned to a reservation in what is now north-eastern Oklahoma, where they still reside, the entire confederated band, including Kaskaskia, Peoria, and other representatives of the old Illinois, together with the remnant of the Wea and Piankishaw of Indiana, numbering only 200 souls, not one of whom is full-blood, and not more than a dozen of whom retain the language.

*Indians' Annual Repts.; Jesuit Relations; Illinois Missions; Kappler, Indian Treaties (Washington, 1903); Sheehan, Catholic Missions (New York, 1854).*

**JAMES MOONEY.**

**KASSA.** See Cassovia, Diocese of.

**KASSAI.** A Prefecture Apostolic of Upper Kassai, erected as a simple mission in 1901, and detached as a prefecture Apostolic from the Vicariate of Belgian Congo since 20 August, 1901. The residence of the prefect Apostolic is the mission of St. Joseph de Lualaba-Kassai, the chief town of which is Lualaba, in the district of Lualaba-Kassai, the chief town of which is Lualaba, residence of the district commissioner. The prefecture, at the time of its creation, comprised almost all the Lualaba-Kassai district. It was bounded on the north by the Vicariate of Belgian Congo (district of the Equateur); on the east by the same vicariate (territory of the Katanga Company); on the south by the Portuguese Congo; and on the west by the Lukue river. In 1908 it was enlarged by taking as its boundaries on the east the left bank of the Lualaba, and on the west the Prefecture of the Kwango, which is in charge of the Jesuit Fathers.

The climate is hot and damp and the ground marshy. Fever is endemic, while the "sleeping sickness" makes great ravages among the blacks and may be communicated to white men by the tsetse fly. The languages used are those of the Bena Lulua, the Baluba, the Bunanioka, and the Bakuba, the Bakete, and the Balambo. It is impossible to fix even approximately the number of inhabitants, more than half of the prefecture being as yet unexplored. All that can be said is that the population numbers millions of pagans all devoted to a rude fetishism. Man lives there in the primitive state; in certain regions, among others that of the Bakete, the natives, men and women, all are entirely naked. Only one religious order of men is engaged in the evangelization of this country, the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary of Scheut-les-Bruxelles; there is also a single religious order of women, the Sisters of Charity of Ghent, Belgium.

Kassai, which was established at Lualaba in November, 1891, when Père Cambier arrived alone at Lualaba to commence the evangelization of these regions, eleven residences have been established. They are, in the order of their foundation: (1) St.-Joseph de Lualaba; (2) Méréza Salvador (Kala Kufumba); (3) St.-Trudon de Lusambo; (4) Hemptinne St-Benoit; (5) Tielen St-Jacques; (6) Bena Makima St-Victorien; (7) St-Antoine de Lusambo; (8) Lusambo; (9) Udema; (10) Pangu-hopital; (11) Lige-Sacreé-Coeurs at Katanga. Besides these large residences tended by at least three priests or two priests and a lay brother, nineteen fermes-chapelles (or Christian villages) have been established in the prefecture. They are named: (1) Louvain-Alma-Mater; (2) Grammont Notre-Dame sur la Montagne; (3) Notre-Dame de Lourdes; (4) Lourdes-Notre-Dame; (5) Ypes; (6) St-Antoine; (7) Flobeq Notre-Dame de la Paix; (8) Tshibala Notre-Dame de Congo; (9) Louvain Adolphe Edmond; (10) Courtrai St-Amand; (11) Kasangai St-Remi; (12) Bakete; (13) Tshifwadi Sacreé-Ceur; (14) Tshiela; (15) Kanjiki St-Jean; (16) Hely St-Aignan; (17) Merode Westerloo; (18) Lige St-Urban; and (19) Harelbeke St-Charles.

The religious in charge are thirty-three priests and thirteen brothers of the Congregation of Scheut, and twenty Sisters of Charity of Ghent, who live in three residences, St-Joseph, St-Trudon de Lusambo and Hemptinne St-Benoit. There are in the prefecture about twenty churches and chapels, over five thousand Catholics and about six thousand catechumens; eleven schools, attended by about eight hundred boys and five hundred girls. Over seven hundred orphans are cared for in orphan asylums.

The Prefect Apostolic of Upper Kassai is Most Rev. Emeri Cambier, born at Flobeq (Belgian Hainaut), 2 January, 1865. He was ordained priest 20 November, 1887, arrived in the Congo in 1888, at Lualaba bourg in 1891, and in 1904 was placed at the head of the newly created prefecture Apostolic. The King of Belgium has lately named him an officer of the Royal Order of the Lion in recognition of his services in South Africa.

**STANISLAUS II. KING OF POLAND.** Angélica Kaufmann, Uffizi Gallery, Florence.

**EMERI CAMEIER.**

**KAUFFMANN, ANGELICA.** b. at Coire, in the canton of Grisons, Switzerland, 30 October, 1741; d. at Rome, 5 Nov., 1807. She was the pupil of her father, Johann Joseph, a painter of mediocre talent, who, nevertheless, had an excellent knowledge of the principles underlying his art, and initiated Angelica at an early age into the difficult use of colours. An astonishingly precocious child, she was summoned to Como by the bishop, Monsignor Nevroni, who desired her to make a portrait of him, at which time she had not yet come. Francis III of Este, Duke of Modena and Governor of Milan, declared himself her protector. Cardinal Roth invited her to Constance and commissioned her to paint his portrait. At the same time Angelica showed a great aptitude for music.
and singing, and some of her father’s friends strongly urged her to give up painting, but in vain. This eye, she has represented in a picture, showing herself, between Painting and Music, bidding farewell to Music. Nevertheless, while cultivation of the latter less ardently than the other, she was still a clever musician. Italy again attracted her; after visits to Parma and Florence, successively, she arrived, in 1783, at Rome, where she attended Winckelmann’s courses in perspective. On a visit to Venice she made the acquaintance of some English noblemen, and as a result of this meeting was her decision to take up residence in London (1766). Reynolds, whose portrait she executed, accorded her a most flattering reception, and urged her for her a passion to which she could never give any encouragement. Among the pictures which she painted in England we may mention “The Mother of the Gracchi”, “The Sacrifice of Messalina”, the “Meeting of Edgar and Elfrida”, and “Cupid and Psyche.” She also engraved many of her works. Her vanity made her the victim of a cruel deception: she allowed herself to be captivated by the engaging manners of a stranger who represented himself to be Count Frederick de Horn, and married him (1767). When the imposture was discovered, a separation followed (1768). The talent of Angelica Kauffmann, suggestive of the Reynolds manner, was highly appreciated in England. The Royal Academy of London elected her as one of its original members. Gessner and Kloost stock sang of her, and the latter, in recognition, received a sentimental picture. The pretended Count de Horn having died in 1781, Angelica was free to contract a second marriage; she married the Venetian painter, Antonio Zucchi, and they determined to return to Italy. After a sojourn at Venice, during which Angelica painted “Leonardo da Vinci dying in the arms of Francis I,” they visited Naples and then went to Rome to establish themselves permanently. There she opened a salon, where G. de Rossi and Seroux d’Aign court, the latter then engaged on his “Histoire de l’art par les monuments,” were frequently to be seen. Goethe, when he visited Rome, was also received in her salon, and speaks of it in the account of his journey. She painted for the Empress Joseph II, who was then travelling in Italy, the “Return of Arminius victorious over the legions of Varus” and “Aeneas celebrating the Funeral Rites of Palladas.” In the last years of her life she was sorely tried by reverses of fortune and by the death of her husband (1795). The poverty does not terrify me,” she confided to an intimate friend, “but the loneliness kills me.” She languished for some twelve years. The academicians of St. Luke assisted at her obsequies in the church of S. Andrea delle Fratte, where she was buried. It was chiefly as a portraitt-painter that Angelica Kauffmann was distinguished; her portraits are wondrously fresh and glowing in brilliancy. In this genre, the portrait of the Duchess of Brunswick, sister of George III, is considered her masterpiece. Her portrait of herself is to be seen in the Berlin Museum. Her historical pictures are altogether inferior; the sentimentality of the period in which she lived contributed to their vogue, and they have since declined considerably in the general esti-
mation, chiefly because the drawing leaves too much to be desired.

**Gérard de Rouzi, Vita di Angelica Kauffmann pittrice (Florence, 1810); Kontynenburg, Kunstdenkmäler von Ang elic Kauffmann (1848); Röckl, Angelica Kauffmann (2 vols., Paris, 1838); Wessely in Kunst und Künstler des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit (Leipzig, 1876).**

**Gaston Sorelais.**

**Kauffmann, Alexander, poet and folklorist, born at Bonn, 14 May, 1817; died at Wertheim, 1 May, 1893.** He came of a well-known patrician family, whose members were prominent during the eighteenth century, some being in the city regiment of Bonn and others in the service of the former Elector of Cologne. Kauffmann was related to the two historical painters, Andreas and Karl Müller. At Bonn he studied jurisprudence, languages, and history; in 1844 he was appointed teacher of Prince Karl von Löwenstein-Wertheim-Rosenberg, who, in 1850, made him keeper of the archives at Wertheim, which post he retained until his death. He published “Gedichte” (1852), “Mainsagen” (1850), and “Unter den Reben” (1871). His original research for Karl Simrock’s legends of the Rhine, and his own legends of the Main are very valuable. He collaborated with the highly imaginative poet Georg Friedrich Dahn in “Mythoterpe, ein Mythen-Sagen- und Legendenbuch”; did critical research work on “Cassarius von Heisterbach” (1850, 1862); and translated “Wunderbare Geschichten aus den Werken des Cassarius von Heisterbach” (1888-91). His posthumous “Biographie des belgischen Domini kaners Thomas von Chantimpire” was published in 1899.

**Leopold Kauffmann, Chief Burgomaster of Bonn, brother of the above, b. 13 March, 1821; d. 27 Feb., 1898.** With his brother Alexander, he attended the grammar school of his native city, and in the year 1840, through Ernst Moritz Arndt, who had shortly before been reinstated in his professorship, Kauffmann was matriculated as student of law at the University of Bonn. Together with his scientific studies he cultivated an intelligent love of music and singing; held inspiring intercourse with such composers as Felix Mendelssohn, Bartholdy and Franz Liszt, with poets like Gottfried Kinkel, and with his future wife Johanna, née Mocell; and with these artistic friends he founded a poetical society called the “Maikäfersbund.” On the occasion of the first Beethoven festival and of the unveiling of the Beethoven Monument, in the summer of 1845, Kauffmann founded the still eminent male choral society of Bonn, the “Concordia.” When the revolutionary disturbances broke out in May, 1848, and many of the burgomasters in the Rheinish provinces voluntarily gave up their positions, he was appointed first government referendary of the burgomaster administrator at Uhlheim, the next year later deputy landrath or president of the District of Zell on the Moselle. In October, 1850, he was elected Burgomaster of Bonn, which at that time contained 18,000 inhabitants, and assumed office in the following May. In 1859 he received the title of chief burgomaster. Among the important enterprises which he planned for the welfare of the city, and which he car-
ried out with prudence and energy, may be mentioned the foundations for extensive docks on the Rhine, the drainage of the entire city, laying out new plans for alignment and rebuilding, and eventually for a canal. For the systematic aid of the poor he laid out the city in districts; he also built an asylum for the insane. He provided for the young by a systematic reorganization of the school system, as well as for the support of the orphans. Very successful too were his exertions for the artistic adornment of the beautiful cemetery of Bonn, of the tombs of Schiller's widow and his son Ernst, those of the composer Robert Schumann, and the poet A. W. von Schlegel.

Kaulen was appointed by the King of Prussia a life member of the Upper House on the nomination of the city of Bonn. On the question of reforming the army, he voted with the so-called constitutional deputies on 11 October, 1862, for the budget as arranged by the Lower House. On the hundredth anniversary of Ludwig von Beethoven (b. at Bonn, 12 Dec., 1770), the Beethoven Hall was built. In August, 1871, the Beethoven musical festival, and in August, 1873, the Schumann festival were held, two significant musical events, the success of which was largely due to Kaufmann, and which procured for Bonn the character of a first-class city. After the Vatican decree of 18 July, 1870, Bonn and Munich became the centres of the Old Catholic movement. Whilst several of Kaufmann's most esteemed friends joined the new sect, he always remained true to the Church. In 1874 he was unanimously re-elected burgomaster for the third time by the town council of Bonn, for a term of twelve years, but he became a victim of the Kulturkampf. Although he recognized the necessity for the government taking measures with the object of regulating its attitude towards the Church, and declared himself prepared in his official capacity to accept the May laws, his confirmation was refused by the administration on 8 May, 1875, a measure which resulted in an interpellation by Windlof in the Reichstag and the Prussian Diet. At the end of 1876, Kaufmann was elected to the Lower House from the electoral district of Münchlen-Glabbach, joined the Centre party, and soon became a member of its governing majority. In the Reichstag he frequently spoke in the interests of art and science. He was likewise one of the founders of the "Gürrengesellschaft", for fostering science in Catholic Germany (1876), and for the first fifteen years was its general secretary. After 1852, he was vice-president of the Borromean Society for Good Deeds. In 1884 he refused re-election to the Reichstag, and henceforth devoted himself to the promotion of art and of useful undertakings, particularly to the decoration of Bonn cathedral. Among his writings may be mentioned: "Albrecht Dürer" (Cologne, 1881; 2nd ed., 1887); "Rieder und das Rheinland" (1884); "Philipp Veit, Vorträge über Kunst" (1891).

KARL HOEBER.

Germany.

KAULEN.

FRANZ PHILIP, Scriptural scholar, b. 20 March, 1827, at Düsseldorf; d. at Bonn, 11 July, 1897. He attended the gymnasia in his native city, studied theology at the University of Bonn from 1846 to 1849, and was ordained priest at Cologne on 3 September, 1850. For several years he was engaged on the mission in various stations of the Diocese of Cologne, until in 1859 he was appointed lecturer at the Koxhaling school at Bonn. In 1862 he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Würzburg in virtue of a commentary on the Book of Jonas; in 1863 he obtained a chair of Old Testament exegesis at the University of Bonn; in 1880 and 1882 he was appointed extraordinary and ordinary professor respectively at the University of Bonn. In 1880 he was raised to the dignity of a domestic prelate by Leo XIII; in 1900 he received the grand cross of the Order of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, and in 1903 he was made a member of the Biblical Commission. During the same year (1903) he was compelled to give up teaching owing to an apoplectic stroke.

The study of the Bible was Kaulen's aim from the beginning. He kept before his mind even when engaged in the ministry or in the conferences at the theological seminary of Bonn the duty of tendering the Bible to it or kindred subjects. His principal works are: (1) "Lingua Mandechurica Institutiones", a grammar of the Manchu language (Ratisbon, 1857); (2) "Die Sprachverwirrung zu Babel", or the confusion of languages at Babel (Mainz, 1861); (3) "Librum Jonas ex Interpretatione Fr. Kaulen", or a commentary on the Book of Jonas (Mainz, 1862); (4) "Geschichte der Vulgata", or a history of the Vulgate (Mainz, 1861); (5) "Sprachliches Handbuch zur biblischen Vulgata", or a linguistic manual to the Latin Vulgate (Mainz, 1870); (6) "Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testamentes", or Introduction to the Sacred Scripture of the Old and New Testament (Freiburg, 1876-86); (7) "Assyrien und Babylonien" (1876); (8) "Der biblische Schöpfungsbericht", or the Biblical account of the creation (Freiburg, 1902); (9) "Thomas von Villanova, ein Büchlein von der göttlichen Liebe", or a book on devotion. (10) Three books of devotion. "Alleluja", "Brot der Engel" and "Bread of the Angels", and "Die ewige Anbetung" and the perpetual adoration. The books of Kaulen were much in demand; some—e. g. the grammar to the Vulgate, the "Introduction" and "Assyria and Babylon"—passed through several editions.

A lasting monument of his theological learning is found in the second edition of the "Kirchenlexikon". The first edition of this work which comprised 11 volumes, a supplement, and a general index, was issued by the publishing firm of Benjamin Herder (q. v.). A second edition, necessary for a larger circle of readers, the copyrightship was entrusted to Dr. Joseph Hegenröther, then professor in Würzburg, but, at the elevation of the latter to the cardinalate in 1879, was finally given to Dr. Kaulen, who presided over the work until it was completed. The new or second edition comprises twelve volumes and a general index; the first volume appeared in 1886, the last in 1901, and the index compiled by the Rev. Hermann Joseph Kamp, with an introduction on the divisions of theology by Dr. Melchior Abfalter, in 1903. Kaulen was helped in this gigantic enterprise by the Rev. Dr. Hermann Streber, by the Rev. A. M. Weiss, O.F.P., who prepared the catalogue of subjects, and by a large number of contributors, the list of whom is given at the end of the last volume. The part taken by Kaulen consisted in editing the articles contributed, in revising several articles taken over from the first edition, and in contributing many articles of his own; the enumeration of his personal contributions is almost five columns in the general list of contributors. The selection of Kaulen for this great theological work was most fortunate. In the preface to the first volume, written in 1882, he declared that the articles should combine depth of learning with ecclesiastical correctness and a clear, intelligible presentation of the subject, which programme was carried out through the entire work.

Mitteilungen der Herderschen Verlagshandlung (Freiburg, September, 1908); Der Katholik, no. 51 (Mainz, 1907).

FRANCIS J. SCHLIEPER.

KAUNITZ, WENZEL ANTON, an Austrian prince and statesman, b. at Vienna 2 February, 1711; d. there 27 June, 1794. His parents had destined him for the Church, and at the age of thirteen years he already held a canonry at Münster. Soon, however, he gave up the idea of becoming an ecclesiastic, and studied law at Vienna, Leipzig, and Leyden. He afterwards undertook an extensive educational journey through England, France, and Italy, and was then made auile counciller in 1735. At the German Diet of Ratisbon
in 1739 he was one of the imperial commissioners. In March, 1746, he was sent on a diplomatic mission to France. He was in Turin in April, 1742, was appointed Austrian ambassador at Turin. Two years later he was appointed minister plenipotentiary to the Government of the Netherlands, in which capacity he was to act as the actual ruler of the Netherlands, because Archduke Joseph, whom Maria Theresa had invested with the government of the Netherlands, died a week after his arrival, and her husband, Prince Charles of Lorraine, was commanding the Austrian army in Bohemia against the King of Prussia. When Brussels was taken after a three weeks' siege by Maurice de Saxe on 20 February, 1746, Kaunitz went to Austria. He remained in the Tyrol, which is in the area that place, he left for Aachen, whence his urgent request to be recalled from his difficult position was finally heeded by the empress in June, 1746. In 1748 he represented the interests of Austria at the Congress of Aachen, and reluctantly signed the treaty on 23 October, 1748. Extremely displeased at the treaty, which deprived Austria of the provinces of Silesia and Glatt, guaranteeing them to Frederick II, Kaunitz sought a way to regain these provinces and destroy the predominance of the King of Prussia. He advocated an alliance with France, and, when sent as ambassador to Berlitz, he was sent to the Congress of Vienna in 1756 to lay the foundation for this alliance, which, however, was not concluded until six years later. In 1753 he was recalled and became chancellor of state and minister of foreign affairs.

Towards the end of 1755 he again began negotiations with France concerning an anti-Prussian alliance. This time the circumstances were in his favour. France felt itself slighted at the alliance into which Prussia had entered with England, and a defensive alliance between Austria and France, known as the Treaty of Versailles, was entered into on May, 1756. This treaty was a very preliminary to the so-called Second Treaty of Versailles, signed on 5 May, 1757; in this it was stipulated that the two powers would fight against the King of Prussia, until Silesia and Glatt were restored to Austria. A similar alliance was effected with Russia on 2 February, 1757. Both these alliances were the effect of a power struggle which practically gave up control of the affairs of the Austrian Empire during the ensuing Seven Years War. Maria Theresa placed implicit reliance in his ability and devotion to his country, and no reform of any importance was undertaken during her rule, which did not originate from Kaunitz or bear his stamp. In 1760 he founded the Austrian Council of State, consisting of six members, improved the financial management, and introduced various other governmental changes. In 1764 he was created a prince of the empire with the title of Count von Rittert. The paramount influence which Kaunitz wielded during the reign of Maria Theresa grew considerably less during the reign of her son, Joseph II. In the main, Joseph II and Kaunitz pursued the same ends, viz. territorial expansion, increase of the central state authority and limitation of the authority of the nobility, to Paris in September, 1750, began the supervision of the latter over the former even in the minstation ritual and disciplinary regulations, a better education of the common people, and more consideration for their legal rights. But, despite the unity of their aims, they had numerous disagreements, because while Kaunitz was still able to give up his visions of reverence towards the other. In addition, Kaunitz was extremely vain and eccentric. He spent hours preparing his elaborate toilet at which he was assisted by a host of servants, having each a particular duty to perform. He manifested a childish fear of contagious diseases and could not bear to hear the word death or plague mentioned in his presence. Emperor Joseph in a letter to his brother Leopold, written about two weeks before his death, says of Kaunitz: "Would you believe that I have not seen him for two years? Since the day on which I returned sick from the army I can no longer go to him, and he does not come to me for fear of contagion". Despite his manifold faults, Kaunitz always had Austria's welfare, as he understood it, at heart, and his long experience and cau-}

KAVANAGH

KAVANAGH

EDWARD, American statesman and diplomat, b. at Newcastle, Maine, 27 April, 1795; d. there, 21 Jan., 1844. He was educated at Harvard College, and came to America from Ireland in 1780, settled in Maine, and became a prosperous merchant and shipowner. His mother, Sarah Jackson, was a native of Boston and a convert to the Catholic Faith. Their home was for many years a centre of hospitality for the missionary priests labouring in Maine. One of these, Father afterwards Cardinal Cheverus, was an intimate friend of the family. Edward Kavanagh entered Georgetown College in 1810, and changed to St. Mary's, Baltimore, in 1812. His classical studies were completed in Europe, where he acquired a useful familiarity with modern languages. Returning home, he devoted himself to his father's business, which had suffered severely in the War of 1812, and to the study of law. He was admitted to the Bar, and was esteemed as a counsellor. Failing in an attempt to enter the diplomatic service, he turned to politics, was elected to the Maine Legislature in 1826, was secretary of the Senate in 1830, and in 1831, as commissioner, explored the northern frontier of the State and presented to the governor a valuable report on the subject. Elected to Congress in 1831, he served two terms. In 1835 he was named chargé d'affaires at Lisbon, Portugal, and ranked as chief American representative in that country. Though Portugal was in the throes of revolution and bankruptcy during the five years of his residence.
Mr. Kavanagh settled all claims pending at his arrival, and negotiated a favourable commercial and navigation treaty. He resigned in 1841, and returning to Maine, was elected to the State senate as its presiding officer. The following year he was elected to the Senate of the United States, and he was chosen to be one of four commissioners to negotiate at Washington the preliminaries for the Webster-Ashburton Treaty. On the resignation of Governor Fairfield, Mr. Kavanagh succeeded to the office of governor which he held nine months. He suffered from demoralism during the latter years of his life. He died sustained by the sacraments of the Church of which he was a faithful and uncompromising member all his life. Though not eloquent, he was a convincing speaker and an accomplished scholar. Longfellow's story, "Kavanagh," is not founded on the Maine statesman's career. He is buried in the shadow of St. Patrick's church, Newcastle (Damariscotta Mills).

Unpublished correspondence and papers in possession of the Kavanagh family, Newcastle, Maine; National Cyclopaedia of Biography, VI (New York, 1896), 300; LAPS, Biographical Dictionary of the U.S., IV (Boston, 1901), 478: Representative Men of Maine, 1895; Maine Historical and Genealogical Recorder, IX (Portland, 1896-97); Allen, Early Landmarks of the County of York, Maine (Portland, 1896); Maine Hist., Soc., Col., VI, 74; Rooms, History of Ancient Shepeet and Newcastle (Bath, 1893), 359; Shepeet, History of Ancient Shepeet and Newcastle, IX (Portland, 1897); Akroyd, O., recollections of her father, 441; 612-5; Curtis, Life of Daniel Webster, II (New York, 1870), 113; Collins, Governor Edward Kavanagh in Historical Records and Studies, V (1900).

CHARLES W. COLLINS.

Kavanagh, Julia, novelist and biographer, b. 7 Jan., 1824, at Thurlow, Ireland; d. 28 October, 1877, at Nice, France. She was an only child. Her father, Morgan Kavanagh, a poet and philologist, was the author of some curious works on the source and science of languages. At an early age she accompanied her parents to London, but soon removed to France, where she received her education and remained till her twentieth year. She then resided in France, with several other long visits later in life, gave her an insight into French life and character, which she portrayed most faithfully in many of her works. In 1844 she returned to London, and at once embraced literature as a profession. She began by writing the articles in the Dictionary of the Day. Her first book, "The Fables of the Irish," a tale for children, appeared in 1847. It was followed by "Madamein" (1848), a story founded on the life of a peasant girl of Auvergne. This gave her a literary reputation which was increased by her historical biographical works: "Women in France during the Eighteenth Century" (1850), "Women of Christianity Exemplary for Acts of Piety and Charity" (1852), "French Women of Letters" (1862), and the companion volume "English Women of Letters" (1862). As a biographer she shows great power and a fine sense of discrimination in portraying her characters, though the claims she makes for her heroines are at times somewhat exaggerated. If is, however, as a novelist, that she is best known. Her studies of French life and character, which are worked into almost all her stories, are excellent and show her at her best. Her plots, though not of great depth, are well developed and of sufficient action to hold the interest. "Her writing" remarked a contributor to the London "Athenæum" at the time of her death, "was quiet and simple in style, but pure and chaste, and characterized by the same high-toned thought and morality that was part of the author's own nature." She wrote about twenty novels, which have had a wide circulation in America and have been translated into French. The best known are "Madamein" (1848), "Nathalie" (1851), "Daughter Burns" (1853), "Rachel Gray" (1855). About 1833 she made a prolonged tour of the Continent, and in 1838 published her experience under the title of "A Summer and Winter in the Two Sicilies".

Her life was rather eventful: a great part of her time was devoted to the care of her widowed mother, who was an invalid. At the outbreak of the Franco-German War, Miss Kavanagh, who was living in Paris with her mother, retired to Rouen and thence to Nice, where she died in her fifty-fourth year. After her death appeared a collection of short tales bearing the appropriate title: "Forget-me-nots" (1878).

Read, Cabinet of Irish Literature (London, 1891); Academy (10 Nov., 1877); Athenæum (17 Nov., 1877); Irish Monthly, VI; preface to Forget-me-nots (1878).

MATTHEW J. FLAHERTY.

Kane, John J. See Dubuque, Archdiocese of.

Keaning, Frederick William. See Northampton, Diocese of.

Kedar. See Cedar.

Keheirn, Joseph, educator, philologist, and historian of German literature, b. at Heidesheim, near Mainz, 20 October, 1808; d. at Montauban, Hesse-Nassau, 25 March, 1876. In 1823 he entered the gymnasium in connexion with the diocesan seminary at Mainz, and after its suppression in 1829 he continued his classical studies at the state gymnasium of the same place, where he graduated in 1831. After studying philology at the University of Giessen from 1831 to 1834, he taught at the gymnasium of Darmstadt, 1835-1837, at that of Heidelberg, 1837-1841, and at the newly founded gymnasium of Haarlem in Nassau, 1845-1846, professor at the same place, 1846-1855, director of the Catholic teachers' seminary at Montauban, 1855-1876, and at the same time director of the Realchule at the same place, 1855-1866. He is the author of numerous works, chiefly on the German language, on the history of German literature, and on pedagogy. The best known among them are: "Die dramatische Poesie der Deutschen" (2 vols., Leipzig, 1840); "Grammatik der neunzehnten deutschen Sprache" (2 vols., Leipzig, 1847-51); "Geschichte der katholischen Kanzeleibesamkeit der Deutschen" (2 vols., Ratisbon, 1843); "Die weltliche Beredsamkeit der Deutschen" (Mains, 1846); "Grammatik der deutschen Sprache des 15-17. Jahrhunderts" (5 vols., Leipzig, 1864-66; 2nd ed., 1869); "Biographisch-kritisches Lexikon der katholischen deutschen Dichter. Volume 19. Jahrhunderts" (2 vols., Würzburg, 1868-71); "Handbuch der Erziehung und des Unterrichts" (Paderborn, 1876; 12th ed., 1906); "Ueberblick der Geschichte der Erziehung" (Paderborn, 1873; 11th ed., 1899). He also edited "Katholische Kirchenblätter aus den ältesten deutschen Gesangbüchern" (3 vols., Würzburg, 1859-65); "Lutherische Sequenzen des Mittelalters" (Mains, 1873).

Keheirn, Joseph Keheirn der Germanist oud Pödagog (Münster, 1901).

MICHAEL OTT.

Kelly, Benjamin J. See Savannah, Diocese of.

Keller, Jacob, controversialist, b. at Säckingen, Baden, Germany, in 1568; d. at Munich, Bavaria, 23 February, 1631. After entering the Society of Jesus in 1589 and completing his studies, he taught the classics at Freiburg and was professor of philosophy and of moral and dogmatic theology at Ingolstadt. He was appointed rector of the college of Ratisbon in 1605, and of the college of Munich in 1607, which post he held until 1623. In 1628 he was reappointed to the rectorship of Munich, and was still holding the office when a stroke of apoplexy ended his life. Besides his literary and scholastic attainments (for he was regarded as a genius by his contemporaries), he possessed uncommon executive ability, and in spite of his extreme humility was consulted not only by his religious superiors, but also by Maximilian I, Elector of Bavaria, who often sought his advice and entrusted to his care affairs of moment, which he discharged with much success.
His principal works are: "Tyrannicideum" (Munich, 1611) and "Catholisch Pabststumb" (Munich, 1614). The former, which appeared both in German and Latin, was an answer to certain calumnies printed by Goether. It is worth noting that the Jesuits of the Society of Jesus on the subject of tyrannicide. Father Keller showed that the Jesuit teaching was no other than that of the greatest theologians, both Catholic and Protestant. The work on the papacy was a reply to aspersions cast on the Holy See by Jacob Heilbrunner, and is a veritable treatise of the teachers of Catholic teachers of both sexes, school inspectors, and seminaries. His "Lebensblatter, Erinnerungen aus der Schulwelt" (1891) is a work of great interest. After his death was published "Lose Blätter, Pädagog. Zeitbetrachtungen und Ratezüge von Keller" (1897).

KELLNER, Lorenz, educationist, b. at Kalteneber in the district of Eichsfeld, 29 January, 1811; d. at Trier, 27 August, 1886. Son of Heinrich Kellner who had been a pupil of Pestalozzi at Yverdon and had introduced Pestalozzi's methods at the normal school he conducted, the first of its kind in the Catholic district of Eichsfeld. Out of these private courses for the training of elementary school-teachers developed the still-existing seminarium for teachers at Heiligenstadt. Lorenz Kellner graduated at the Gymnasium Josephinum at Hildesheim, and then studied with great success at the evangelical seminarium for teachers at Magdeburg. After being a teacher at the Catholic elementary school at Erfurt for two years, he entered the seminary at Trier. Kellner founded several seminaries both for male and female teachers during the twenty-nine years of his official activity here. In his chief work, "Praktischer Lehrgang für den deutschen Unterricht" (1837-40), the teaching of grammar was systematically connected with the reading-book. This was, for that period, a very important advance when contrasted with the current methods of grammatical instruction. In 1850 appeared his best-known work, "Zur Pädagogik der Schule und des Hauses. Aphorismen," which was translated into several languages. It contains altogether 178 essays which cover the entire field of teaching and training. His "Skizzen und Beobachtungen Entlehnten Erziehungswesens" (3 vols., 1858) was the first and also the best treatment of the history of pedagogy by a Catholic author. In 1863 the Academy of Münster in Westphalia made Kellner Doctor of Philosophy honoris causa, in recognition of his services on behalf of the German language and of pedagogics. Kellner's "Kurze Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichtes" (1877) is a book of practical suggestions for teachers; his "Volksschulkunde" (1882) was a theoretical presentation of his ideas. Catholic teachers of both sexes, school inspectors, and seminaries. His "Lebensblatter, Erinnerungen aus der Schulwelt" (1891) is a work of great interest. After his death was published "Lose Blätter, Pädagog. Zeitbetrachtungen und Ratezüge von Keller" (1897)
factum est nunc filius meus dilectus mihi
bene complacuit inimico

Joseph se inerat in pietatem quasi uxor
hominum circinat et superbatur filius

Joseph
out a single false or irregular line. Some of the most accomplished of modern draughtsmen have attempted the 'Diagrams of St. Patrick,' but such is the delicacy of the execution, that they have not succeeded in laying them down as hopeless. In a space of one inch square, they counted no less than 158 interlaces of white ribbon with a black border on either side. On the other hand, the pictures of the personages delineated are feeble and primitive, and show but a limited knowledge of the human figure and its relative proportions. No words can describe the beauty and the extreme splendour of the richly coloured initial letters, which are more profuse in the "Book of Kells" than in any other manuscript. The only thing to which they can be compared is a bed of many coloured crocuses and tulips or the very finest stained glass window, in which they equal in beauty of colouring and rival in delicacy of ornament and drawing. The artist possessed a wonderful knowledge of the proportion of colour and the distribution of his material—sienna, purple, lilac, red, pink, green, blue, yellow, the colours most often used—and he managed the shading and tinting of the letters with consummate taste and skill. (On the pigments employed by the illuminator, see Hartley in "Proceed. Royal Dublin Society, Science," N. S., IV, 1885, p. 485.) It is remarkable that there is no trace of the use of silver or gold on thevellum. Sometimes the picture is in black, in which case a yellowish appearance of enamel, and are here and there as bright and soft and lustrous as when put on fresh more than twelve hundred years ago. Even the best photographic and colour reproductions give but a faint idea of the beauty of the original. Especially worthy of notice is the series of illuminated miniatures, including pictorial representations of the Evangelists and their symbols, the Blessed Virgin and the Divine Child, the temptation of Jesus, and Jesus seized by the Jews. These pictures reach their culminating point in what is, in some respects, the most marvellous example of workmanship that the world has ever produced, namely the full-page monogram XP on which occurs in the text of the Gospel of St. Matthew. It is no wonder that it was for a long time believed that the "Book of Kells" could have been written only by angels.

* 

BRONN, An Enquiry into the Art of the Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages (Stockholm, 1897); WESTWOOD, Palaeographia Sacra Pictoria (London, 1843); IDDEM, Facsimiles of the Miniatures and Ornaments of Anglo-Saxon and Irish Manuscripts: Early Christian Art in Ireland (London, 1887); BEECHER, Celtic Ornament from the Book of Kells (Dublin, 1899); ROMILLY ALLEN, Celtic Art in Pagan and Christian Times (Cambridge, 1905); HOBSON, Celtic Illuminative Art in the Gospel Book of and Kells (Dublin, 1905).

JOSEPH DUNN.

Kells, SCHOOL OF.—Kells (in Gaelic Ceanannus) was the chief of the Irish Columban monasteries. It was founded most probably in 554, that is nine years before Columba founded Iona, and during the second half of the fifth century became the greatest of the insular monasteries. Kells still contains several ancient monuments which tradition closely connects with Columba's residence there. Of these the most interesting is "Columba's House," a tall high-pitched building, of which the ground floor formed an oratory, while the crypt between the convex arching of the oratory and the roof of the building was the chamber or sleeping apartment of the saint. There are also two fine crosses dating probably from the ninth century, when Kells held the principatus of all the Columban monasteries both in Erin and Alba, and which stand in the most prominent place and the most conspicuous situation in the churchyard. The latter is a finely sculptured cross, having on the plinth the inscription Petri et Columbe [cruz], which would seem to imply that it was intended to commemorate the memory of Patrick, who founded the original church of Kells, and Col-

umba, who founded the monastery. There is also a fine round tower, still ninety feet high, built doubtless during the period of the Church of Iona's supremacy over the monastery. The "Book of Kells," called also the Great Gospel of Columcille, which legend attributed to the pen of Columcille himself, was preserved in Kells down to Usher's time. It was stolen in 1006, when the gold was stripped off its cover, but the book and case were afterwards found in a bog. It was regarded as "the chief relic of the Christian world," and Professor Westwood of Oxford declared that "it is unquestionably the most elaborately executed MS. of so early a date now in existence." It is preserved at present in Trinity College, Dublin.

Kells and Iona were always closely connected. Shortly after the house of Iona was burned by the Danes in 802, its abbot fortunately got a "free grant of Kells without a battle"—for it had originally belonged to Columcille. Thereupon a "new religious city"—the old one being probably in ruins—was built in Kells; and the Abbot Cellach of Iona transferred his residence and insular primacy to Kells, which henceforward became the acknowledged head of the Columban houses. The abbot also carried with him the shrine of Columba, which, however, more than once crossed and re-crossed the sea throughout the ninth century. During this and the following centuries Kells became a healthy place for religious and artistic culture, and continued to flourish in spite of the frequent ravages of the Danes. The celebrated Cathach, the battle-standard of the O'Donnells, was preserved in the monastery and enshtered therein in a beautifully wrought casket. It contained a pastrility said to have been written by the hand of Columba himself. Mac Robartaigh, Comharb of Kells, had its marvellous cover made in his own house. His family belonged to Tirhugh in County Donegal, and gave many abbots and sages and scholars at this period to the school of Kells. The most famous of them was the renowned Marianus Scotus, described by Murchadha Mac Robartaigh—a celebrated scribe and commentator on Scripture, to be carefully distinguished from his namesake, Marianus Scotus, the chroniplier. Leaving his beloved Kells he journeyed all the way to Ratisbon, a pilgrim for Christ, and there founded for his countrymen in the land of the stranger the celebrated Monastery of St. James. He himself unwearingly copied the Scriptures, and is described by Aventinus in his "Annals of Bavaria" as "a distinguished poet and theologian, second to no man of his time." The poems are lost, but the commentaries survive though still unpublished.

They include a commentary on the psalms, which was considered so valuable that it was not allowed outside the walls of the monastic library without a valuable deposit being left to secure its safe return. There is also extant in the Cotton collection an unpublished codex containing the treatise of Marianus Scotus consisting of "Extracts from the Writings of Various Doctors on the Gospel." His most famous work, however, was a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, with marginal and interlinear notes. It is still unpublished amongst the treasures of the Imperial Library of Vienna, and is specially valuable because it contains many entries in the pure Middle Gaelic of the eleventh century, written by a man who was at once an accomplished scribe and most excellent Irish scholar. This learned work shows that Marianus was acquainted with the writings of nearly all the Latin Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. It was composed about the last Friday, the sixteenth day before the Kalends of June, 1079. The devoted scribe and commentator, who is commonly and justly styled the Blessed Marianus Scotus, lived for ten years more, and after his death was universally regarded as a saint. He was, after Adamnan, Abbot of Hy, justly esteemed.
as the greatest glory of the Columban schools. His
ameake, the chronicler, died some six years before him.

Healy, Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars (5th ed.,
Dublin, 1908); Life of Mariana Scottus by a contemporary
Irish monk [FATHER ISAAC]. D'Anna's Four Masters;
Healy's Life of Columba; Trencher. The
Story of Iona (Edinburgh, 1909).

JOHN HEALY.

Kelly, DENIS. See ROSS, DioceSE OF.

Kelly, MICHAEL. See SYDNEY, Archdiocese OF.

Kelly, WILLIAM BERNARD. See Geraldton, DioceSE OF.

Kemble, JOHN, VENERABLE, martyr, b. at Rhysdi-
car Farm, St. Weoner's, Herefordshire, 1599; d. at
Widemars Common, Hereford, 22 August, 1679;
son of John Kemble, formerly of Kemble, Wiltshire,
afterwards of Llangarren, and of Urchinfield (now
part of the parish of Hardwicke), and Anne, daughter
of John Morgan, of The Waen, Skenfrith, Monmouth-
shire. His uncle, George Kemble, of Pembroke Cast-
te, Welsh Newton, was the father of Captain Richard
Kemble, who saved Charles II at the battle of Wor-
cester. Ordained priest at Douai College, 23 Febru-
ary, 1625, he was sent on the mission 4 June, and
in his old age lived with his nephew at Pembroke Castle.
Arrived Capt. John Seadmore of St. Peter's church, he was lodged in Hereford Gaol in November,
1678, and condemned under 27 Eliz. c. 2 at the end
of March following. Ordered to London with Father
Charles Baker, he was lodged in Newgate and inter-
viewed by Oates, Bedloe, and Dugdale. Sent back to
Hereford, the aged priest spent three more months in
gaol. Before leaving for his execution he smoked a
pipe and drank a cup of sack with the under-sheriff,
this giving rise to the Herefordshire expression
"Kemble pipe", and "Kemble cup", meaning a part-
ing pipe or cup. Sir John Hawkins in a note to "The
Complot Anglorum" turns Kemble into a Protestant in
Mary's reign. One of the martyr's hands is preserved
at St. Francis Xavier's, Hereford. His body rests in
Welsh Newton churchyard.

BROMAGE, Ven. FR. JOHN KEMBLE (London, 1902); Catholic Recueil
(Publications (London, privately printed
ARCHBISHOP BOSWORTH, Mem. of
the Missionary Priests (Leamington, s. a.), II, 411; WALTON,
Complete Angler (London, 1888), 394.

B. W. WAINWRIGHT.

Kemp, JOHN, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury,
and Chancellor of England; b. at Wye, Kent, about
1380; d. at Lambeth, 22 March, 1454. He was the
son of Thomas Kemp of Ollantigh and 27th Ashford,
Beatrice Lewkno, and was educated at Merton Col-
lege, Oxford. Having become doctor of laws, he
practised as an ecclesiastical lawyer with such success
that in 1415 he was made dean of the Court of Arches
and vicar-general to the Archbishop of Canterbury.
King Henry V also utilized his diplomatic talent in
military commissions. Appointed Bishop of Rochester
by papal provision, 26 June, 1419, he was consecrated
in the following December. In 1421 he was translated to
Chichester, and eight months later to London, by
provision of Martin V. On the death of King Henry
V, whom he had served as Chancellor of Normandy,
he was made a member of the Senate, in which capacity
he supported Cardinal Beaufort against Humphrey,
Duke of Gloucester. In 1426 he was made first
Chancellor and then Archbishop of York.

His political differences with Gloucester led to his
resigning the chancellorship in 1422, but he continued
to act in public life as a supporter of the peace
party, who wished to end the long war with France.
In 1433 he was the head of the important but fruitless
embassy to the congress of Arras, when a settlement
was vainly attempted under the auspices of the papal
legates. In 1439 he was created cardinal by Eugenue
IV, his title being Sancta Balbina. After the deaths
of his opponent Gloucester and his friend Beaufort, he
set himself to resist the power of the Duke of Suffolk,
and in 1450 he was again a Westminster in that city.
In this capacity he put down the Kentish rebellion, and amid the con-
suming likelihood of civil war remained the mainstay of the king's party against the Yorkists. In 1452 Nicholas
V transferred him from York to Canterbury, giving
him the pallium on 24 Sept. The same pope made
him a cardinal bishop by dividing the See of Porto
from that of Santa Rufina and creating for him the last-named diocese. His last days were agitated by the tumultuous proceedings of the London citizens,
who, supported by the Yorkists, were threatening him
with violence, when the end came. He lies buried in
Canterbury cathedral. More statesman than bishop,
he was accused with reason of neglecting his diocese,
but his private life was distinguished by wisdom,
learning, and uprightness.

HOOK, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury (London, 1860-
1894); WILLIAMs, Lives of the English Cardinals (London,
1885); GARNETT, Preface to the Postern Letters (London, 1872);

EDWIN BURTON.

KEMPIS, THOMAS A. See THOMAS A KEMPIS.

Kenia, Vicariate Apostolic of, coextensive with
the civil province of Kenya in British East Africa, to
which the station of Limuru is added. It extends east
as far as the Rivers Tana and Soni, and south to the
mountains of Aberdare and the River Guaso-Uguiro,
while its northern limits are as yet indeter-
minate. Originally part of the Vicariate Apostolic
of Northern Zanzibar, it was first entered by several
priests of the Institute Consolata of Turin. In Sep-
tember, 1949, the Sacred College of the Insti-
tegy erected it into an independent mission, and
in 1909 the mission was in turn created a vicariate
Apostolic. Its superior, Father Philippus Perlo, was
made titular Bishop of Maronia and the first head of
the new vicariate. The climate of Kenya is, for the
most part, temperate and healthy. The language of
the natives is chiefly Kikuyu and Kiswahili. The popu-
lation is estimated at between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000,
almost entirely savage, and given over to various
forms of fetishism and nature-worship. Conversa-
tions, however, are being gradually effected. The vicariate includes 17 regular priests of the Institute Consolata; 10 European catechists; 80 chapels—the more im-
portant of which are located at Tusu-Kasongori, Fort
Hall, Limuru, Kekondo, Niere, Mogoiri, and
Karema; schools at the different stations; 1 orphan-
age; the Order of the Institute Consolata with 8
houses and 36 brothers; and the Order of St. Vincent
Cottolengo with 6 houses and 31 sisters.

Missions Catholicae (Rome, 1907); FOLET, Les Missions, V;
Gerarchia Cattolica (Rome, 1908); Ann. Sac., (Rome, 1908).

STANLEY J. QUINN.

Kennedy, James, Bishop of St. Andrews, Scotland,
about 1406; d. 10 May, 1466. Of the ancient house
of Kennedy of Dunure, he was a son of Lady Mary,
doughter of King Robert III, and was therefore a
cousin of James II, then reigning in Scotland. After
studying on the Continent, he was appointed Bishop
of Dunkeld in 1438, and Abbot of Scone soon after-
wards, and in 1440 he succeeded Henry Wardlaw as
Bishop of St. Andrews. In 1444 he founded the new
convent of Bubbleburn, and in 1444 he showed himself a vigorous reformer of the civil and
ecclesiastical abuses rampant in Scotland, and conse-
quently incurred the enmity of many of the nobles.
Kennedy soon resigned the chancellorship, finding it
incompatible with his ecclesiastical duties, to which he
had devoted himself with the greatest delight. His
concern for learning was shown by his foundation and munifi-
cent endowment, in 1450, of St. Salvator's College,
St. Andrews, with the sanction and approbation of Nicho-
laus V and Pius II. He introduced the Franciscan
Observants into St. Andrews, in 1458; and he also
built a vessel—described by his contemporaries as "a vast ship of great burden"—for trading purposes, called the St. Salvator, which remained the property of the sea till 1472, when it was wrecked. At the death of James II, in 1460, Kennedy was chosen a regent of the kingdom, and exercised the office until his death five years later. The remains of his splendid tomb are still to be seen in the ruined chapel of St. Salvator's. Kennedy was one of the most learned, wise, and pious prelates of the ancient Scottish Church.


D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Kenny, William John. See St. Augustine, Dio-
cese of.

Kenosis, a term derived from the discussion as to the real meaning of Phil., ii, 6 sqq.: "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But emptied himself (besides himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and in habit found as man." The early Reformers, not satisfied with the teaching of Catholic theology on this point, professed to find a deeper meaning in St. Paul's words, and later in the Church, and in their speculations. John Brenz (d. 10 September, 1570), of Tubingen, maintained that as the Word assumed Christ's human nature, so His human na-
ture assumed the Word; hence His human nature not only possessed the Divinity, but had also the power to make use of the Divinity, though it freely ab-
stained from such a use. Chemnits differed from this view. He denied that Jesus Christ possessed the Divinity in such a way as to have a right to its use. The kenosis, or the exinanition, of His Divine attributes was, therefore, a free act of Christ, according to Brenz; it was the conatural consequence of the Incarnation, according to Chemnits.

Among modern Protestants the following opinions have been the most prevalent: (1) Thomasius, De-
litzseh, and Kahnis regard the Incarnation as a self-
emptying of the Divine manner of existence, as a self-
limitation of the Word's omniscience, omnipotence, etc. (2) Gess, Reuss, and Godet contend that the In-
carnation implies a real de potentation of the Word; the Word became, rather than assumed, the human soul of Christ. (3) Ebrard holds that the Divine prop-
erties in Christ appeared under the Kantiuan time-
form appropriate to man; his kenosis consists in an as-
ceasement of the eternal for a time-form of existence. (4) Martensen and perhaps Hutton distinguish a double life of the Word: In the Man-Christ they see a kenosis and a real de potentation of the Word; in the world the purely Divine Word carries on the work of mediator and revealer. According to Godet, as probably also Gess, the Word in His kenosis preserves Himself even of His immutable holiness, His infinite love, and His personal consciousness, so as to enter into a human development similar to ours.

According to Catholic theology, the abasement of the Word consists in the assumption of humanity and the simultaneous occultation of the Divinity. Christ's abasement is seen first in His subjecting Himself to the laws of human birth and growth and to the lowliness of fallen human nature. His likeness, in His abas-
sement, to the fallen nature does not comprise the actual loss of justice and sanctity, but only the pains and passions characteristic of the latter. These fall upon the body, partly on the soul, and consist in liability to suffering from internal and external causes.

(1) As to the body, Christ's dignity excludes some bodily pains and states. God's all-preserving power inhabiting the body of Jesus did not allow any corruption; it also prevented disease or the beginning of cor-

ruption. Christ's holiness was not compatible with decomposition after death, which is the image of the destroying power of sin. In fact, Christ had the right to be free from all bodily pain, and His tormentors had the power to remove or to suspend the action of the causes of pain. But He freely subjected Himself to most of the pains resulting from bodily exertion and adverse external influences, e. g. fatigue, hunger, wounds, etc. As these pains had their sufficient reason in the nature of Christ's body, they were natural to Him.

(2) Christ retained in His also the weaknesses of the soul, the passions of His rational and sensitive appetites, but with the following restrictions: (a) Inor-
dinate and sinful motions are incompatible with Christ's holiness. Only morally blameworthy and affections, e. g. fear, sadness, the share of the soul in the sufferings of the body, were compatible with His Divinity and His spiritual perfection. (b) The origin, intensity, and duration of even these emotions were subject to Christ's free choice. Besides, He could prevent their disturbing the actions of His soul and His peace of mind.

To complete His abasement, Christ was subject to His Mother and St. Joseph, to the laws of the State and the positive laws of God; He shared the hard-
ships and privations of the poor and the lowly. (See COMMUNICATION ICONICAE, 109, 111 sqq. in these chapters; ST. THOMAS, III, Q. XIX-XX, and SALL. URB., IV, XI-XII, in these chapters; PAVOLIUS, Dogmaticus, III, 266-74; BRUCE, Humil-
itations of Christ, 113 sqq.; GORE, Baptism Lectures (1961), 147; HANNA, in The New Jeru-
selem, I, 303 sqq.; On Phil., ii, 6 sqq.

A. J. MAAS.

Kenraughty (KIRCHACHA, KINRECHTIN, OF MAKEN-
RACHTUS; in Irish MACINNIGHARACHAIGH, anglicized HANRATTY AND ENIGHTY), Irish priest, d. 30 April, 1585, at Clonmel, Co. Tipperary. He was the son of a silversmith at Kilmallock, embraced the ecclesi-
asical state, studied abroad, and graduated bachelor in theology. Returning to Ireland, he became chap-

clain to Gerald, sixteenth Earl of Desmond, and shared the fortunes of his patron's struggle against Queen Elizabeth. In September, 1583, a fugitive with the earl, he was surprised on Sliabh Luachra by Lord Roche's gallowglasses, and handed over to the Earl of Ormond. By Ormond's command he was chained to two columns and left to perish. Here he lay in iron, exhorting, instructing, and hearing confession at his prison gate until April, 1585. His jailer was then bribed by Victor White, a leading townsman, to release the priest for one night to say Mass and administer the Paschal Communion in White's house on Passion Sunday. The jailer secretly warned the President of Munster to take this opportunity of apprehending most of the neighbouring recusants at Maas. In the morning an armed force surrounded the house, arrested White and others, seized the sacred vessels, and sought the priest every-

where. He had been hidden under straw at the first alarm, and, though wounded when the heat was probed, ultimately escaped to the woods. Learning, however, that White's life could not be saved but by his own surrender, he gave himself up, and was at once tried by martial law. Pardon and preferrment were offered him for conforming; but he resolutely maintained the Catholic Faith and the pope's authority, and was executed as a traitor. His head was set up in the market-place, and his body, purchased from the soldiers, was buried behind the high altar of the Franciscan convent. He is one of the Irish martyrs whose cause of canonization was introduced.

O'Reilly, Memoirs of those who suffered for the Catholic Faith in Ireland (London, 1888); Murphy, Our Martyrs (Dub-
lin, 1889); Calendar of State Papers (London, 1867); O'Sullivan, Brack, Patricia decaus (Madrid, 1659); Holins in Spicilegium Omorinum, Ist ser. (Dublin, 1874).

Charles Mcneill.
Krenick, Francis Patrick and Peter Richard, Archbishops respectively of Baltimore, Maryland, and of St. Louis, Missouri. They were sons of Thomas Kenrick and his wife Jane, and were born in the older part of the city of Dublin, Ireland, the first-named on 3 December, 1797, and the second on 17 August, 1806. An uncle, Father Richard Kenrick, was for several years prior and priest of St. Nicholas and Myra in the same city, and he cultivated carefully the quality of piety which he observed at an early age in both children.

I.—Francis Patrick was sent by his uncle to a good classical school, and at the age of eighteen was selected as one of the number who were to study for the priesthood. Here he became deeply impressed with the gentle bearing of Pius VII, who had just then been restored to his capital after long imprisonment by Napoleon Bonaparte, and the lesson it taught him bore fruit many years afterwards, when he was called on to deal with the onslaughts on Catholics and their Church in the United States in the years of the Nativist and Know-nothing uprisings. His progress in his clerical studies was rapid; his sanctity conspicuous—so much so as to mark him out for early distinction. He confined himself to the study of his classical books, and the study of the Scriptures, and worked out in his own mind not a few weighty problems. He soon acquired a familiarity with the patristic writings and the Sacred Text that enabled him later on to give the Church in the United States valuable treatises on theological and Biblical literature. He consulted no translations, but took the Hebrew text or the Greek, and pondered on its significance in the light of his own reason and erudition. The rector of Propaganda College, Cardinal Litta, had no hesitation in selecting him despite his youth, when a call came from England for a priest to go to Philadelphia. He was chosen for the chair of theology at Bardstown Seminary, Kentucky. This post he held for nine years, at the same time teaching Greek and history in the College of St. Joseph in the same state, and giving in addition professorial help in every educational institution in the state. He also did much valuable work in the parochial field, and engaged in controversy in the public press with some aggressive polemists of the Episcopal and Presbyterian communions. He made many converts at that time, and in 1826–7 had fifty to his credit, as well as a record of twelve hundred confirmations and six thousand baptisms. His first-fruits in this field were widespread, and his manner most winning.

In 1829 he attended the Provincial Council of Baltimore as theologian to Bishop Flaget, and was appointed secretary to the assembly. There, among the other weighty subjects, had to be considered the distressed state of the Diocese of Philadelphia, then labouring under the troubles begotten of the Hogan schism. Hogan was an excommunicated priest, who persisted in celebrating Mass and administering the sacraments despite the interdict, and had a considerable following in the city. Bishop Connell had by this time become enfeebled and nearly blind, and Rev. William Matthews of Washington had been appointed vicar-general to assist him. Before the council rose it had named Father Kenrick as coadjutor bishop and forwarded the nomination to the Holy See. It was soon confirmed. Doctor Kenrick's title being Bishop of Alton, his consecration he led in Bardstown, assisted by Bishop Flaget, assisted by Bishops England, Conwell, David, and Fenwick, on 6 June, 1830, being then only thirty-four years old. A quarrel with the trustees of St. Mary's broke out immediately on his arrival, resulting in an intercept being placed upon the church and the property; the trustees submitted to their senses, and they gave up the contest for the control of the funds—the power by means of which they had been able to browbeat the preceding ordinaries. Bishop Kenrick soon obtained the passage of a law to prevent the recurrence of such conflicts, by having the bishop's name substituted for those of the trustees in all bequests for the Church. His first thought, after this trouble was over, was the erection of a seminary for the training of young men for the priesthood, the Nativist attack of the past having made the experiment eventually being succeeded by the present seminary of St. Charles Borromeo at Overbrook.

A terrible outbreak of cholera took place in Philadelphia soon after the bishop's arrival, and he gained the gratitude of the authorities and the people at large with his exertions in the midst of the pest. He sent the Sisters of Charity to attend the stricken, and gave the parochial residence of St. Augustine's as a temporary hospital; the local priests, at the same time, went about fearlessly among the stricken, ministering to their spiritual comfort. For these services he was voted public thanks by the mayor and council of the city. To the Sisters of Charity was tendered a service of plate by the grateful authorities, but this offer was promptly and politely declined by those ladies. Soon after this episode Bishop Kenrick set about the utilization of the press for the spread of Catholic doctrine. He started two weekly journals, under the direction of the Reverend John Hughes, afterwards Archbishop of New York. He also began the erection of the Cathedral of St. John the Evangelist to replace St. Mary's, which had been so fruitful a source of trouble to him and his predecessor. Greater trouble soon started up in the form of the anti-Catholic Nativist outbreak of 1844. Furious mobs, maddened by inflammatory harangues about the Bible and the public schools, started out in Philadelphia, as in Boston and other cities, to attack churches and convents. They burned St. Augustine's in Philadelphia and attacked the quarters of the American College at St. John's, but were driven off by the military. They burned many houses in Kensington, the Catholic district, and killed many unoffending people, but were dispersed at length by the soldiery, leaving several of their number dead.

Bishop Kenrick, during this reign of terror, did everything he could to stem the rioting. He ordered the doors of all the churches to be closed and the cessation of Divine worship as a protest against the unpineness of the authorities; the clergy went about in ordinary clothes, and the sacred vessels and vestments were taken from the churches to places of security from the private fury of the people. The effect of restoring a state of peace to the city. The Diocese of Philadelphia had earlier included Pittsburgh and a large part of New Jersey, and in 1843 it was divided, the Rev. Michael O'Connor being consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh in August of that year by Cardinal Francis at St. Augustine's in Rome. This step proved a great relief to Bishop Kenrick, upon whom the care of his vast diocese and its arduous visitations at a period of primitive crudeness in travelling facilities and accommodation, were beginning to leave a deep mark. In 1845 he visited Rome for the first time since his consecration and was received most graciously by the pope.

In August, 1851, Bishop Kenrick was transferred to Baltimore as successor to Archbishop Eccleston, who had just died. Moreover he received from the Holy See the dignity of Apostolic delegate, and in this capacity he led in Bardstown at the Eleventh Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852. One of the results of that important gathering was the establishment of branches of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. It was Archbishop Kenrick also who in 1853 introduced the Forty Hours' devotion into the United States, and the trustees of the Holy Father to collect and forward to him the respective opinions of the American bishops on the
doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. The latter part of the same year found him back in Rome as a participant in the ceremonies attendant on the proclamation of that dogma.

A fresh outbreak of anti-Catholic fury took place soon after the archbishop's return, occasioned by the charges of the Rev. Brother Benedict Mundelein, the inflammatory and lying speeches of the ex-priest, Alessandro Gavazzi, on the nuncio's action while in Bologna during the rising against Austria. Many churches and convents were burned as in the previous outbreak, and many lives were lost in New England and Kentucky in Cincinnati and other cities. But no religious disturbances occurred in Maryland to perturb the archbishop's closing years. The Civil War, however, soon came to rend his heart, and he died on the morning after the battle of Gettysburg (8 July, 1863), his end being hastened, it was believed, by the rumours of the terrible slaughter that went on not far from his residence. When Bishop Kenrick went to Philadelphia in 1830 there were only four churches in the city and one in the suburb, and ten priests; when he left it in 1857, the diocese contained 94 churches and many religious institutions, and was the home of 160 priests and 800 religious, besides numerous religious orders. The chief literary works of Archbishop Kenrick were a new translation of the Bible, with a commentary; a "Moral and Doctrinal Theology"; a "Commentary on the Book of Job"; "The Primacy of Peter", and letters to the Protestant bishops of the United States on Christian unity.

II. — Peter Richard had to work closely in the scrivener's office of his father after the latter's death in order to help to maintain his mother and himself, as well as carry on the business, but was enabled by his own industry and his uncle's help to enter Maynooth College at the age of twenty-one. Previous to his entry he had acquired a well-taught knowledge of the essentials by Father Richard, while his taste for secular literature had been acquired through associations with the unfortunate poet and littérateur, James Clarence Mangan, who had for several years worked beside him as a clerk at the scrivener's desk. After five years' assiduous study he was ordained to the priesthood by Archbishop Murray of Dublin, and, on the death of his mother, after a few months of local missionary work, left for the United States on the invitation of his brother and took up work with him in Philadelphia. He was given the post of president of the seminary, to which he devoted himself with great vigour and care.

This was in the latter part of 1833. During his seven years of missionary work with his brother he produced several works which built up his fame as a theologian, as "Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined" (Philadelphia, 1841), "New Month of Mary", and "History of the Holy House of Loretto". In 1840 he left for Rome, with the idea of entering the Jesuit Order, but was dissuaded from carrying out his intention by the superior in Rome. Bishop Rosati met the young priest there, and requested the Holy See to give him to the See of St. Louis, and, after a journey by way of Canada, he was with his character and qualities. The Holy See assented, and both returned from Rome to have the ceremony of consecration performed in the United States. This was done in Philadelphia, Bishop Rosati officiating and the new prelate's brother and Bishop Lefevre of Detroit assisting, while Bishop England delivered the consecration sermon.

The new bishop was given the title of Dras, and had the right of succession in St. Louis. Bishop Rosati died a short time afterwards on a special mission in Haiti, and the care of the diocese devolved upon his young coadjutor at a much earlier period than either of them anticipated. It was not a sinecure, for the financial affairs of the Church in St. Louis were in a deplorable condition. There was a very heavy debt on the cathedral, and he found the Catholics of the diocese by no means anxious to remove it. The bishop then saw that he must either resign or get other means of raising funds, and he took the bold course of getting into the real-estate business. He was most successful. A local gentleman named Thornton made a bequest of $20,000 dollars, a munificent sum, and many of the inflammatory and lying speeches of the ex-priest, Alessandro Gavazzi, on the nuncio's action while in Bologna during the rising against Austria. Many churches and convents were burned as in the previous outbreak, and many lives were lost in New England and Kentucky in Cincinnati and other cities. But no religious disturbances occurred in Maryland to perturb the archbishop's closing years. The Civil War, however, soon came to rend his heart, and he died on the morning after the battle of Gettysburg (8 July, 1863), his end being hastened, it was believed, by the rumours of the terrible slaughter that went on not far from his residence. When Bishop Kenrick went to Philadelphia in 1830 there were only four churches in the city and one in the suburb, and ten priests; when he left it in 1857, the diocese contained 94 churches and many religious institutions, and was the home of 160 priests and 800 religious, besides numerous religious orders. The chief literary works of Archbishop Kenrick were a new translation of the Bible, with a commentary; a "Moral and Doctrinal Theology"; a "Commentary on the Book of Job"; "The Primacy of Peter", and letters to the Protestant bishops of the United States on Christian unity.

II. — Peter Richard had to work closely in the scrivener's office of his father after the latter's death in order to help to maintain his mother and himself, as well as carry on the business, but was enabled by his own industry and his uncle's help to enter Maynooth College at the age of twenty-one. Previous to his entry he had acquired a well-taught knowledge of the essentials by Father Richard, while his taste for secular literature had been acquired through associations with the unfortunate poet and littérateur, James Clarence Mangan, who had for several years worked beside him as a clerk at the scrivener's desk. After five years' assiduous study he was ordained to the priesthood by Archbishop Murray of Dublin, and, on the death of his mother, after a few months of local missionary work, left for the United States on the invitation of his brother and took up work with him in Philadelphia. He was given the post of president of the seminary, to which he devoted himself with great vigour and care.

This was in the latter part of 1833. During his seven years of missionary work with his brother he produced several works which built up his fame as a theologian, as "Validity of Anglican Ordinations Examined" (Philadelphia, 1841), "New Month of Mary", and "History of the Holy House of Loretto". In 1840 he left for Rome, with the idea of entering the Jesuit Order, but was dissuaded from carrying out his intention by the superior in Rome. Bishop Rosati met the young priest there, and requested the Holy See to give him to the See of St. Louis, and, after a journey by way of Canada, he was with his character and qualities. The Holy See assented, and both returned from Rome to have the ceremony of consecration performed in the United States. This was done in Philadelphia, Bishop Rosati officiating and the new prelate's brother and Bishop Lefevre of Detroit assisting, while Bishop England delivered the consecration sermon.

The new bishop was given the title of Dras, and had the right of succession in St. Louis. Bishop Rosati died a short time afterwards on a special mission in Haiti, and the care of the diocese devolved upon his young coadjutor at a much earlier period than either of them anticipated. It was not a sinecure, for the financial affairs of the Church in St. Louis were in a deplorable condition. There was a very heavy debt on the cathedral, and he found the Catholics of the diocese by no means anxious to remove it. The bishop then saw that he must either resign or get other means of raising funds, and he took the bold course of getting into the real-estate business. He was most successful. A local gentleman named Thornton made a bequest of $20,000 dollars, a munificent sum, and many of the
Kentigern (or Mungo), Saint, bishop, founder of the See of Glasgow, b. about 518; d. at Glasgow, 13 January, 603. His real name was Theoderic. He was the daughter of a British prince, Lothus (from whom the province of Lothian was called); his father's name is unknown. According to Jocelyn's life of Kentigern, the saint was born at Curoles in Fife, and brought up until manhood by St. Serf (or Servaunus) at his monastery there; but whether this is true or not, his missionary labours, and his new church at Glasgow, prove him to have been a great saint through the whole of the Kingdom of Strathclyde, and the Christian King of Struthclyde, Roderick Hael, welcomed the saint, and procured his consecration as bishop, which took place about 540. For some thirteen years he laboured in the district, living a most austere life in a cell at the confluence of the Clyde and the Molenad, and making many converts by his holy example and his preaching. A large community grew up around him, became known as "Clagscu" (meaning the "dear family") and ultimately grew into the town and city of Glasgow.

About 553 a strong anti-Christian movement in Strathclyde compelled Kentigern to leave the district, and he retired to Wales, staying for a time with St. David at Menevia, and afterwards founding a large monastery at Llanellwy, now St. Asaph's, of which he appointed the holy monk Asaph superior in succession to himself. In 573 the battle of Arthurset secured the triumph of the Christian cause in Cambria, and Kentigern, at the earnest appeal of King Roderick, returned thither, accompanied by many of his Welsh disciples. For eight years he fixed his see at Hoddam in Dumfriesshire, evangelising thence the districts of Galloway and Cumberland. About 581 he finally retired, and later miracle stories were told of how he was visited by St. Columba, who was at that time labouring in Strathclyde. The two saints embraced, held long converse, and exchanged their pastoral staves.

Kentigern was buried on the spot where now stands the magnificent cathedral dedicated in his honour. His remains are said still to rest in the crypt. His festival is kept throughout Scotland on 13 January. The Bollandists have printed a special mass for this feast, dating from the thirteenth century.

Jocelyn of Furness, Life of Kentigern, c. 1185, printed, with notes, in the First Series, Lives of the Scottish Saints (Paisley, 1889-95), is the only ancient authority, except a fragment of c. 1184; see Jocelyn, St. Ninian and St. Kentigern in t. xiv (Edinburgh, 1874); see also Stack, Life of St. Mungo (Glasgow); Forrester, Kalendar of Scottish Saints (Edinburgh, 1872), 373-82; Edmonds, The Early Scottish Church (Edinburgh, 1900), ix; BELLERBEK, Hist. of Cath. Ch. of Scot., I (Edinburgh, 1887), 149-157; Acts SS. (Brussels, 1883), II, 97-103.

D. O. Hunter-Blair.

Kentucky, a state situated between the parallels of latitude 36° 30' and 39° 6' N., and between the meridians 82° and 89° 35' W. The state is named after the Indian tribe that lived in the region. The first European settlement in what is now Kentucky was established by the French in the late 17th century. Kentucky became a state in 1792. Kentucky is known for its rich history, including the American Revolution and the Civil War, as well as its role in the tobacco and bourbon industries. It is also home to the University of Kentucky, one of the largest public universities in the United States. The state is divided into 120 counties, with the capital being Frankfort. The state is known for its natural beauty, including its forests, lakes, and mountains. The climate is generally mild, with warm summers and cool winters. The state is home to a diverse range of wildlife, including deer, turkey, and raccoon. The state is also known for its history of agriculture, including tobacco, corn, and wheat.
stock of $17,078,500, an aggregate surplus of $5,283,739.56, and individual deposits amounting to $55,-
400,000. The total real estate and personal estate of Kentucky aggregating $114,158,595.84. There are 406 state banks and trust companies with an aggregate capital of $19,642,770, an aggregate surplus of $5,504,746, and deposits aggregating $66,947,965.84.
Mining.—The chief mineral products of Kentucky are coal (the most important of all), petroleum, nat-
ural gas, fluor spar, clay products, and national lead. The total mineral output for 1907 amounted in value to $19,294,341.
Agriculture.—Of the total area of Kentucky in 1900, farm lands occupied 85.9 per cent, and of this 62.5 per cent was improved. The average size of the farms has shown gains. In 1890 the average was 93.7 acres, which is less than half what it was fifty years previous. More than 67 per cent of the farms are operated by owners of the land. Indian corn (maize) is the principal crop, exceeding in average and value that of all the other leading crops combined. In 1908 the total area planted in Indian corn was 3,866,000 acres; in wheat, 758,000 acres; in oats, 173,000 acres; in hay, 500,000 acres; in tobacco, 240,000 acres. The total value of all principal crops in 1908 was $92,566,600. Kentucky produces nearly all the hemp grown in the United States; but the demand for this product has so far decreased that in 1900 only 14,107 acres were planted in the state. More tobacco is grown in Kentucky than in any other state in the Union, the product being twice as much as that of North Carolina, which is next in rank. The Kentucky crop usually equals one-third of the total production of the United States.
Grazing.—On account of the climate, the large pro-
duction of grain, and the excellence of the pasturage, stock-raising is very extensively carried on. The total value of live stock in 1900 was $95,100,000—horses, $37,905,000; mules, $21,942,000; horned cattle, $25,312,000; other live stock, $39,441,000. The Blue-Grass Region is the home of the Kentucky thoroughbred, the best known and most highly valued horse in America. No other part of the country devotes so much attention to the raising of horses of fine breed, and nowhere else in America are so many farms devoted exclusively to that purpose. The cattle industry is in Fayette County, though many valuable breeding farms are in the adjoining counties.
Manufactures.—Kentucky is an agricultural state. Its manufactures depend largely upon the products of its farms. Corn- and grist-mills are its principal manufacturing concerns. Other enterprises closely allied with the production of the products of the farms—tobacco, distilled and malt liquors, lumber and timber products. A comparison of industrial conditions in 1900 and in 1903 shows an increase in the latter year of 73.4 per cent in capital invested, 26.3 in wages paid, and 20.8 in value of output. Although Kentucky is the leading tobacco-growing state in the country, there has been a decrease in the manufacture of this product in the state, so that Kentucky, formerly the second state of the Union in the value of its output of manufactured chewing and smoking tobacco and snuff, is now third, with a total output of $13,117,000 for the year 1905.
Transportation.—The Ohio River affords a means of transportation along the full length of the state's northern boundary, and the Mississippi River on the west. The Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers are navigable for steamboats across the entire width of the state. Kentucky and Green Rivers are navigable for more than one hundred miles of their course. In 1900 there were 3093 miles of railroad, and 3574 miles in 1908. The total valuation of railroad prop-
erty for purposes of taxation in 1908 was $63,753,699; the gross receipts for the same year were $40,464,504, and the net earnings $11,641,856.

Education.—The Kentucky State University, a public institution owned by the state, is located at Lexington in Fayette County. Each county is en-
titled annually to send one student to the university for each 3000 white pupils in its public schools, and one for each fraction of 3000 over 1500, based on the last official census preceding the appointment. Each county is entitled to at least one appointment. Students, except those entered solely in the departments of law and medicine, are entitled to (fee tuition, room, rent, fuel, light, and all other advantages of the un-
iversity. This institution was formerly the Agricul-
tural and Mechanical College of Kentucky, and was established in 1865. By an Act of the Legislature, in 1908, the name was changed and it became the State University.
The total number of students in all departments in 1909 was 772, and there were 61 professors and assist-
ants. There are two normal schools for the training of whitemen, one at Richmond, in Madison County, and the other at Bowling Green, in Warren County. There is also a normal school for colored students at Frankfort (the state capital), in Franklin County. All of these institutions are maintained by public taxation.
Each county in the state, excluding cities and towns having separate school systems, and graded school districts whose tax levy is not less than 20 cents, con-
stitutes a school district. Each district is divided into educational divisions. There may be four, six, or eight of these divisions, as deemed expedient. Educa-
tional divisions are required to contain as nearly as possible an equal number of pupils. Each of these educational divisions is in turn divided into school districts, and each school district elects one trustee. Most of the trustees from the school districts constitute a division board, and organize as such for the purpose of caring for the schools in their respective educational divisions. The chairmen of the division boards constitute the county board of education, and this county board has general supervision over all educational matters in the county; is authorized to establish, and when established has charge of the county high schools; estimates the needs and requirements of the schools and certifies to the county governing body the amount of money necessary to be raised for school purposes in the county. The county is required to levy a tax on the general school district not exceeding 20 cents on every $100 of the assessed value of property in the district, to meet the requirements of the County Board of Education. All cities of the first, second, third, and fourth classes—i. e. all cities having a population in excess of 3000—maintain separate school systems in accordance with the provisions of their respective charters.
The state at large levies a general tax over the en-
tire state, and this fund is used in the payment of salaries of teachers. The local sub-divisions provide school buildings and pay all other expenses incidental to the maintenance of the schools. The total number
of children of school age, according to the last school census, was 759,352. The actual number enrolled in the public schools was 441,377, and the average daily attendance 293,691. The total number of teachers was about 9000. In 1808 there were 24,610 Catholic children attending the Catholic schools of the state. There was expended in the last fiscal year by the state and local taxing districts for public school purposes, exclusive of expenditures for the State University, normal schools, schools for the blind, deaf and dumb, etc., $3,891,306.65.

CHARITIES AND CORRECTION.—There are there asylums for the insane: one situated at Lexington in Fayette County, another at Lakeland in Jefferson County, and the third at Hopkinsville in Christian County. All of these institutions have competent superintendents and physicians in charge. Inmates who are without means are maintained by the state. There is an institution for feeble-minded children at Frankfort, where children between the age of six and eighteen years whose condition of mind is such that they can be taught to read or write, and can be educated to do work, are received, and if unable to pay are maintained by the state. At Danville, in Boyle County, the Kentucky School for the Deaf is established, and near Louisville, in Jefferson County, there is an institution for the education of the blind. Indigent and afflicted children are received at these institutions and educated at the expense of the state. The Kentucky Confederate Home, for the benefit of Kentucky's indigent and infirm veterans of the Confederacy, is in Jefferson County, and is maintained by the state. The legislature makes annual appropriations for the support of the Kentucky Children's Home Society, a private corporation devoted to the care of homeless and destitute children, and it has also made an appropriation for the assistance of a sanitarium at Louisville for the treatment of persons afflicted with tuberculosis.

There are two state prisons: one at Frankfort, and the other at Eddyville in Lyon County. The management is by a board of commissioners of three members elected by the Legislature, and the convicts are worked under the contract system. The prison commissioners have the power to parole prisoners, except in cases of rape or incest, or where the prisoner has previously served a term of imprisonment or broken his parole. Prisoners convicted of murder cannot be paroled until they have served at least five years. The governor has the power of granting reprieves or pardons in all cases except treason, and the General Assembly alone has the power of granting the pardon. Houses of reform for boys and girls are established in Fayette County. Juvenile offenders under twenty-one years of age are committed to these institutions.

The courts are authorized to fix an indeterminate sentence for such offenders, so as to keep them confined until they have attained the age of twenty-one. The management of these institutions is vested in the prison commissioners, who are authorized to parol and discharge such inmates whenever their conduct is such as to warrant the belief that they will in future conduct themselves properly.

GENERAL HISTORY.—Kentucky was originally a part of Fincastle county, Virginia. It became a separate county in 1776. In 1743, when De Soto's survivors descended the Mississippi River as far as Kentucky, there are records of numerous expeditions into the state. In 1654 Colonel Wood, an Englishman, is said to have explored as far as what is now the western boundary of the state, and in 1673 the renowned Jesuit missionary, Father Jacques Marquette, descended the Mississippi as far as the Ohio. From Marquette we have the first authentic account of the Indian tribes inhabiting what is now the western portion of the state. In 1730 John Salling, while exploring the Roanoke River, was captured by the Indians and carried through Kentucky to the Tennessee River. He was afterwards captured by the Illinois tribe and taken to Kaskaskia, where he was ransomed. A Frenchman named Longueil descended the Ohio in 1739, and discovered Big Bone Lick in what is now Boone County, and in 1747 Dr. Thomas Walker of Virginia crossed the Cumberland Mountains and discovered the Cumberland and Kanawha Rivers, after most extensive explorations, and the most important as bearing upon the actual settlement of Kentucky, were made about the year 1769 by Daniel Boone, John Findlay, and four others from North Carolina. Part of this expedition returned after a short time, but Boone remained in Kentucky for two years and then returned to North Carolina, intending to lead a party into Kentucky for permanent settlement. In 1774 John Harrod conducted a party of forty persons into the territory and settled at Harrodsburg. The year following, Daniel Boone brought his party and erected a fort and established a settlement at Boonesboro.

These were the first settlements in Kentucky. There were no resident Indian tribes in the central and eastern portion of the territory at this time, but numerous bands of savages traversed it, and the first settlers were constantly harassed, the fort at Boonesboro being attacked three times. In 1775 Richard Henderson purchased from the Cherokee Indians many thousand square miles of land in Kentucky and attempted to organize a separate state under the name of Transylvania. He proceeded to the extent of sending a delegate to Congress, but his representative was not recognized, and Virginia declared his purchase from the Indians invalid. In 1778 about twenty families accompanied General George Rogers Clark upon his expedition against the British posts in Illinois. They landed on a large island just above the Falls of the Ohio River, directly opposite the present site of Louisville, and immediately erected blockhouses and established a settlement. Each year a portion of these settlers moved to the main shore and erected a fort at a point which is now the foot of Twelfth Street. On 17 April, 1779, a public meeting was held and the town was definitely established by the election of trustees. There is no record indicating the religious belief of any of these early settlers, but from some of the names appearing in the records of the town prior to 1800, it is fair to assume that there were a number of Irish Catholics.

In 1780 Virginia, in order to afford a better government, divided Kentucky into three counties, but the settlers, who had by this time become quite numerous, believed that their interest would be better served by separation from the parent state. Eight separate conventions were held before a satisfactory agreement of separation was arrived at, and it was not until July,
1790, that the territory was formally separated. By an Act of 1 February, 1791, Congress authorized the admission of Kentucky into the Union, the Act be-
coming effective 1 June, 1792. In April, 1792, the first
Constitutional Convention assembled at Danville in
what is now Boyle County, and adopted a constitu-
tion. The first Legislature met at Lexington in June,
1792, elected Isaac Shelby governor, and decided upon
Frankfort as the capital of the state. In 1798 a
second Constitution was adopted, which made Shelby
the first governor and other state officers elective by the
people. The second Constitution remained in force from 1800
to 1850, at which time a new Constitution was adopted
which remained in force until 1891, when the present
Constitution became effective, upon its ratification by
the people.

One of the most interesting incidents in the history of Kentucky was what is known as the Old-Court and
New-Court controversy. In the early days of Ken-
tucky coin had been very scarce, and commerce among
the people had been carried on generally by the bar-
tering of merchandise. In 1802, under the pretext of
forming a company for insuring cargoes on the western
waters, the Kentucky Insurance Company obtained a
charter from the Legislature in which there was fraud-
ulently inserted a clause giving it the right to issue
paper money. Thus commenced a period of wild-cat
money. Between 1806 and 1820 more than forty
banks were chartered with similar power and with an
aggregate capital of $9,920,000. These banks were
generally conducted in a very loose and unbusinesslike
manner. The state was flooded with paper money,
and a period of wild speculation followed, resulting in
the inevitable panic. To afford relief, the Legislature,
between the years 1822 and 1826, passed various laws,
but the Court of Appeals held them unconstitutional.
In 1824 the Legislature, exasperated by the action of
the Court of Appeals, attempted to legislate the court
out of office and to establish a new court. One of
the bitterest fights in the history of the state followed.
The old court declined to recognize the right of the
Legislature to oust it from office, and refuse to recog-
nize as constitutional the court established by the
Legislature. In 1826 the issue of the old court and the
new court brought about an election, characterized by
the most intense excitement, which resulted in the
triumph of the Old-Court party, and the election of the
Legislature which repealed the Acts attempting to
establish the new court.

Kentucky has taken a very active part in the mili-
tary affairs of the nation. In the war of 1812 about
7000 troops—a number far in excess of Kentucky's
population—served in the Federal army. A portion of
these soldiers served in the North under Harrison,
and the balance in the South under Jackson. At the bat-
tle of New Orleans fully one-fourth of Jackson's army
was made up of Kentuckians. In the Mexican War
Kentucky's quota should have been 2400 men, but she
sent more than 10,000. And in the Civil War, when
the people of the state were divided in their sympa-
thies, about 80,000 men enlisted in the Federal army
and about 40,000 in the Confederate army.

The Know-nothing lodges made their appearance
in Kentucky in 1854, and spread with the utmost
rapidity; so much so that in 1855 the American, or
Know-nothing, Party elected its candidates for gover-
nor and the other state offices. Intense bitterness
towards Catholics was manifested all over the state
at this election, but in the city of Louisville fanatical
frenzy reached its climax. A mob dominated the city
on election day (Alter Monday), Catholics were sa-
momed, their property plundered, and their houses
destroyed. Twenty-four persons killed, many wounded,
and more than twenty houses of Catholics destroyed,
was the sum of the outrages of this day of horrors.
The city government was under the control of the
Know-nothings and no serious effort was made to pro-
tect life or property. Insult and violence were the lot
of the Catholic people on all sides. Fortunately,
the good sense of the people rebelled against the domina-
tion of this party of violence; its candidates were de-
feated in the general election of the following year,
and within a few years the last vestige of the party dis-
appeared. (See also LOUISVILLE, DIOCESE OF.)

RELIGION.—Growth of the Church in Kentucky.—The
Boone family were among the first Catholic set-
tlers of Maryland, and upon the strength of this fact
it has been contended that Daniel Boone was a Cath-
olic. Nothing, however, that is recorded of the life
of this famous Kentucky pioneer seems to support this
contention. In all probability, Dr. George Hart and
William Coomes, who accompanied John Harrod,
and settled at Harrodsburg in 1774, were the first
Catholics to arrive in Kentucky. Dr. Hart, if not the first, was cer-
tainly one of the first physicians to settle in Kentucky.
He practised his profession at Harrodsburg until about
the year 1786, when he moved to the vicinity of
Bardstown, in what is now Nelson County, in order to
join his co-religionists who had recently emigrated
from Maryland.

The first distinctively Catholic body of immigrants
came from Maryland in the year 1786. A league of
sixty families, mostly from St. Mary's County in that
state, was formed for the purpose of migrating to
Kentucky, and in the same year twenty-five of these
families, under the leadership of Basil Hayden, ar-
ived in Kentucky and settled near the present site of
Bardstown (Nelson County). In the following year a
second settlement, about ten miles distant from the
first, but on better lands, was begun by Edward and
Charles Beaven. Between this date and 1795 five
separate bodies of Catholic immigrants settled in the
vicinity of these earlier settlements, and a thriving
Catholic colony was begun. In 1796 one of the com-
panies of immigrants, while on its way to join the first
settlers in Nelson County, attracted by the beauty and
fertility of the country through which they were pass-
ing, decided to go no farther, and settled in what is
now Scott County, near the centre of the famous Blue-
Grass Region. By 1796 it is estimated that there were 300 Catholic families in Kentucky.

The first missionary priest to reach Kentucky was the Rev. M. Whelan, who came in the year 1787 with a band of immigrants under the leadership of Edward Hylan. In 1790 Father Whelan returned to Maryland. Six months later the Rev. Wm. De Rohan arrived, but without faculties and unaccredited to Kentucky. He performed such service as he could, but the settlements were without full priestly attention until 1793, at which time the Rev. Stephen Theodore Bardin (q. v.) and Father Ehrenreich, a native of Belgium, joined him. Father Nerincx laboured in the state for nineteen years, sharing with his associate all the hardships of this most trying mission, and by his wonderful zeal and great piety materially promoting the progress and prosperity of the Church. He died in St. Mary's Church, near the landing place, in 1811. Louis Tarascon arrived at Louisville in the year 1806 and settled near the Falls of the Ohio, to engage in the millin business, utilizing the falls for power. These colonists were, or at least should have been, Catholics, but the early missionaries do not appear to have considered them very faithful children of the Church. However, when the first church was built, in 1811, the name of J. A. Tarascon appears on the list of trustees for the new parish. Father Bardin was the first pastor, and continued as such until 1817, when he was succeeded by the Rev. C. J. Chabrat, like him, a Frenchman, who was in turn succeeded by the Rev. Philip Horstman, a native American.

In 1808 the Diocese of Bardstown was erected, to include in its jurisdiction the whole of Kentucky as well as Tennessee (see LOUISVILLE, DIOCESE OF). In 1841 the see was transferred to Louisville, and in 1853 the see of the Diocese of Kentucky was brought into existence the present ecclesiastical division of the State of Kentucky into the two dioceses of Louisville and Covington.

Kentucky enjoys the distinction of having been the first great nursery of the Faith in the United States west of the Alleghenies. This was the consequence of this fact (which will be more especially dealt with in the article LOUISVILLE, DIOCESE OF) was a remarkably early development of new religious congregations in the old Diocese of Bardstown. In Marion County, the Sisterhood of Loretto, founded in 1812 as "Friends of Mary," the Root of the Cross, in Nelson County, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, founded in the same year, were almost, if not quite, the earliest religious institutes to originate in the United States (see Loretto, Sisters of; Nazareth, Sisters of Charity of). Of the older institutes of women, the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic have been established in Kentucky since 1822; the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, since 1842; Ursuline Nuns, since 1858; Benedictine Nuns, since 1859; Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, since 1860; Visitandines, since 1864; Sisters of Mercy, since 1867; Little Sisters of the Poor, since 1869; the Sisters of Notre Dame and others have come in more recently. Among the religious orders of men, the Order of Preachers found their first home in the United States near Springfield, Washington County, Kentucky (St. Rose of Lima, 1806), where they are still flourishing; the Trappists founded their famous Abbey of Gethsemani (q. v.), in Nelson County, in 1843; the Franciscans took charge of the parish of St. Boniface, Louisville, in 1849; the Benedictines came to Covington in 1858. Other male religious orders in Kentucky are the Passionists, Xaverian Brothers, Brothers of Mary, and Fathers of the Resurrection. The total Catholic population of the state is estimated at 189,854, about three-fourths of that number (which includes upwards of 4000 coloured Catholics) being in the Diocese of Louisville.

Legislation Directly Affecting Religion.—The Bill of Rights of the Constitution of Kentucky guarantees to all citizens the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience, and it also provides that no public funds raised for educational purposes shall be used in the aid of any church, or sectarian or denominational school. It is further provided by statute that no sectarian, infidel, or immoral publications shall be used or distributed in the common schools of the state; nor shall any sectarian, infidel, or immoral doctrine be taught therein. The court of last resort in Kentucky, in construing these provisions of the Constitution and Statute of the State, declared (Graded School, 120 Ky. 608); held that they are not violated by reading verses from the King James Version of the Bible, without note or comment, nor by the recital of the following prayer: "Our Father who art in heaven we ask Thy aid in our day's work. Give us wisdom and strength to do all our duties, so that if we should be taught, may teacher and pupil have mutual love and respect. Watch over these children both in the schoolroom and on the playground. Keep them from being hurt in any way, and at last when we come to die may none of our number be missing around Thy throne. These things as we ask in Christ's name." The laws of the state provide that no work or business shall be done on Sunday except the ordinary household offices or other work of necessity or charity, or work required in the operation of a ferry, skiff, steamboat, or steam or street railway. But persons who belong to a religious society which observes some other day than Sunday are not liable for the penalties provided in this act if they actually observe as a Sabbath one day in each seven. There are specific enactments penalizing the sale of liquor, barbering, pool and billiard playing, and hunting. The enforcement of the law is the work of the county officers, particularly in the cities. So also with reference to the sale of liquor on Sunday. In some of the cities this law is not enforced at all, in others some effort is made towards its enforcement, and in some places it is rigidly enforced. The law provides that if any proceeding is directed by any person to be done on a particular day of the month, and that day happens to fall on Sunday, the proceeding shall be had, or the act done, on the following day.

Oaths may be administered by any judge of a court, notary public, clerk of a court, examiner, master commissioner, and justices of the peace of the circuit or county. Persons refusing for conscientious reasons to take an oath may affirm. The oath is ordinarily administered by the officer and the person to be sworn, both raising their right hands, the officer repeating the oath and the person responding: I do. Testimony taken out of the state, to be used in proceedings in the courts of the state, may be taken before a commissioner appointed by the governor or by any other person empowered by commission directed to him by consent of the parties, or by order of a court; or before the judge of a court, justice of the peace, mayor of a city, or a notary public. Any person profanely cursing or swearing is liable to a fine of one dollar for each offense, and every oath is deemed a separate offense. If the offense is committed in the presence of a court of record or justice of the peace, the said court or justice may instantly,
without further proof, inflict the penalty. Instances of the enforcement of this law are very rare.

There is no law providing for prayer at the sessions of the Legislature, but it is the custom to open the daily session of both branches of the general assembly with prayer. The ministers of the various denominations representing the churches of the capital city are invited without prejudice or partiality. The Catholic priest takes his turn with the others.

The legal holidays recognized by law are Christmas and New Year’s Day. Other legal holidays are Washington’s Birthday, Decoration Day (30 May), Independence Day, Labor Day (first Monday in September), and all days specially designated by the President of the United States or the governor of the state.

No clergyman or priest, without the consent of the person confessing, is permitted to testify concerning any confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the Church to which he belongs.

Any number of persons may associate to form a corporation, having no capital stock, for religious, charitable or educational purposes. Incorporation may be effected by the persons concerned filing articles of incorporation with the Secretary of State, and having the same recorded in the county court of the county where the corporation intends to conduct its business. Corporations must be organized as the proposed corporation, the object for which it is organized, and such other facts as the incorporators deem proper to mention. Such corporations have the right to contract and be contracted to, sue and be sued, to have and use a common seal, and to receive and hold property. They are not subject to the general laws relating to corporations, except that they must designate an agent upon whom service of process may be had, and that they are at all times subject to visitation by the Legislature.

Places actually used for religious worship, with the grounds attached thereto, not exceeding one-half acre in cities and towns, and not exceeding two acres in the country; places of burial not held for profit; institutions of purely public charity and institutions of education not used or employed for gain; all parsonages and residences owned by any religious society and occupied by the minister of any religious denomination, with not exceeding one-half acre in the city, and two acres in the country, are exempt from taxation. This constitutional provision has been construed as to bring within its meaning seminaries for the education of youth, to meet the minister, even though its management is denominational. So also other educational institutions under similar control, even though tuition is charged. Property of the Young Men’s Christian Association is also held exempt under this provision of the Constitution, so also orphan asylums and homes for sick, indigent, and homeless persons are held exempt, even though they are denominational and controlled; provided they are not operated for gain. The expression “purely public charity” used in the Constitution, has been defined by the Court of Appeals of Kentucky as meaning a charity which performs in whole or in part a duty which the Commonwealth owes to the sick, indigent, homeless, and helpless. All institutions, therefore, which aid the state in the performance of this duty are exempt from taxation. These exemptions, however, do not apply to local assessments for street-improvements, against which there is no exemption provided by law.

Clergymen are not required to serve on petit juries, though they may do so. But there is no such exemption from service on grand juries. Militia service in actual practice is, of course, purely voluntary, but clergymen are not exempt in the event of enforced enlistment.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage is prohibited and void (1) when either party is an idiot or a lunatic; (2) when either of the parties has a husband or wife living in undivorce; (3) when not contracted in the presence of an authorized person or persons; (4) however, that if the person attempting to perform the marriage ceremony had no authority, and yet either of the parties believed he had such authority, and the marriage is consummated under that belief, it will be valid; (5) when at the time of the marriage the male is under fourteen and the female under twelve years of age; (6) when one person is white and the other is a negro. A man is not permitted to marry his mother, grandmother, sister, or grandchild, nor the widow or divorced wife of his father, grandfather, son, or grandson, nor the daughter, granddaughter, mother, or grandmother of his wife, nor the daughter or granddaughter of his brother or sister, nor the sister of his father or mother. A woman cannot marry her father, grandfather, brother, son, or grandson; nor the widower or divorced husband of her mother, grandmother, daughter, or granddaughter; nor the son, grandson, father, or grandfather of her husband; nor the son or grandson of her brother or sister, or the brother of her father or mother. All marriages coming within any of the above-mentioned degrees of relationship are void. If, however, a marriage is valid where contracted it will be recognized as valid in Kentucky solemnized by the priest of any denomination in regular communion with any religious society, who has obtained a licence for that purpose from the county court of the county of his residence. The county judge and such justices of the peace as the county court may authorize may solemnize marriage, or it may be solemnized by consent given in the presence of a religious society having no officiating minister, where either party is a member of such religious society, and the ceremony is in conformity with the usage prevailing in such society.

Judgments in divorce cases are entered without the intervention of a jury. Courts of general equity jurisdiction hear and determine all such actions. Divorce may be granted for the following reasons: To both parties; first, for such impotency or malformation as prevents sexual intercourse; second, living apart without cohabitation for five consecutive years next to the marriage; third, for the action of the party in fault; first, abandonment for one year; second, living in adultery; third, condemnation for felony; fourth, the existence of some loathsome disease; fifth, force, fraud, or duress in obtaining the marriage; sixth, union with a religious society which forbids husband or wife cohabiting, or the marriage, or the wife when not in like fault; first, on account of a confirmed habit of drunkenness accompanied with a wasting of his estate and failure to suitably provide for his family; second, habitually behaving towards his wife, for a period of not less than six months, in a cruel manner; third, such cruel beating or attempted beating or injury as indicates an outrageous temper and probable danger to the wife.—To the husband: first, where the wife is pregnant by another man at the time of marriage; second, when not in like fault, habitual drunkenness on the part of the wife for not less than one year; third, adultery or such lewd or lascivious behavior as indicates unchastity. Divorced persons may marry again, but only one divorce shall be granted the same person, except where adultery or any of the grounds for which divorce may be granted to both parties is charged. Divorce from bed and board may be granted for any other cause deemed sufficient by the court. An absolute divorce restores to the parties all property obtained from the other either before or during marriage in consideration thereof. The custody of children is determined by the chancellor from the proof in the case.
Sale of Intoxicants.—Under the operation of local-option laws, 96 of the 119 counties of the state have voted out liquor. The larger cities, however, are not affected by these laws. It is forbidden to ship liquor into local option territory, but this law is generally not enforced. There has been no case involving transportation from points outside the state.

Wills and Testaments.—Every person more than twenty-one years of age may dispose of his or her estate by will. Wills are required to be attested by two subscribing witnesses unless wholly written and signed in persons. There is no intestate succession upon charitable bequest, but the State imposes a tax of 5 per cent upon all bequests over $500, including those for charitable purposes, except where made to husband or wife, father or mother, child or children or their lineal descendants, or the husband or wife of a daughter or son.

Cemeteries.—All cemeteries not conducted for profit are exempt from taxation. The directors or trustees of incorporated cemeteries are required by law to make a full and complete report of the financial condition of the association to the stock-holders and lot-owners. Severe penalties are provided for unlawfully disturbing graves or monuments.

WEBB, The Centenary of Catholicism in Kentucky (Louisville, 1884); COLLINS, Historical Sketches of Kentucky (Louisville, 1857); ALLEN, History of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (Louisville, 1834); MARSHALL, History of Kentucky (Frankfort, 1824); DURRITT, The Centenary of Kentucky (Louisville, 1892).

FRANK M. TRACY.

KEON, MILES GERALD, journalist, novelist, colonial secretary, lecturer, last descendent of the Keons, of Keonbrooke, County Leitrim, Ireland; b. 20 February, 1821; d. at Bermuda, 3 June, 1875. He was the only son of Myles Gerald Keon, barrister, and on his mother's side was descended from the Falons of Runnymede, County Roscommon. Both parents dying in his infancy, Keon was left to the care of his maternal grandmother and, later, to that of his uncle, Francis Philip, Count Magswy. He studied at the Jesuit college at Stonyhurst, where he wrote the prize poem on Queen Victoria's accession (Stonyhurst Magazine, no. 32). An adventurous pedestrian tour across the Continent followed graduation, terminating in a brief service in the French army in Algeria. On his return to Bermuda he studied law at Gray's Inn, London, and was called to the Bar. In 1843 he published "The Irish Revolution, or What can the Repealers do? And what shall be the New Constitution?" ("Tablet", IV, 532), and, in 1845, a vindication of the Jesuits (Oxford and Cambridge Review, September, 1845), a controversial article that provoked more than passing interest. The results of his pedestrian tour and military service were apparent in a series of contributions to Colburn's "United Service Magazine" (from September, 1845, to October, 1846). For a few months in 1846 he became editor of "Dolman's Magazine" at Forest Hall. In November of that year, married Anne de la Pierre, daughter of an English army officer. In 1847 appeared his "Life of Saint Alexis, the Roman Patrician". For the next twelve years he served on the staff of the "Morning Post", becoming its representative at St. Petersburg in 1850. In 1852 his first novel, "Harding the Money-Spinner", appeared, serially, in the "London Journal", but in 1856, on the occasion of the coronation of Alexander II, he was again at St. Petersburg representing the "Morning Post". It was on this occasion that he met Boucher de Perthes, in whose reminiscences Keon is pleasantly appreciated. He returned in 1859 from Calcutta, where he had been sent "under government" to edit the "Bengal Hurkuru", he was appointed colonial secretary at Bermuda, a position which he held until his death. In 1866 appeared "Dion and the Sibyls, a romance of the First Century". The year following, at Mechanics' Hall, Hamilton, he gave a course of lectures on "Government, its Source, its Form, and its Means", declining, subsequently to lecture in the United States on account of his official position. He attended the opening of the Council of the Vatican at Rome in 1869.


JARVIS KELLEY.

Kerkuk, Diocese of (Chechennia), is a Chaldean Uniat diocese. The ancient name of the city was Karka of Bel-Slok, in the Bel-Garmel, a province of the Persian Empire. Christianity flourished there very early. In 318 two brothers, Adurpawa and Mihrarsis, with their sister Mahdoukht, were martyred there. In the fifth century, under King Yezdegid II (439–57), the "History of the city of Bel-Slok, makes mention of hundreds and thousands of martyrs slain in this city (Moseinger, "Monumenta Syriacae", II). Mention may also be made of a bishop, Mara, in the fourth century, with six nuns: Thekla, Danak, Tatou, etc.; the Bishop St. Isaac, in the fifth century; St. Sirina, in 559; etc. The "Synodicon Orientale" (Paris, 1905, 674) mentions nine metropolitans of Bel-Slok and 132 bishops or bishops of various cities, 410 and 612. Lequien (Oriens Christ., II, 1331) speaks of others, many of whom were Catholics. At the beginning of the nineteenth century a number of Nestorians recognized the authority of the pope, who created for them the Diocese of Kerkuk. At present it contains 6000 Catholics, 15 stations, 16 churches and chapels, 22 native priests, and 5 primary schools. The city of Kerkuk itself, which has 30,000 inhabitants and constitutes a sanjak in the vilayet of Mosul, contains only about 300 or 400 Catholics, the remainder of the inhabitants being Mussulmans, Jews, or Nestorians.


S. VALHÉ.

KERNAN, FRANCIS, lawyer, statesman, born in Steuben County, New York, 14 January, 1816; d. at Utica, New York, 7 September, 1892; son of General William Kernan, who came to America from County Cavan, Ireland, in 1799, and Mary Ann Stubs, his wife. He attended Georgetown College, D. C., from 1833 to 1836, studied law in Utica, N. Y., in the office of Joshua A. Spencer, and later became his partner. He won fame as an advocate of ability, especially in legal conflict with such leaders of the bar as Denio, Jenkins, Beardsley, Doolittle, Hunt, and Conkling. His rank in his profession was well summed up by Judge Martin Grover, as being without a superior as an all-round lawyer at the bar of New York State. In dress, manner, decision, learning, and unassuming dignity of bearing and geniality, he was a very type of the old school of the bar.

Kernan's political services to his country covered a wide range. He was school commissioner of Utica, manager of the New York State Hospital, official reporter of the Court of Appeals from 1854 to 1857, member of the Constitutional Convention of 1867, regent of the University of the State of New York from 1870 to his death, member of Assembly from 1860 to 1862, member of the House of Representatives from 1863 to 1865, United States Senator from 1876 to 1882. In all these positions he was conspicuous for ability, fidelity to his convictions, zeal in their defense, and, being an able and skilled debater, he spoke extemporaneously, with clearness, vigour, and feeling, and to the point; his speeches were models of clear and convincing statement and analysis. He
numbered among his friends Abraham Lincoln, Horatio Seymour, Samuel J. Tilden, Thomas F. Bayard, Grover Cleveland, and other distinguished Americans, and to counsel and advice were often sought by them. Both as a member of the New York Assembly and as a congressman, he was a “War Democrat”. In Congress he rendered important service as a member of the judiciary committee, and was thoroughly in accord with the national government and its policy to maintain the integrity of the Union. He showed so decided a spirit of justice and moderation that he was often consulted by President Lincoln on matters pertaining to the conduct of the war.

In July, 1876, at the St. Louis convention, Senator Kerr was nominated for the presidency. In the Democratic convention of 1884, held at Chicago, he was not a delegate, but he was present at the special request of the leaders of his party and was one of the most efficient advocates, outside of the convention, for the nomination of Grover Cleveland. In the disastrous Democratic campaign of 1872, he was a candidate for governor against John A. Dix. He was a devout and practical Catholic, frequently assisting at Mass and approaching the sacraments. He represented Georgetown College at the Catholic Congress of laymen at Baltimore in 1889, and delivered a memorable address on that occasion. In charity he gave much, considering his means, as he was never a very wealthy man, to his church and to charitable institutions; and his legal advice was often freely given to the clergy and to his Alma Mater, Georgetown College, which bestowed upon him the degree of Doctor of Laws.

Kerr’s home life was very happy. In 1843 he married Mary A. Devereux, daughter of Nicholas Devereux, of Utica, who was one of the principal founders and benefactors of the Catholic Church and its charitable institutions in Central and Western New York. He brought up a family of ten children and was a great home-lover, with no fondness for the thought of a round-the-world club life. He was fond of reading of an innocent game of cards, and was a fine conversationalist. Occasionally, but not often, he attended dinners and receptions in Washington and Utica. Duty, not pleasure, was his watchword. He often worked in his hotel at night over lawsuits and congressional speeches. In person he was tall, had a good figure, and an attractive, intellectual face. Without pretense or sham, he was one of nature’s gentlemen. His old age was calm, genial, peaceful, and contented. He served his country and his Church to the best of his ability and was a shining example of what a Catholic lawyer and statesman should be.

Thomas P. Kernan.

Kerry and Aghadoe, Diocese of (Kerriensis et Aghadoensis), suffragan of Cashel, Ireland, is sixty-six miles in length, and sixty-one in breadth, containing 1,600,000 acres, and extending over the whole County of Kerry and a portion of that of Cork; in 1901 the Catholic population was 187,346. This diocese, in its actual condition, was constituted by the union of two very ancient sees—Ardert and Aghadoe, but the precise date of this incorporation cannot now be definitely ascertained. All we know is that it had taken place before the Synod of Rathbramail (1110); for it was there proposed and sanctioned that the see of the then united Diocese of Ardfert and Aghadoe should be transferred to Tralee. Our ecclesiastical historians give a detailed account of the various journeys of St. Patrick, who, though visiting the neighbouring County of Limerick, never set foot in Kerry, being content (as the ancient chroniclers say) with giving this remote corner of Ireland his blessing, while abstaining from the vantage point of West Limerick and viewing the lofty mountains and vast bogs of ancient Kerry. Nevertheless, we know from many sources that Christianity was introduced here at a very early period. This fact is attested not merely by the annalists, but also by the many monuments of great antiquity and Christian character which still exist in various districts of the diocese. The first bishop whom we find mentioned in connexion with the history of Kerry, was named Erc, and there can be no reasonable doubt that this bishop was St. Erc of Slane, who died according to the Annals of Ulster in 532. He exercised an episcopal jurisdiction in the county before the birth of St. Brendan, and, from what we read about his relations with that saint, must have resided there almost continuously for several years afterwards. It is very probable he came to Kerry soon after the mission of St. Benignus, who was sent by St. Patrick in 450 to preach to the tribes of West Munster, and “to unite them to the Church by the saving waters of baptism.” This visit of St. Benignus was comparatively short, for he was called away to North Clare and Connaught, where his apostolic labours may have been more urgently needed. To complete, however, the conversion of Kerry thus auspiciously begun by Erc, one of his most zealous and devoted bishops, St. Erc, who had spiritual charge not only of Kerry, but also of a wide range of south-west Limerick, in the heart of which lay the convent of St. Ita at Killeedy, over which he seems to have had jurisdiction. He was the special friend of St. Brendan, the patron of Kerry, whose feast is celebrated on 16 May. There is not among the ancient saints of Erin a more interesting figure than this patron of Kerry. His travels by land, and still more his voyages by sea, have made him famous from the earliest times. Very ancient manuscript copies of his famous seven years’ voyage in the Atlantic Ocean are found in several European libraries, while his romantic career was a favourite theme with the poets and romancers of medieval Europe. (See Brendan, St.)

The other ancient see included in the modern Diocese of Kerry, is that of Aghadoe. Another native saint, Finan Cam, was the first to build a church at Aghadoe, which in after times became the see of a bishop. It was this saint also who founded the famous monastery and school of Innisfallen, a lovely island in the Lower Lake of Killarney. It is said there that one of the greatest of Ireland’s kings was educated—Brian Boru, who destroyed the power of the Danes at Clontarf in 1014, while his distinguished professor, Maelseathin O’Carroll, was most probably the original compiler of the famous Annals of Innisfallen. The principal copy of this valuable work is
preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. It begins with a general history of the great empires of the world dating to A. D. 450. The remainder, and the most valuable portion of the page, consists of an abridgment of an old Irish manuscript, containing a brief chronicle of Ireland to 1319. This monastery, owing to its situation, escaped the ravages of the Danes, who had worked such ruin on other churches in Kerry. Unfortunately, there are few records of the early bishops either of Ardfert or Aghadoe previous to the Norman invasion in the twelfth century. All we know is, each had its distinct succession of bishops, and each cathedral had its separate chapter. But these, in the days of persecution, were allowed to lapse. The chapter of Kerry was re-established by Brief of His Holiness, Pius IX, in 1853. Owing to persecution, and the want of a resident clergy in the country, this archdiocese had no bishops from 1610 to 1641, and again from 1653 to 1703, being governed during both these periods by vicars Apostolic. From this latter date there has been no interruption in the episcopal succession. Many of its bishops have been men of distinction. We may mention Dr. Richard O'Connell (1641–1653), who at a very trying time successfully resisted the determined attacks of heresy on the faith of the people. In modern times Kerry had Dr. David Moriarty (1856–1877), a most accomplished pulpit orator, and Dr. Daniel McCarthy (1878–1881), professor at the College of Maynooth and author of valuable works on Sacred Scripture. The religious orders were introduced into the diocese chiefly through the piety and zeal of some of the ancient lords of the county. The Franciscans came to Ardfert in 1523, to Muckross in 1440, and to Lislaughtin in 1464. The Dominican convent in Tralee was founded in 1213. The Cistercians built the Abbey of Kyrie Eleison in Ordoney in 1154, while at a much earlier period religious communities existed at Killagha in the parish of Kilcolean, at Derrinane, at Ratoo, etc. During the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth all these religious establishments were destroyed, the priests were expelled, while their property was confiscated. The successful career of Cromwell and his lieutenants had a still more disastrous effect on the religious condition of this remote see in southwest Munster. In modern times there has been a similar development. Though finer and more elaborate cathedrals, and the parochial churches throughout the diocese, were utterly ruined in days of persecution, there has been a complete restoration from the wreck and disaster of those sad times. The Dominicans are again established in Tralee, while the Franciscans flourished in the last century and are still in Muckross, not far away. The parish churches, which were mostly thatched cabins not so long ago, are now magnificent stone structures raised throughout the zeal and energy of a faithful priesthood, aided by the generosity and religious spirit of the laity of the county. The ancient cathedrals of Ardfert and Aghadoe are now in ruins, but the modern cathedral of Kerry, canonically erected in the ancient parish of Aghadoe by special Brief dated 18 May, 1858, surpasses even old Ardfert—still magnificent, though in ruins. It was designed by Pugin and was begun under Bishop Egan in 1840. For over fifty years it remained in an unfinished state, but the present occupant of the See of Kerry and Aghadoe, Most Rev. Dr. John Mangan, has with characteristic energy undertaken the completion of this magnificent structure according to the original designs of its celebrated architect. Mangan was born in the parish of Listowel in 1843, and was educated at Killarney and Maynooth, where he won the highest academic distinctions. His missionary life in Kerry was mainly spent in the parishes of Glenariff and Kenmare, which, owing to their extent, always demanded great labour on the part of their pastor. As a reward for his energy and zeal, he was appointed archdeacon of Aghadoe, parish priest of Kenmare, and vicar-general of the diocese in 1901. He was raised to the episcopate, 21 July, 1904. This diocese consists of 51 parishes, has 49 priests, 22 assistant ministers, and 69 curates. It has 99 churches, 2 friaries, 5 monasteries, and 17 convents.


DENIS O'CONNOR.

Kerressenbrooch (Kerressenbroek), Hermann von, teacher and historian, b. at Münster, in the Duchy of Pommern, d. at Osnabrück, 5 July, 1558. He attended school first at Paderborn, and after 1533 at Münster until his parents were banished from that city by the Anabaptists. He completed his studies at Cologne, where, in 1541, he received his degree of Bachelor of Philosophy and the Liberal Arts. In 1545 he left Cologne to teach in a superior school, probably at Düsseldorf, after which he was rector at Hamm (1548–50), and head of the Pauline Gymnasium at Münster, which had formerly held a high reputation. After twenty-five years of fruitful activity there, he was chiefliey dependent on the means contributed from the parents of their pupils. A still extant programme of studies of the Pauline Gymnasium for the year 1551, entitled "Ratio studiorum scholae Monasteriiensis secundi" (in Driver, "Bibliotheca Monasteriensia", Münster, 1793, I, 265–72), shows that as teacher he laid great stress on grammar, especially in Latin and Greek, advocating also the study of Hebrew, but utterly disregarding the exact and historical sciences (Reulien). He required a high degree of skill in the preparation of written work, and careful and constant practice in oral recitation. Pupils were expected to be the most exact master, while as a practical organizer of the school system he was received everywhere with open arms. But while in his capacity of teacher he was held in high repute, as historian he suffered much unpleasantness and even persecution; his literary work had a strong influence on his career, as the cause, as it was, of his frequent change of habitation. His first known work, written while he was at Cologne, was a poem in metric hexameters, "Brevis descripition bellii Monasteriensis contra anabaptistica monstra gesti", skilful in workmanship, but of slight importance. His principal work deals with the same subject, "Historia Anabaptistarum Monasteriensium", as might be expected from a humanist it is embellished with rhetorical flourishes which produce at times an unpleasant effect. It was written on a broad scale, forming a history of the whole city from 1524 to 1554. The author claims that his data in the period of formation, in addition to the accounts of many eyewitnesses, is his own experiences, which placed him in a position to give a complete picture of the bloody disturbances of these times. He lacked, however, the essential qualifications of an historian, the critical faculty and impartial judgment, so that the work, written at the instance and with the assistance of the cathedral chapter, was in
parts most biased, to the prejudice of the municipal authorities and the patricians. Their anger being roused, they compelled him to retract several passages as being erroneous, to destroy his manuscript, and to promise on oath to write no more books. This work was published in 1730 at Leipzig by Mencke in "Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum," vol. III, and in a German translation at Frankfurt in 1771 under the title "Geschichte der Wiedererwachenen Kaiserlichen Hanseat. Niederlande". A revised edition was published without a revised edition: "Hermann a Kerssenbroch anabaptistus fiorus Monasterium incitam Westphaliam metropolim evetentis historia narratio" (Münster, 1899), parts of it being extremely instructive. The Kerssenbroch's position in Münster having become insecure, he went to Paderborn, and while there, in spite of his oath, he published "Catalogus episcoporum paderbonensium eorumque acta" (Lemgo, 1578), availing himself of Gobelinus Persona and others. The open violation of his oath lost him the respect of many friends, and forced him to leave Paderborn. At Werd he prepared a vindication, which, however, was never printed, "Causa cum capitatis M. Hermann a Kerssenbroch succincta narratio cum earunadem vera et solida confectione". To revenge himself upon his enemies, he resorted to a means which imperilled his life; he wrote a biting satire on the "Protestants", to which his opponents sent a delegation to Werd to call him to account for perjury and breaking his oath, and his only safety lay in flight.


PATRICKUS SCHLAGER.

Kervyn de Lettenhove, JOSEPH-BRANCO-CONSTANTIN, Baron, Belgian statesman and historian, b. at Saint-Michel-lez-Bruges, 17 August, 1817; d. there, 3 April, 1891. He entered very early on a political career, and in 1861 was sent to the Chamber of Representatives by the district of Ezeloo. He took an active part in most parliamentary debates on foreign affairs and public instruction, and in 1870 upon the accession of his party, the Constitutional Catholics, he received the portfolio of the Interior. His ministerial career, however, was short-lived; he made the mistake of appointing to the government of Limburg P. de Decker, a former minister, whose name had been connected with financial failure (see BELGIUM), and was compelled to resign. He remained in the Chamber of Representatives, but gradually withdrew from politics and devoted his time to historical researches. He had already won some fame in that field: in 1856 the French Academy had crowned his work "Etudes sur les Chroniques de Froyaart". Kervyn travelled extensively in Europe, visiting most libraries and archives of note, gathering data for his historical works, some of which have modified on a number of points the prevailing opinion of his time. His style is grave and somewhat bombastic, while his arguments have been charged, but without sufficient reason, with unfaithfulness to Queen Elizabeth, William the Silent, and Mantix de Sainte Aldegonde. His most important works, besides the one already mentioned, are: "Histoire de Flandre" (Brussels, 1847-90); "Lettres éclairant sur l'université de Comines" (Brussels, 1847); "Chroniques relatives à l'histoire de la Belgique sous la domination des ducs de Bourgogne" (Brussels, 1870-7); "Marie Stuart" (Paris, 1889); "Relations de la Belgique et de l'Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe III" (Brussels, 1882-91).

Kervyn de Lettenhove, Biography, 1 (Bruges, 1880); 2nd ed. (Bruges, 1883); "Kervyn de Lettenhove, Académies de Belgique, 1890; "Bibliografia de Belgique" (Brussels, 1890); "Bibliographie Académique" (Brussels, 1893).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Ketteler, WILHELM EMMANUEL, Baron von, Bishop of Mainz, b. at Münster, in Westphalia, 25 Dec., 1811; d. at Burghausen, 13 July, 1877. He was about to enter the Prussian bureaucracy when, in 1837, the persecution conducted by Prussia against the Archbishop Droste-Vischere of Hildesheim touched Ketteler's religious spirit and led him to resign. In 1841 he studied theology at Munich University, and in 1843 he completed his preparation for the priesthood at the Seminary of Münster. In 1844 he became a curate at Beckum and in 1846 rector of Hopsten in Westphalia. Elected by the District of Teckelburg and Warendorf to the Frankfort Parliament in 1848, Ketteler distinguished himself by his broad and discerning intelligence of the social movements of his time. In the oration which he delivered 21 Sept., 1848, at the funeral of General Auerwald and Prince Trinchnowsky, victims of the great body of the German people from responsibility for the crime. At the Catholic Congress of Mainz (Oct., 1848), one of the first of the great meetings of German Catholics, he offered a toast to "the plain people" and declared that as religion has need of freedom, so has freedom need of religion. Finally, during the year 1848, he preached at Mainz two sermons, on the Catholic theory of property and on the duties of Christian charity, developing the sociology of St. Thomas Aquinas, and demonstrating the manner in which it answered every social need of the times. He became rector of St. Hedwig in Berlin, Oct., 1849, with Bishop Diepenbrock of Bremen, which the task of bringing back to Catholicism the famous Prot-
KETTLEL

estant novelis, Ida von Hahn-Hahn. He reorganized the large St. Hedwig Hospital, and for the first time since the Reformation led a Corpus Christi procession through the streets of Berlin.

In 1849 the nomination of Professor Schmid as bishop by the canons of Mainz was rejected by Pius IX, to whom Schmid's views were justly an object of suspicion. The chapter after some opposition proposed three names to Pius IX, among them Ketteler's, and on 15 March, 1850, the pope named him bishop of that see. The circumstances of his nomination and its acceptance by the grand-ducal Government of Hesse marked a defeat for the Josephist bureaucracy which for twenty-five years had tyrannized over the Church in all the small states of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine. Ketteler immediately inflicted two more defeats upon them. In 1851 the theological seminary of Mainz and thereby freed his clergy from the influence of the theological faculty of Giessen, where the State had hitherto required Catholic seminarians to study; moreover he called a "concordat" for some vacant rectories without asking the permission of the State. Through his institution of diocesan conferences and the introduction of numerous male and female congregations, Mainz became a model diocese. The Brothers of St. Joseph and the Sisters of Providence, two orders founded by Ketteler, were destined to a larger growth. As to the relations between the Church and the State in the Grand Duchy of Hesse, they rested chiefly on the good understanding between Ketteler and Dalwigk, the minister. Their written agreement (1854) was not approved by Rome. They preferred that all the bishops of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine should act as a unit in their struggle against the legislation which the smaller German states were seeking to impose on all of them. The new agreement, which, after a visit to Rome, Ketteler negotiated with Dalwigk (1856), was sent to Rome by the bishop for approval, but was never returned. Until 1870 religious peace was maintained in Hesse through the harmonious relations between the bishop and the minister.

Religious Conflicts in Baden.—Ketteler played a very active part in the difficulties which broke out between the Baden government and Archbishop Vicari. He published a brochure defending the latter, and a visit of Ketteler's to Carlshagen, in January, 1854, almost brought about an understanding between Vicari and the Prince Regent of Baden. Bismarck, however, then Prussia's plenipotentiary at Frankfort, exercised such a strong influence over the Baden ministry that the attempted reconciliation failed. In 1865, when the opposition of the Catholics to the Baden school law caused a severe persecution, Ketteler invoked the intervention of Emperor Francis Joseph, and in two pamphlets refuted the formula of Lamen, according to which "law was the public conscience superior to private consciences." After Archbishop Vicari's death (1868) it was again Ketteler who defended against Minister Jolly the electoral right of the Freiburg canons. At Ketteler's suggestion, on the occasion of the eleventh centenary of St. Boniface, were inaugurated the conferences of German bishops; since then they have grown more frequent and are almost nominal since 1869. In this way Ketteler was the chief promoter of an institution which for the past forty years has greatly aided the cohesion and strength of the German episcopate. During 1864—66 his name was mentioned for the archbishopric of Posen or Cologne, and Bismarck seemed for a moment to favour the nomination.

Ketteler as a Social Reformer.—Ketteler thought that he was not exceeding his rights as a bishop when he spoke authoritatively on social questions. In 1848 he believed that social reform had to begin with the interior regeneration of the soul. Later he was to enter more deeply into economical problems. When, about 1853, the Liberal Congress was the Socialists Lassalle made forcible appeals to the German workmen, Ketteler studied their doctrines and even consulted Lassalle in an anonymous letter on a scheme of founding five small co-operative associations of workmen.

The Labour Question and Christianity.—In a book published in 1864, "The Labour Question and Christianity", he adopted Lassalle's criticism of the modern treatment of labour, and admitted the reality of an insurmountable law. In opposition to Schule-Delitsch he pointed out the futility of the remedies proposed by the Liberals, he condemned the class distinctions, and even accepted the idea of co-operative unions to be established, not as Lassalle wished, by state subvention, but by generous aid from Christian capitalists. In a Socialist meeting at Rondsorf, 23 May, 1864, Lassalle paid homage to Ketteler's book. On his side, Ketteler, the Catholic workmen had asked in 1866 if they could conscientiously join the "workingmen's association" founded by Lassalle, was disposed to dissuade them from so doing, owing to the anti-religious spirit of Lassalle's successors; nevertheless in his reply he duly acknowledged Lassalle's "respectful recognition of the depth and truth of Christianity". At this time he counted particularly upon the initiative of Christian charity for the organization of productive co-operative associations destined to restore social justice on a more equal scale. In 1869 he went still further: in a sermon preached near Offenbach, 25 July of that year, he particularised certain reforms, where the "hours of labour, prohibition of child-labour in factories, prohibition of women's and young girls' labour"; these claims, he thought, should be presented to the public authorities. In Sept., 1869, at the Fulda conference of the German bishops, he showed how necessary for the Church's work was the intervention of the Church in the name of faith, morals, and charity. He also made clear the right of workingmen to legal protection and urged that in every diocese some priests should be selected to make a study of economic questions. This Fulda discourse of Ketteler brought the Church of Germany into closer relations with the new social activity; on the other hand, his programme for protection of labour, taken up again in 1873 in his pamphlet on "Catholics in the German Empire", long served the German Centre as a basis for their social claims.

Doctrinal Controversies: The Vatican Council.—Though not professionally a theologian, Ketteler made his influence felt in the various doctrinal controversies of his time. In his "Liberty, Authority, and Church" (1862) he took a stand on the question of Liberalism, and set forth the Christian attitude towards the various meanings of the word liberty. "School" which Ketteler published in his seminary at Mainz, and whose chief representatives were Moufang and Heinrich, was noted for its adherence to Scholastic theology and its hostility to the anti-Roman tendencies of "Germanism" and "German Science.
represented by Döllinger and the Munich School. The former urged with much tenacity the theological seminaries, as preferable to theological faculties in the universities, for the education of the Catholic clergy, and earnestly strove, since 1862, for the establishment of that free Catholic university in Germany which is yet a desideratum. Despite this firm attitude, Ketteler had great intellectual influence, and contributed a theological viewpoint to what he had been told. He built a garrison in Munich under the pseudonym of "Guirius." He circulated in the council a pamphlet of the Jesuit Quarella, which in some respects seemed to militate against the doctrine of infallibility, but he did not personally accept all the theories of this work. It was he who suggested the petition of May, 1870, in which a number of bishops demanded that the eleven chapters of the "Schema" on the Church be taken up before entering on the discussion of infallibility. On 23 May he declared in a plenary meeting that he had always believed in papal infallibility, but he asked whether the theological proofs put forward sufficed to justify its dogmatic definition. He was not present at the final vote and left Rome after a written declaration that he submitted beforehand to the decision of the council. In September, 1870, he signed, with other German bishops, the Heilige Gements in favour of the newly defined dogma.

Ketteler and German Unity.—The political changes that took place in Germany, and the indirect effect they might have upon Catholic interests, were a source of much anxiety to him. When Austria's defeat (1866) filled the Catholics of Germany with consternation, and proved that the dream of an Austrian Germany was quite over, Ketteler tried to revive their courage in his "Germany after the War of 1866." He advised them to meet halfway the coming changes, and to let no one surpass them in their love of the German Fatherland. On the other hand, he sought Prussia not to be misled by those who would make her an instrument of Protestantism or of certain philosophical theories, and urged the respect of all existing political and social autonomies.

After the establishment of German unity (1870-71), Ketteler's chief concern was to obtain for German Catholics in the new empire such liberties and guarantees as the Constitution granted them in Prussia. This much he demanded in a letter to Bismarck (1 Oct., 1870), also during a visit he paid him in the spring of 1871, and in a speech in the Reichstag (3 April, 1871), where he served as a deputy from the Bielefeld constituents of Waldm.-Lancken. On the National Liberal party, on the contrary, urged the new empire towards religious persecution. Ketteler conferred once more with Bismarck, on 16 March, 1871, again pleaded with him for the Catholics, and then, on 14 March, 1872, resigned his seat in the German Parliament. He kept in touch, however, with religious politics, and wrote important pamphlets against the Prussian Kulturkampf, also against the papal measures by the French Liberals, yet influential with Dalwigk's successors, were inaugurating in Hesse. During the Kulturkampf his share in the Fulda episcopal conferences was often predominant. He and Archbishop Melchers of Cologne were potent in the decision passed in 1873 urging the bishop and the State to oppose the Roman Laws by absolute passive resistance, and, on the other hand, advocating a conciliatory attitude towards the Prussian law on the administration of church property. In 1873 he views on the rights of Christianity and of a bishop led him to enter the broader political field in his book on "The Catholics in the German Empire" in which he drew up a plan for the establishment of an effective connection between the Church and the State. He corresponded frequently the Liberalism of 1848, sincerely respectful of religious belief, with the "National Liberalism" of Bismarckian Germany, the old German idea of local autonomy with the idea of centralization borrowed from France. He hated in Bismarckian Germany the spread of political absolutism quite as in modern industrialism he hated the development of capitalist absolutism. The spirit of initiative which characterized this bishop is well set forth in a letter written 6 May, 1870, to Haffner, future Bishop of Mains: "I am heart and soul attached to the new great institute which the Christian truths will create for all human relations." Of him Windthorst said, in 1890: "We venerate him unanimously as the doctor and leading champion of Catholic social aspirations."
(in Matt., xvi, 19). The promise there made finds its explanation in Isaías, xxii, in which "the key of the house of David" is conferred upon Eliacim, the son of Hilkias, as the symbol of planetary authority in the Kingdom of Judá. Christ by employing this expression clearly designed to signify his intention to confer on St. Peter the supreme authority over His Church. For a consideration of the text in its dogmatic bearing, see Pope; Primacy. In the present article our sole purpose is to give a brief historical account of the meaning attached to the expression by ecclesiastical writers.

I. The Fathers.—(1) In the Fathers the references to the promise of Matt., xvi, 19, are of frequent occurrence. Almost invariably the words of Christ are cited in proof of the Church's power to forgive sins. The application of the symbol of planetary authority in the Kingdom of Judá, for the promise of the keys is immediately followed by the words: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth," etc. Moreover, the power to confer or to withhold forgiveness might well be viewed as the opening and shutting of the gates of heaven. This interpretation, however, restricts the sense somewhat too narrowly; for the remission of sins is but one of the various ways in which ecclesiastical authority is exercised. We have examples of this use of the term in such passages as August., "De Doctrina Christi," xvii, xviii: "Quid liberator et misericordius facere potuit ... nisi ut omnia donaret congregationes, quae mundam instituit Ecclesiam sibi ... ut quoverter in terra soluta essent in ccelo" (How could He [Christ] have shown greater liberality and greater mercy ... than by granting full forgiveness to those who shall turn from their sins ... He gave these keys to His Church, therefore, that whatever it should remit on earth should be remitted also in heaven) (P. L., XXIV, 25; cf. Hilary, "In Matt.", xvi, P. L., IX, 1010).

It is comparatively seldom that the Fathers, when speaking of the power of the keys, make any reference to the supremacy of St. Peter. When they deal with that question, they ordinarily appeal not to the gift of the keys but to his office as the rock on which the Church is founded. In their references to the potestas clariam, they are usually intent on vindicating against the Montanist andNovatian heretics the power inherent in the Church to forgive. Thus St. Augustine in his De Haeresibus, declares that the authority to bind and loose was not a purely personal gift to St. Peter, but was conferred upon him as representing the Church. The whole Church, he urges, exercises the power of forgiving sins. This could not have been the gift been a personal one (tract. I in Joan., n. 12, P. L., XII, 1271; P. Ser. cec. xcv, in P. L., XXXVIII, 1349). From the passage just quoted, the Montanists have drawn the curious conclusion that the power to forgive sins belongs not to the priesthood but to the collective body of Christians (see Cheetham in "Dict. Christ. Antiq."

There is, of course, no suggestion of this meaning. St. Augustine merely signifies that the power to absolve was to be imparted through St. Peter to members of the Church's hierarchy throughout the world. Some few of the Fathers, however, are careful to note that the bestowal of this power upon St. Peter alone, apart from the other Apostles, denoted his primacy among the twelve (Optatus, "De Schism. Don."

17, in P. L., XI, 1087). Origen dilates at length on this point, but teaches erroneously that the power conferred upon the Twelve in Matt., xviii, 18, could only be exercised within certain restrictions of place, while that conferred upon St. Peter in Matt., xvi, 18, was in an universal extent (Comm. in Matt., P. G., XIII, 1179).

(2) Occasionally, though infrequently, Christ's promise is not restricted to signify the power to forgive sins, but is taken in the fuller meaning of the gift of authority over the Church. Thus St. Gregory in his letter to the Emperor Maurice, after quoting Christ's words in Matt., xvi, 18, 19, writes: "Habilis he [Peter] received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power to bind and to loose in the Kingdom of Judá. Christ by employing this expression clearly designed to signify his intention to confer on St. Peter the supreme authority over His Church. For a consideration of the text in its dogmatic bearing, see Pope; Primacy. In the present article our sole purpose is to give a brief historical account of the meaning attached to the expression by ecclesiastical writers.

II. The Scholastics.—By the Scholastic theologians the precise significance of the term was closely analysed. (1) The view which is now universally accepted is exposed at length by Suarez (De Pot., disp. xvi). According to him, the phrase as employed by Christ in His promise to St. Peter denotes the gift of ecclesiastical authority in its widest scope. This authority was to be in a sense peculiar to St. Peter and his successors in the chief pastorate; for they alone were to possess it in its fullness. But it was to be exercised in due measure by the other members of the College of Bishops according to several degrees. Thus understood, the potestas clariam includes (a) the power of order, namely power exercised in regard to sacrifice and sacrifice, (b) the power of jurisdiction, and (c) the power to define in questions of faith and morals. The various powers were conferred upon the Church were held to belong either to the clavis potestiae or to the clavis scientiae, the latter of these two being understood to signify the power to teach, while the other departments of authority pertained to the clavis potestiae. The distinction is, however, a theological refinement, and is not involved in the expression itself. Suárez urges, Christ, when using the plural form, did not intend to indicate that the gift was twofold.

(2) The meaning attached to the term by the older Scholastics was, however, different from this. They followed the patristic tradition, and confined its significance to the judicial authority of the College of Bishops. The power of the keys, St. Thomas tells us (Summa Theol., Supp., Q. xvii, art. 2, ad 1ºm.), is a necessary consequence of the sacerdotal character. It is, in fact, identical in essence with the power to consecrate and to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The one sacerdotal gift is applied to different departments in the different systems; but it appears to be the teaching of Pope John XXII in a well-known passage dealing with this subject (Extravag., tit. xiv, De verborum significatione, c. v, Quia quorumdam). The definition, "Clavis est specialis potestas ligandi et solvendi qua judex ecclesiasticus dignus recipere et indignus excogitare debeat a regno," the keys are a special power of binding and loosing by which the ecclesiastical judge should receive the worthy [into the kingdom of heaven] and exclude the unworthy therefrom, generally accepted in the Scholastic period (Pet. Lomb., "Sent.", IV, dist. xviii, John XXII, loc. cit.; St. Thomas, loc. cit.), might seem indeed to include jurisdiction in the external as well as in the internal forum. But in point of fact it was not so understood. The distinction between the clavis potestiae and the clavis scientiae was employed here. By the clavis scientiae was understood the priestly authority which is not to interrogate the penitent and thus obtain cognizance of the facts of the case; by the clavis potestiae, the authority to grant or refuse absolution.

The view just exposed is inadmissible as an interpretation of Christ's words. For it is plain that He desired to confer by them some special prerogative on
Kharput, Armenian Uniat diocese created in 1850. The city of Kharput, Armenian Karperpet, which means "rocky fortress," is very ancient. Although it was built under the first Armenian kings it has nevertheless no history. It is situated on a mountainside and there are still to be seen the ruined fortress and ancient tower, also well preserved. Because of its height and also owing to its lack of water, Kharput is being by degrees abandoned by its inhabitants, who have preferred to take up their abode in Mezrez, a city about three miles from the plain. The two cities are in constant communication and Kharput still contains 30,000 inhabitants. It is the capital of the vilayet of Mamouret-ul-Aziz recently created. The Armenian Catholic diocese numbers 3000 faithful, 8 parishes, 6 churches, 3 chapels, 14 stations, 14 primary schools, chiefy at Kharput-Mezrez and Malatia. There are about 72,000 Christians throughout the vilayet, which contains about 600,000 inhabitants. The Armenian Protestants have a large American mission at Kharput, which is the headquarters of all those in Armenia.

Extrait de "La Turquie d'Asie, II" (Paris, 1892), 317-357; Missions Catholiques (Rome, 1907), 755.

S. Valié

Khosru (Khosrau). See Persia.

Kiang-nan, Vicariate Apostolic of.-The present vicariate comprises the two provinces of Kiang-siu and Ning-hwei. Its alluvial lands make it, especially Kiang-siu, one of the most populous and best peopled provinces of China. The number of inhabitants of both provinces exceeds 60,000,000. Father Matteo Ricci, S.J., was its first missionary, introducing the Catholic religion into this country at the end of the sixteenth century. He found a powerful aid in the person of the famous Chinese minister, Paul Siu Kwang-ki, whom he met first at Kwang-tung and later at Peking. Baptized in 1603 at Kiang-nan, Paul Siu returned to Shanghai, his native place, and there converted many pagans. In 1607 he took with him from Peking Father Lazzaro Cattaneo, who built a residence and a chapel still to be seen at Shanghai. Returning to Peking, he at first followed the Jesuit Fathers in their disgrace, was restored to favour in 1628, and died in 1633. In 1641 his remains were transferred to Zhi-chou, where they still rest, and his principal establishment of the new mission is in the vicinity of his tomb. The Jesuits Francesco Brancati and Geronimo de Gravina were at this period building the churches of Sung-kiang, Su-chou, Tsang-ming; Father Sambriani, those of Nan-king, Chin-kiang, Yang-chou, Hwai-nan. The mission of Kiang-nan enjoyed peace from 1644 to 1661, during which time there were too few for the work. In 1660 the Vicariate Apostolic of Kiang-nan was created and confided to Bishop Ignazio Cotolendi of the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. During the persecution from 1664 to 1671 twenty Jesuits were exiled to Macao, Father Verbiest at Peking obtaining their release in the latter year. After the death of Kiang-hi, Yung Cheng exiled all the missionaries of the provinces; a few, however, succeeded in hiding themselves and, helped by twelve or fifteen Chinese priests, attended to the wants of the Christians. In 1690 Alexander VIII created the Diocese of Nanking, raising it under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Goa and with authority over the provinces of Kiang-nan and Ho-nan. The first Bishop of Nan-king was Alessandro Ciceri of Milan, a Jesuit, consecrated at Macao on 2 Feb., 1696. His last successor was Gaiatano Pires-Pireis, a Portuguese Lazarist (d. at Peking, 1839). After 1836 the Diocese of Nan-king was governed by Apostolic administrators until 1856, when the episcopal see was abandoned.

In 1736 the mandarins commenced a bloody persecution which lasted a whole century. At Kiang-nan the Father Tristan of Athenburg, who was the last Jesuit to be arrested. The superior of the mission, Father Anthony Joseph Henriches, was pursued and surrendered on 21 Dec., 1747. Both missionaries were strangled at Su-chou 17 Sept., 1748. The process of their beatification is not yet finished. Three Jesuit missionaries followed in Kiang-nan, viz. Fathers Ignatius Peres, Martin Corre, and Godofry of Lening ten hoven, named Bishop of Nan-king on 15 May, 1752, and consecrated at Macao on 22 July, 1756. He remained thirty years at Kiang-nan with two Chinese Jesuit priests, Mark Kwan and John Yau. It is related that in 1754 Bishop Godofry entered Su-chou and was received by chair-dealer to ordain him. He was arrested on 25 May, 1757, and, not before sorrowfully proclaiming as bishop the dissolution of his own Society. Before his death, he obtained the favour of re-entering the Society, yet surviving in Russia. For the next fifty years only Chinese priests conducted the Kiang-nan mission. In 1830 two Portuguese Lazarists, Fathers Miranda and Henriches, arrived in Kiang-nan. From 1835 to 1840 Fathers Ferdinand Faivre and Peter Lavassie made temporary sojourns in the mission. In reality, from 1877 till the return of the Jesuits in 1840, Kiang-nan was governed by native priests, who kept alive the Faith.

In 1833 Gaiatano Pires-Pereis was made Bishop of Kiang-nan, and resided at Peking, delegating his powers to Father Henriches, a Lazarist like himself residing at Macao. On 1 Oct., 1838, Mgr Peres, last Bishop of Nan-king, conferred the powers of vicarapostolic on Father Lourde, then Vicar Apostolic of Shan-tung and administrator of the Diocese of Nan-king and consecrated titular Bishop of Canopus. He arrived at Kiang-nan in 1842, and obtained some French Jesuits from the Propaganda and from Father Roothan, then General of the Society of Jesus. Fathers Gotseved, Benjamin Brueyve, and Francois left Europe on 25 April, 1840.
In 1842 a treaty between England and China resulted in the opening of five Chinese ports, among them Shanghai. Five new fathers and one brother left France for China in 1842. They made the voyage with M. de Lagrange, ambassador of France to Peiping, who became the first bishop of the Catholic religion in China. Bishop de Besi appointed Father Brueyre to found the seminary, which was opened on 3 Feb., 1843, with twenty-three students. In 1853 it was established at Song-kia-tu. In 1849 all the Christian settlements were confided to the French Jesuits; they contained four thousand seven hundred and fifty Christians. The rebels invaded in 1853 a great part of the province and remained there eleven years. The Jesuit Fathers established themselves in 1847 at Zi-ka-wei near the tomb of Paul Siu, at which period the orphanages of the mission were commenced. An asylum for girls was founded in 1855 at Wan-tung. In 1853 the Chang-mau rebels (Tai-ping) took possession of Nanking, then of Shanghai, but abandoned the latter in 1854.

Bishop de Besi left for Rome in 1847, leaving the government of the mission to his coadjutor, Bishop Maresca. In 1849 the latter was named administrator of the Diocese of Nan-king, but returned to Europe, owing to ill-health, on 8 April, 1855. On 13 Nov. of the same year he died at Naples. The Diocese of Nan-king was then suppressed, and the Vicariate Apostolic in Chinese, and entrusted to the French Jesuits. Father Pierre André Borinjet became administrator Apostolic in 1856. During the eight years of his administration the rebels laid waste all the Christian missions of Kiang-nan, except that of Shanghai. Then followed the wars of the French and English against China, beginning in 1857. A treaty was signed in 1858, but the war was renewed in 1860, at the end of which entrance into China was obtained. In 1859 the rebels held only Nan-king, but suddenly became stronger. Father Masse was arrested by them, but made his escape; his brother Louis, however, was killed while defending the orphanage of Tai-kia- wan. The orphan asylum was pillaged and burned, and many Christians were massacred. A few Chinese natives of Manila were able to defend Tung-kia-tu and Zi-ka-wei. In 1862 Admirals Hope and Protec opened a campaign, but the latter was killed at Nan-kia. Major Gordon, who commanded from four to six months, latter recaptured the country but was dismissed in 1866 by the Chinese. At the end of the same year the rebels were driven out of every place they had held. The missions, however, suffered much in the meantime. Father Vuillaume was killed on 4 March, 1862; between 1856 and 1864 twenty-four missionaries died, and before the close of 1865 six or seven were victims of typhus. Bishop Borinjet died of cholera on 31 July, 1862. Mgr Hippolyte Adrien Languijatt, Bishop of Seregopolis and Vicar Apostolic of Chi-li since Sept., 1856, was named Vicar Apostolic of Kiang-nan on 2 Feb., 1865, and continued administering the Chinese and the French rebels. He went to Rome in 1867, and brought back with him religious Helpers of the Souls in Purgatory and some Carmelites. He founded the observatory about the same period, and took part in the Vatican Council of 1870, but in 1874 a stroke of apoplexy almost disabled him for any active service. The following are the statistics for the years 1866 and 1878: in 1866, 42 European priests and 12 Chinese priests, 184 missions, 71,184 Christians, and 5033 pupils in the schools; in 1878, 56 European and 26 native priests, 655 missions, 93,310 Christians, 9135 pupils in the schools.

Father Carrère suffered much at Nan-king. Driven out of this city by Li Hung Chang, he was recalled by the consul of France from Shanghai; he died on 17 Aug., 1868. A hospital for aged men was established at Shanghai in 1867, and the St. Francis Xavier School was opened. A severe persecution broke out in 1876. In March some residences were pillaged, and a catechist massacred. On 13 July a Chinese priest was massacred with one of his servants and a boy from the school. The church was pillaged, and the bodies of the victims were consumed. The girls of the school and their teachers were taken into captivity. Everywhere the property of the Christians was pillaged, and their chapels burned. Bishop Languijatt died during this persecution, at Zi-ka-wei, on 29 Nov., 1878. Bishop Valentine Garrier, the present coadjutor, was named his successor; he was fifty-four years old, and governed the mission nineteen years. The accounts of his administration from 1879 to 1899 are as follows: in 1879, 55 European and 26 Chinese priests, 550 missions, 345 schools for boys with 6222 pupils, 213 schools for girls with 2701 pupils, 95,175 Christians; in 1898, 116 European and 40 Chinese priests, 896 missions, 390 schools for boys with 10,663 pupils, 449 schools for girls with 5208 pupils, 115,177 Christians.

The fathers succeeded finally in establishing themselves in the centre of Ngaun-hwei. In 1882 Bishop Garnier sent missionaries to Su-chou-fu, the most northerm prefecture of the province of Kiang-su. The fathers bought a house in the city, and then commenced their difficulties, which lasted fourteen years. On 5 Feb., 1889, the European concession of Chi- nian Nanking was attacked by the inhabitants of the United States was pillaged and burned, but the church and residence of the mission were spared. On 2 May, 1891, some of the rabble besieged the orphanages of the mission, but soldiers rescued the orphans. On 12 May, 1891, Wu-hu and then Nang-king were attacked, but the presence of a French vessel saved them. However, five or six chapels were pillaged or burned in the interior of the provinces. Tranquillity was restored, thanks to the presence of Admiral Bernard. Bishop Garnier died on 14 July, 1898. Bishop Simon was named vicar Apostolic in Jan., 1899, and consecrated on 25 June; he died on 10 Aug. of the same year at Wu-bu. At the end of 1900 Bishop Paris, superior of the mission, was named vicar Apostolic and titular Bishop of Bilanda. The following was the condition of the mission in 1907: 1 bishop; 142 Jesuits, of whom 26 are Chinese; 35 native priests; 969 churches or chapels; 1 grand seminary at Zi-ka-wei with 29 students; 1 little seminary at Kiang-nan with 73 students; 558 schools for boys with 14,175 pupils; 604 schools for girls with 9360 pupils; 2 colleges for boys with 408 students; 3 colleges for European girls with 766 students (at Shanghai); 1 English school with 543 pupils; 1 French school with 336 pupils; 6 hospitals with 3898 patients; 6 asylums for old men with 117 inmates; 75 orphanages with 6584 children; 29 Little Brothers of Mary; 32 Carmelite nuns, 20 of whom are natives; 91 Helpers of the Souls in Purgatory, 33 of whom are natives; 31 Sisters of Charity; 9 Little Sisters of the Poor; 137 Chinese religious; 145,219 Catholics, and 99,881 catechumens.

Ptroet, Les Missions Catholiques Francaises au XIXe siecle, III (Paris, 1900), vi; Missione Catholica (Rome).

V. H. Montanar.

**Kiang-i, Vicariate Apostolic of Eastern.**—The mission of Eastern Kiang-i was separated from the northern mission of Kiang-su in 1885. It includes 8,000,000 inhabitants and is formed from the four prefectures of Fu-chou-fu, Yao-chou-fu, Kwang-hsin-fu, and Kien-chang-fu. The first vicar Apostolic is the present incumbent, Mgr. Casimir Vie, a Lazarist, named in 1885 titular Bishop of Tchien-nan. He resides at Fu-chou-fu. The Catholic community included in 1899: 1 bishop, 16 Lazarists (including three Chinese), six native priests, six Sisters of Charity, forty-eight Sisters of St. Ann, fifty-six schools with...
1910 pupils, sixty-six churches and chapels, twenty-five seminarians, ten orphanages with 622 children. In 1951, Bishop Paul Ferrant was consecrated coadjutor Bishop of Barbaliou; he assumed the direction of the mission in 1905. In the succeeding years the mission of Northern Kiang-si was the scene of bloody persecutions. Father Lacruche and five Little Brothers of Mary were massacred at Nan-chang on 25 Feb., 1906; the mission and the school were burned. Three other missionaries and five Daughters of Charity saved their lives by fleeing to Kiu-kiang.

The mission of Northern Kiang-si comprises to-day (1910) the six following civil prefectures: Kiu-kiang-fu, residence of the vicar Apostolic, Yoei-chou-fu, Nan-chang-fu, capital of the province, Nan-kang-fu, Liu-kung-fu, and Yuan-chou-fu, with a total of ten million inhabitants. In 1899 the Catholic mission included: 2 bishops, 11 Lazarist priests, of whom two were Chinese, 2 native priests, 14 Daughters of Charity, 5071 Catholics. Condition of the mission in 1907: 1 bishop, 16 European missionaries, 4 native priests, 98 churches and chapels, 2 seminaries with 24 students, 50 schools with 1439 scholars, 1 school directed by the Little Brothers of Mary, 24 Daughters of Charity, 8395 Catholics. In 1908: 1 bishop, 18 European missionaries, 4 native priests, 110 churches and chapels, 11,397 Catholics. Missiones Catholicae.

V. H. MONTANAR.

Kiang-si, VICARIATE APOTOLIC OF NORTHERN. — Father Matteo Rieci of the Society of Jesus was the first missionary who entered the Province of Kiang-si at the end of the sixteenth century. It was during his voyage from Canton to the capital of China, that he remained some time in this province and preached the Gospel with success. After him, during the seventeenth century, some missionaries belonging to different religious orders came. Innocent XIII organized this province into a vicariate Apostolic, and entrusted it to Rev. Fr. Alvaro Benavento of the Augustinian Order, appointing him titular Bishop of Ascalon. The new vicar fixed his residence at Kan-chou-fu. During his administration the Jesuit Fathers built beautiful churches and teaching Christian communities at Yao-chou, Kiu-kiang, and Nan-chang, capital of the province. Bishop Benavento died at Macao, 1705. He was not replaced on account of the persecution. The mission was entrusted to Bishop Ventallot, Vicar Apostolic of Fu-kien. The vicars Apostolic of Fu-kien maintained the mission of Kiang-si under their jurisdiction till the appointment of Bishop Carpena, who in 1838 that the missions of Kiang-si and Che-kiang be removed from his jurisdiction and transferred to the Lazarist Fathers. In 1722 Father Etrecolles, S.J., at King-te-chen, went to make a mission study on the Chinese moulding. In 1785 the first Lazarist missionaries arrived at Peking to take the place of the Jesuit missionaries. They were charged with the missions of Kiang-si and Kiang-nan. Unable to go themselves in those missions on account of the persecutions of Yung-ching and Kien-long, they delegated the native priests to visit the Christians. In 1790 Blessed Clet was sent to Kiang-si where no European missionaries had set foot during the preceding forty years. He remained alone during three years. The persecution broke out again during the reign of Kiu-kung. Blessed Clet, assisted by Chinese Lazarists, administered during this time the mission to the Lazarist Fathers. He was arrested at Ho-nan in 1819, and on 18 Feb., 1820, suffered death by strangulation at the age of seventy-two. In 1832 Father Laribe arrived in Kiang-si.

In 1833, at the request of Bishop Carpena, Kiang-si and Che-kiang were separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of Fu-kien. Bishop Rameaux, former missionary of Hu-pe, was named vicar Apostolic of the new vicariate formed by the union of Kiang-si and Che-kiang. At this time there were approximately 6000 Chinese in Kiang-si. In 1845 Bishop Rameaux died of apoplexy. The mission of Che-kiang was separated from that of Kiang-si and Bishop Laribe was named Vicar Apostolic of Kiang-si. The mission then numbered 9000 Christians. Bishop Delaplace soon replaced Bishop Laribe, but the new bishop was transferred to Che-kiang in 1854, and Bishop Dancour succeeded him. From 1856 to 1858 the ravages of Changmou (Tai-ping) reduced the Christians to 6000. In 1870, at the arrival of Bishop Bray, there were 7388 Christians and more than 1059 catechumens. There were then 4 European missionaries and 10 native priests. In 1874 Leo XIII divided Kiang-si into the Vicariates of Southern Kiang-si and Northern Kiang-si. Finally, in 1888, the Vicariate Apostolic of Eastern Kiang-si was separated from Northern Kiang-si. Bishop Paul Ferrant was consecrated coadjutor Bishop of Barbaliou; he assumed the direction of the mission in 1905. In the succeeding years the mission of Northern Kiang-si was the scene of bloody persecutions. Father Lacruche and five Little Brothers of Mary were massacred at Nan-chang on 25 Feb., 1906; the mission and the school were burned. Three other missionaries and five Daughters of Charity saved their lives by fleeing to Kiu-kiang.

The mission of Northern Kiang-si comprises to-day (1910) the six following civil prefectures: Kiu-kiang-fu, residence of the vicar Apostolic, Yoei-chou-fu, Nan-chang-fu, capital of the province, Nan-kang-fu, Liu-kung-fu, and Yuan-chou-fu, with a total of ten million inhabitants. In 1899 the Catholic mission included: 2 bishops, 11 Lazarist priests, of whom two were Chinese, 2 native priests, 14 Daughters of Charity, 5071 Catholics. Condition of the mission in 1907: 1 bishop, 16 European missionaries, 4 native priests, 98 churches and chapels, 2 seminaries with 24 students, 50 schools with 1439 scholars, 1 school directed by the Little Brothers of Mary, 24 Daughters of Charity, 8395 Catholics. In 1908: 1 bishop, 18 European missionaries, 4 native priests, 110 churches and chapels, 11,397 Catholics. Missiones Catholicae.

V. H. MONTANAR.

Kiang-si, VICARIATE APOTOLIC OF SOUTHERN. — Southern Kiang-si was separated from the Northern mission of Kiang-si in 1879, and organized into an independent vicariate Apostolic. The mission possessed at the time 3000 Catholics among a population of ten million. This part of Kiang-si had been greatly neglected up to this time on account of its remoteness. Father Rouger, a Lazarist, was the first superior of the new mission. He retained the title of pro-vicar till 1884, when he was named vicar Apostolic. He established his residence at Ki-nang-fu. At his death in 1887, Mgr Cogret assumed the direction of the mission. The latter came from Peking, and found only two missionaries in the mission. Southern Kiang-si was often a prey to persecution. In 1884 the Christian districts were pillaged. At the end of August, 1900, the chapels on the frontiers of Kwangtung were again pillaged, then burned, and the Christians driven from their homes. Later, towards the end of September, 1907, Father Candigiglia, an Italian Lazarist, and more than sixty Christians were massacred at Ta-ho-li; the churches and more than twenty Christian villages were pillaged and destroyed by fire. The following is the account rendered at different periods of the condition of the mission. In 1899: 1 bishop, 16 priests, 27 churches and chapels, 2 seminaries with 28 students, 4 colleges with 87 students, 7 native Daughters of St. Anne, 4 orphan asylums with 138 children, 5229 Catholics, and more than 4500 catechumens. In 1905: 1 bishop, 15 missionaries, 6 native priests, 43 churches and chapels, 2 seminaries with 42 students, 1 college with 30 students, 4 orphan asylums with 317 children, 4 Little Brothers of Mary, 5 Daughters of Charity, 15 native Daughters of St. Anne, 8637 Catholics, and about 3000 catechumens. Missiones Catholicae.

V. H. MONTANAR.

Kiches. See Quiche Indians.

Kichas. See Quichua Indians.

Kickapoos. See Kickapoo Indians.

Kickapoo Indians. — Apparently corrupted from a longer term signifying "roamers": a tribe of Algonquian stock, closely related dialectically to the Sauk and Foxes, and living when first known in south central Wisconsin, whence they gradually moved southward, taking up a position about the lower Wabash in Illinois and Indiana, upon lands seized from the Illi-
nois and Miami. In their general habit, as well as in their mythology and ceremonial forms, they closely resembled the Sauk and Foxes. They were agricultural, occupying fixed villages of bark houses in summer and oval mud-dwelling wigwams in winter, and making frequent excursions into the plains beyond the Mississippi to hunt the buffalo and steal horses. As the name implies they were noted for their roving and adventurist disposition. Their religious belief centered about two mythical hero brothers, to whom all gifts were attributed, and who ruled in the spirit world. They held the dog particularly sacred. They had a system of eleven clans (see INDIANS), which is still kept up, descent following the male line, and the name of the individual indicating the clan to which he belonged. As a people the Kickapoo have usually been noted for their warlike spirit and their civilization. They are possibly identical with a tribe mentioned by the Jesuit Druillettes in 1658, but were first definitely met by Allouez about 1669, as visitors, with other tribes, at the Francis Xavier Mission, on Green Bay, Wisconsin. In 1680 they killed the Recollect missionary Father Gabriel de la Ribourde on the banks of the Illinois. They joined the French in the long war beginning in 1712, and in 1728, together with the Mascoutens, captured Father Ignatius Guignas and constrained him to the stake, but afterwards adopted him and through his influence made peace with the French the next year. They joined later against the English in 1756, and aided the northern tribes in the ensuing destruction of the Illinois, and joined the same tribes and the English in the revolutionary wars and the War of 1812.

Between 1809 and 1819 they ceded all their lands in Illinois and Indiana, removing first to Missouri and later to Kansas. About this period a noted prophet named Kanakuk arose among them preaching the doctrine of temperance, peace, and a return to the old Indian life. About the year 1852 a large party left the main body in Kansas and moved down into Texas and thence into Mexico, where they were joined later by others and became known as the Mexican Kickapoo. In 1873 a part of these were induced to return and were settled in central Oklahoma, but the rest remain in Mexico, upon a reservation granted by the Mexican Government, in the Santa Rosa Mountains, eastern Chihuahua. Both in Kansas and Mexico they are noted for their conservative and unprogressive tendency. They refuse the operation of an unfortunate allotment agreement in 1891 with power to sell their allotted lands, the Oklahoma band has been rendered practically homeless. A few are under the influence of the Catholic mission at Sacred Heart or of the Friends working in the same region, but the majority are still heathen.

From a possible two thousand when first known, they have decreased to about eight hundred souls in 1908, of whom one hundred and ninety-five were in Kansas, two hundred and thirty-four in Oklahoma, and the rest in Mexico. There has been a scattering movement from Oklahoma to Mexico for the past five years.

Kidron, Brook of. See CEDRON, BROOK OF.

Kief. See LUTEZ, DIOCESE OF.

Kielce (Russian Kireitzy), Diocese of (KIELCENSI), in the southern part of Russian Poland, comprises the government (province) of Kielce and a part of the government of Piotrkow. Kielce, the episcopal see, contains four Catholic churches, one Orthodox and one Protestant church, and a Jewish synagogue. The church of the Assumption, now the cathedral, was founded in 1173 by Gideon, Bishop of Cracow. The beautiful church of the Holy Trinity was founded in 1646. The church of St. Adalbert (twelfth century) is built with red sandstone, and the church of St. George in winter, and the magnificent church of St. Michael the Archangel was founded in 1221 by Ivan Odrowski, Bishop of Cracow. The diocesan seminary was founded by Bishop Stanislaus in 1727, and now (1910) has ten professors and seventy-nine seminarians. Kielce has also a bracteal, in the form of the Society of the Sisters of Charity, and two high schools. The Diocese of Kielce, first erected in 1807 by Pius VII, was separated from and made subject to the Archdiocese of Cracow. At present it is a suffragan of Warsaw. The first bishop, Adalbert de Boza Gorski (1753-1817), of Cracow, incurred the enmity of the Russians, and on his death the diocese was suppressed and again added to Cracow. Afterwards, owing to strong Russian supervision, it was detached from Cracow and placed under Warsaw. Pope Leo XIII re-established the diocese 26 December, 1882. The second bishop was Thomas Theophilus Kulinski (1829-1907), who was again hostile to the Russian Government, but since his death the see has been vacant. The diocese, divided into eight deaneries, has (1910) 944,604 Catholics; 5323 Orthodox; 3560 Protestants; and 103,759 Jews; 242 parish churches; 21 other churches; 141 chapels; 333 secular clergy, and in 1784, aided the Government; 1 convent of Norbertines with 12 nuns; and 10 establishments of the Sisters of Charity with 47 sisters.

Kieran, Saints.—There are many Irish saints of this name, but the most celebrated is St. Kieran of Clonmacnoise (see CLONMACNOISE). Of the others, St. Kieran of Seir-Kieran and St. Kieran of Dysert Kieran are the best known. The founder is Seir-Kieran, Kings County (about A.D. 450), and also of the See of Ossory (see OSSORY, DIOCESE OF). His history is obscure, but he flourished during the greater part of the fifth century, and is venerated in England, Ireland, France, and Spain. The only church permitted by the Government; 1 convent of Norbertines with 12 nuns; and 10 establishments of the Sisters of Charity with 47 sisters.

Kieran, St., patron of Connemara, is commemorated on 30 April, and St. Kieran, son of Coilán, on 19 May. The friend of the Irish author, a history, and in 1738, aided the Government; 1 convent of Norbertines with 12 nuns; and 10 establishments of the Sisters of Charity with 47 sisters.


Kildare, School of.—Kildare (Irish: Cill-Dara), originally known as Drum Cruaidh, or the Ridge of Clay, situated in Magh Liffe, or the Plain of the Liffe, was known to be called Cill-Dara, or the Church of the Oak, from the stately oak-tree so much loved by St. Brigid, who under its branches laid the foundations of what in process of time became a monastic city. Through the influence and talent for rule and organisation possessed by the holy foundress the little oratory she built soon expanded into a large double establishment, one portion being for women, the other for men, and crowds of devotees flocked thither from far and near to make pilgrimages or hear words of heavenly wisdom from the lips of the "Saviour of the Gael." "Seeing, however, that the official biography, that this state of things could not exist without a pontiff to consecrate her churches and ordain the sacred ministers, she chose an illustrious anciestor, celebrated for his virtues and his miracles, that as bishop he might aid her in the government of the Church, and
that nothing should be wanting for the proper discharge of all ecclesiastical functions." In these words of the biographer, "ut ecclesiam in episcopali dignitate cum eâ gubernaret", there is surely nothing to justify the absurd statement sometimes made that Brigid had any authority over, or gave canonical jurisdiction to, this illustrious anchoress. She simply selected him to govern the establishment under her advice and guidance, and he got his jurisdiction in the ordinary way. In those days of violence and turmoil a needed sense of security would be afforded a convent of nuns by having hard by a house of monks with an apostolic bishop at their head. And not only did Brigid procure the renowned St. Conlaeth to rule and ordain, but she had another bishop, St. Naddraoich, to preach and teach the Gospel, and thus she hoped to make Kildare a great and independent home of sanctity and learning. And such in truth it became.

Cognitous, a monk of Kildare in the eighth century, and the author of what is known as the "Second Life of St. Brigid", calls Kildare "the head-city of all the bishops", and Conlaeth and his successors "archbishops of the bishops of Ireland", and goes on to refer to the primacy of honour and domestic jurisdiction acknowledged in the abbess of this city by all the abbesses of Ireland. To this primacy, maintained all along, is due the unique distinction enjoyed by Kildare of having recorded by the annalists, till comparatively recent times, the succession of its abbesses in parallel columns with that of its abbots. Cognitous also makes mention of the enormous crowds that, in his time, used to come to Kildare from "all the provinces of Erin", especially on St. Brigid's feast-day, 1 February, to pray and to have cures effected at her venerated shrine. From the interesting description he gives of the church we learn that it was very spacious and beautiful, that it had divisions rigidly distinct for the men and the women, and was lavishly adorned with pictures and embroidered hangings, which set off its highly ornamental windows and doorways.

Unhappily, no portion of this church now remains, nor indeed of any of the ancient buildings, with the exception of the Round Tower. This tower, the loftiest in Ireland—being 136 feet 7 inches high—has an elaborately worked doorway of a graceful finish rarely met with in those hoary sentinels of the past. Bishop Conlaeth, himself a man of remarkable artistic genius, founded at Kildare a school in metal work which grew and prospered as the years went on. And from Cognitous Barry we learn to what a high pitch of perfection the art of illumination had been brought in that city.

Nothing, he says, that he saw at Kildare impressed him so much as the "Evangelistarium", or manuscript of the Four Gospels, according to the version of St. Jerome, which, by reason of the extraordinary grace and ingenuity displayed in the letters and figures, looked rather like the work of angels than of men. The famous "Book of Leinster" was probably copied from originals preserved in the School of Kildare, by Finn MacGormain, who became Bishop of Kildare in 119.

Even during the most stormy periods of the school's history we find recorded interesting facts and dates concerning its professors. We read of Colthac, who died in 1069, and was celebrated for "his universal knowledge of ecclesiastical discipline"; and of Ferdomnaigh, the Blind, who was deeply versed in the knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures. In 1135 Diarmait MacMurrough, of contemptible memory, "forebly carried away the Abbess of Kildare from her cloister, and compelled her to marry one of his own people"; and in the following year Diarmait O'Brien and his brothers sacked and set fire to the town. But the school continued in spite of the ravages of native and foreign despoiler. The holy fire called the "inextinguishable", which had probably been kept alight since the days of Brigid, was put out by order of Henry de Londres, Archbishop of Dublin, who perhaps thought the practice savoured of superstition. Our opinion is that it simply arose from a desire on the part of the spiritual daughters of St. Brigid to secure a means by which lamps might be kept perpetually burning before the shrines of their sainted foundresses. Be that as it may, the fire was kindled again by the Bishop of Kildare, and with a steady flame it burned till the fierce storm of persecution in the reign of Elizabeth extinguished it and every other monastic light in Ireland.

COLORADO. Thieh Taunaquate (Louvin, 1647); STOKER, LIVES of the Saints from the Book of Lismore (Oxford, 1890); O'HANLIN, Lives of the Irish Saints, HEALY, Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars (3rd ed., Dublin, 1908).

JOHN HEALY.

Kildare and Leiglinn, Diocese of (Kildareensis et Leiglinensis), one of the four suffragans of Dublin, Ireland. These two dioceses continued to be separate from their foundation until 1678, when, owing to the extreme tenuity of the episcopal revenues—about fifteen pounds a year each—the Diocese of Leiglinn was given in commendam by the Holy See to the Bishop of Kildare, Dr. Mark Forstall. The Diocese of Kildare includes the northern half of that county, the eastern portion of King's County, as far as Tullamore, and the two northern baronies of Queen's County, and it embraces the ancient territories of Offaly, Carbury, and Hy Faelain. Its direction lies east and west. The Diocese of Leiglinn lies north and south, including one half of Queen's County, all County Carlow, and portions of Kilkenny, Wexford, and Wicklow Counties. It embraces ancient Leix, which connects it with Kildare, and a portion of Úi Céinsealaigh. The united diocese is one of the largest dioceses in Ireland, comprising 1,022,529 acres; and the Catholic population, according to the census of 1901, was 100,977 out of a total of 149,168.

History.—When St. Patrick had preached the Gospel in the North and West of Ireland, he turned his steps to the South, and coming into Leinster from Meath by Drum Ureballi he passed through Straffan and Clane to Naas. Pitching his tent on its green, he there baptized its joint kings, Ailill and Illan, sons of Dunfing, and Ailill's two daughters, Mogain and Fedelm. Their people seeing this soon embraced the Gospel also, and Patrick placed his nephew, Auxilius, as bishop at Kilkesbee, a few miles south of Naas, and anecdotally with Mac Tail as bishops at Old Kilcullen. From here he went towards Athy, founding churches at Narraghmore and other places, and, crossing the Barrow, continued his journey by
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Ballydams and Stradbally to Morett. Here he built a church and then turning north re-crossed the Barrow south of Rathangan, and going by Lullymore, Allen, and Kilcock, he returned to Tara. These events occurred about the year 448. Later on he made a second journey into Leinster, and coming to Rathvilly in County Carlow he baptized King Crimthan, his wife Mel, and his son and heir, Dathi. He translated Iserimus (Fith) from Kilcullen to Aghade. At Donaghmore in Ui Ceinnsealagh he met his old friend Dubtach, the chief bard of Erin, who alone amongst King Laoghaire's household had continued to salute the saint, accompanied by Fiacc, his gifted pupil and successor-apparent. Patrick, being in need of a suitable candidate for the episcopacy, consecrated Fiacc on Dubtach's recommendation, and placed him at Domnach Fiacc, midway between Clonmore and Aghold. Years afterwards he transferred him to Sletty, blessing his church there, and making his see quasi-metropolitan. This pre-eminence afterwards passed to Ferns, then to Kildare, and later on to Dublin. The fame of Fiacc's virtues and miracles followed him from Domnach Fiacc, bringing crowds of pilgrims to Sletty, and especially grew up of which he was the first abbot. St. Fiacc practised extraordinary austerities even in his old age, spending each Lent in the cave of Drum Coblai (the doon of Clopook), so that the fame of his sanctity still survives in the district. He died in 510. In the next century the See of Sletty was transferred to Leighlin, which means either "the half glen" or "the white plain".

St. Laserian (also called Molaise) was the first bishop and patron saint of Leighlin, b. 566; d. 18 April, 639. He was the son of Cairle de Bitha, a Ulster noble, and Gobhan, daughter of a Scottish king. Part of his youth was spent in Scotland. On his return home he refused the chieftainship of his clan, went into retirement, and ultimately set out for Rome, where he studied for fourteen years and was ordained by Gregory the Great. Returning to Leighlin he entered the great monastery which St. Gobban had established, and soon found himself its abbot; St. Gobban having retired in his favour and gone into Osse. This establishment soon became famous, and contained as many as 1500 monks. St. Laserian took the leading part in settling the Easter controversy. He presided at the Synod of Clonard, where he successfully defended the Roman computation, and was sent by the council as delegate to Rome. There, in 633, he was consecrated first Bishop of Leighlin by Honorius I. On his return from the centre of Catholic unity Laserian pleaded the cause of the Roman practice so powerfully at another synod in Leighlin that the controversy was practically ended for the greater part of the country. The list of his successors, sometimes called abbots and sometimes bishops, is practically complete. The cathedral of Leighlin was built about the middle of the twelfth century, and is the finest Gothic church of wood. It was plundered several times both by the Danes and by the native chieftains, and the great religious establishments of Sletty and Killeshin shared the same fate. In the reign of Henry VIII it was seized by the Reformers, was made a Protestant church, and has continued as such since. The sufferings of the Catholics were so severe during the persecutions which raged over Ireland for more than two centuries, that towards the end but a remnant of the clergy remained. What the number of the clergy was in these dioceses before the Reformation, we cannot say for certain; but from the ecclesiastical ruins we have the means of forming a fair estimate. Over these dioceses, at the present day, there lie scattered the moulder ruins of 240 churches and 63 religious houses, bearing mute but eloquent testimony to the persecutions borne by the Catholics, and to the numbers of the clergy who suffered banishment or death. Nor were these convents small or unimportant; there were many large monasteries of the different religious orders, including the four great Cistercian Abbeys of Jerpoint, Kilree, Baltinglass, and Clongowes. The abbey church of Duiske, Graignamanagh, is one of the few abbey churches at present in possession of their rightful owners, and actually devoted to the service of the old religion. There were eight round towers in these dioceses, two of which are still standing at Kildare. That on the eastern rampart of the Pale can be traced for a mile between Clane and Clongowes College.

**Abbey and Shrine of St. Brigid.**—Before the time of St. Laserian of Leighlin, St. Conleth and St. Brigid were the patron saints of Kildare. The latter was a native of the district, though born at Faughart, near Dundalk. In 487 she received the religious habit from St. Macaille, Bishop of Croghan in Offaly, and coming to Kildare formed a community of the pious virgins who flocked around her. Her first house was a humble cell under a large oak, which gave Kildare its name—"Cilligre—"Cille of the Oak." The fame of her sanctity attracted such a conourse of pilgrims to Kildare that a city soon sprang up which included a religious community of men. To meet the spiritual wants of the new city St. Brigid requested the appointment of a bishop. Great deference was paid to her wishes, and, as she had recommended St. Conleth, she was consecrated the first Bishop of Kildare about 490. He had been leading the life of a recluse at Old Connell near Newbridge, was a skilful artificer in gold and silver; and the ancient crosier in the museum of the Royal Academy is believed to be the work of his hands. It is said that the gold of which it was made and its relics see BRIGID, SAINT. Kildare with its church was plundered and burned frequently. Sometimes it suffered from the Danes, sometimes from the native chieftains, and sometimes by accident. Its records give about twenty-five catastrophes of the kind. At the Reformation the cathedral was seized by the Protestants, and a portion of it was used for a church. The rest of the building became a ruin, and so remained till 1875-96, when it was completely restored by private contributions, and is now the Protestant cathedral.

**Bishops of Kildare.**—The bishops of Kildare were frequently called abbot-bishops and bishops of Leinster down to the Synod of Kells. The record of succession is practically complete down to the union of the two dioceses. For the episcopal lists see, besides Gams and Ewel, Brady, "Episcopal Succession in England, Scotland, and Ireland" (Rome, 1877). Dr. Lestrange (1497-1577) was consecrated Bishop of Kildare in 1555, and early in Elizabeth's reign, when the bishops of Ireland were summoned before the Lord Deputy to take the oath of supremacy, the Bishop of Kildare peremptorily refused, and being asked the reason of his refusal replied: "All ecclesiastical authority is from Christ, who is a woman, even His blessed mother. How then can it be sworn that in future ages God would confer it on a woman?" He added: "The Apostle has commanded
that no woman should dare even to speak with authority in the church, much less to preside and govern there."

KILIAN

KILIAN. See GALWAY AND KILMACDUAGH, DIOCESE OF.

Kilian (KILLENA, CILLINÉ), Saint, Apostle of Frangonia and martyr, b. about 640 of noble parents probably in Ireland (according to others in Scotland, though Scotia tulta, as it is called by the elder "Passio"), may also in medieval times have meant Ireland. The later "Passio" says: "Scotiae quinto, prout Hibernia dicta est", 8 July, probably in 688. He was distinguished from his youth for his piety and love of study, and, according to the later "Passio", embraced the monastic life. Trithemius and later writers say that he was a monk in the celebrated monastery of Hy; that he was later the abbot of this monastery is also held by Trithemius; however, that, a supposition, cannot be proved. The statement in the older "Passio" that Kilian was raised to the purple before leaving his native land may be accepted as trustworthy, although the later "Passio" refers this event to his sojourn in Rome. In accordance with the custom then prevailing in the Irish Church, he was assigned to parishes, and was thus district bishop or travelling bishop. One day he made up his mind to be a missionary, left his native country with eleven companions, travelled through Gaul, thence across the Rhine, and finally reached the city of Würzburg, inhabited by the Thuringian (Frankish) Duke Gottert, who was, like his people, still pagan. Kilian resolved to preach the Gospel here, but first journeyed with his companions to Rome to receive missionary faculties from the pope. John V, whom he expected to find, had died meanwhile (2 August, 689), and was succeeded by Conon from whom Kilian obtained his faculties. From the sources already cited, we learn that the arrival of St. Kilian and his companions at Würzburg and the journey to Rome occurred in the summer of 688, that they arrived in the latter city in the late autumn, and that their labours at Würzburg continued during 687 and the following years. The original group separated on the return journey—some departing to seek other fields of missionary work, while St. Kilian with two companions, the priest Coloman and the deacon Totnan, came back to Würzburg. He took this town as the base of his activity, which extended over an ever-increasing area in East Frangonia and Thuringia. Duke Gosbert with a large part of his subjects to Christianity. Concerning the cause of the martyrdom of the three missionaries, the early documents supply the following information: After Duke Gosbert had become a Christian, St. Kilian explained to him that his marriage with Geilana, his brother's widow, was unlawful under the Christian dispensation, and secured the duke's promise to separate from her. In consequence of this action, Geilana plotted vengeance against the saint, and caused him and his two companions to be secretly murdered in the absence of the duke, their corpses being immediately buried at the scene of the crime together with the ecclesiastical vestments, and holy writings. This is generally held to have happened on 8 July, 689, although opinions vary as to the exact year. The early documents relate further that, after the duke's return, Geilana at first denied any knowledge of what had become of the missionaries; the murderer confessed his crime, and died miserably, Geilana also dying insane. Recent critics, especially Hauck and Riezler (see bibliography), question without sufficient grounds the authenticity of these statements in the matter of detail, especially as regards the cause and the immediate circumstances of the martyrdom of the three missionaries. Through prejudice against the Irish Church the Protestant party has also disputed the absolutely reliable information about the journey to...
Rome undertaken by St. Kilian and his assistants. His missionary labours through Eastern Francia and his martyrdom are, however, accepted without question by everyone. Although Kilian's work was not discontinued after his death, St. Boniface on his arrival in Thuringia found at least evidence of his predecessors' labours. The relics of the three martyrs, after wonderful cures had brought renown to their burial place, were transferred in 743 by Saint Burchard, first Bishop of Würzburg, to the Church of Our Lady, where they were temporarily interred. Later, when Burchard had obtained Pope Zachary's permission for the public veneration, they were solemnly transferred—probably on 8 July, 752—to the newly finished Cathedral of the Saviour. Still later they were buried in St. Kilian's vault in the new cathedral erected on the spot where tradition affirms the martyrdom to have taken place. The New Testament belonging to St. Kilian was preserved among the treasures of Würzburg Cathedral until 1805, and since then has been in the university library. Kilian is the patron saint of the diocese, and his feast is celebrated in Würzburg on 8 July with great solemnity.

The chief source of information is the older and shorter "Passio" (which begins "Fuit vir vitae venerabilis Kilena nomine"), formerly considered to date from the tenth or ninth century. Emmerich (after the example of the "Histoire littérale de la France", IV, Paris, 1738, p. 86), and Hefner (see below) on very good grounds now connect the appearance of this chronicle with the solemn translation of the relics in 752, which raises its historic value beyond the reach of attack. The later and more voluminous "Passio" is an amplified and embellished version of the shorter one and cannot be relied upon when the accounts differ. Both have been published by H. Canisius, "Antiques lectiones", IV, pt. ii (Ingolstadt, 1603), pp. 625-47; by Mabillon, "Acta Sanctorum O.S.B.", II (Paris, 1669), pp. 997-103; in the "Acta Sanctorum" for 8 July (see below), and finally, with a collection of later sources and with the Offices of St. Kilian of the Würzburg Church, by Emmerich (see below).

The Cathedrale, Ballina

Kilkenny, Diocese of (Alladensis). It is one of the five suffragan sees of the ecclesiastical Province of Tuam, and comprises the north-western part of the County Mayo with the Barony of Tireragh in the County Sligo. In all there are 22 parishes, some of which, bordering on the Atlantic Ocean, consist mostly of wild moorland, sparsely inhabited. The geographical Dictionary sets down the length of the diocese as 45 miles, the breadth 21 miles, and the estimated superfluities as 314,300 acres—of which 43,100 are in the County Sligo, and 271,200 in the County Mayo. In the census returns for the year 1901 the Catholic population is given as 69,848, of which the non-Catholic as 3576. The foundation of the diocese dates from the time of St. Patrick, who placed his disciple St. Muredach over the church called in Irish Cell Alair. In a well that still flows close to the town, beside the sea, Patrick baptized in a single day 12,000 converts, and on the same occasion, in presence of the crowds, raised to life a dead woman whom he also baptized. Muredach is described as an old man of Patrick's family, and was appointed to the Church of Killala as early as 442 or 443. His feast-day is 12 August. It is probable that he resigned his see after a few years, and retired to end his life in the lonely island in Donegal Bay which has ever since borne his name, Innismurray. It was at Killala that Patrick baptized the two maidens whom he met in childbed at Foilth Wood by the western sea, and whose voices in visions of the night had often piously called him to come once more and dwell amongst them. He did come, and he baptized them, and built them a church where they spent the rest of their days as holy nuns in the service of God.

Little or nothing is known of the successors of Muredach in Killala down to the twelfth century. Of the sainted Bishop Cellach, for example, we learn merely that he came of royal blood, flourished in the sixth century, and was foully murdered at the instigation of his foster-brother. His name is mentioned in all the Irish martyrologies. Beyond doubt, however, the most illustrious of them all belongs to modern times. With pardonable pride the people of Killala still, and will ever, recall the fact that John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam, was a child of their diocese, and, if we may so speak, served his apprenticeship as bishop amongst them. He was born at Tubbernavine, at the foot of Mount Nephin, 6 March, 1791; became Coadjutor Bishop of Killala in 1825, bishop in 1834, and later in the same year was transferred to Tuam, where for nearly half a century he exercised a more potent influence on the ecclesiastical history of Ireland than perhaps any of his contemporaries, with the single exception of O'Connell. He died 7 November, 1881, and is buried in the sanctuary of the Tuam cathedral. After him came Doctor Finan, a Dominican priest of remarkable piety and attainments, but rather by continental training, to direct the affairs of an Irish diocese. On his resignation in the year 1838, a parish priest of the Archdiocese of Tuam, Rev. Thomas

Friedrich Lauchert.

Kilkenny. See Omagh, Diocese of.
KILLALOE

Feeney, who had formerly been professor and president of St. Jarlath's College, Tuam, was chosen for the task of repairing the injury that ecclesiastical discipline had suffered during his reign. Feeney is said to have been the most heroic of the bishops in the circumstances. Thirty-five years of his firm and resolute rule obliterated practically all traces of the wrangled controversies that distracted the diocese under his predecessor.

The town of Killala is remarkable in Irish history as the scene of French under General Humbert landed in 1798. The exact spot is by the rocky ledge in the outer estuary of the Mow known as "St. Patrick's Rocks", from which it is said that the saint set sail when making his escape as a poor young slave from Ireland. The French officers occupied the palace of Breckan and remained in the town for a short time with his lordship and family. The bishop has written a most interesting and authentic account of these gentlemen which he himself saw and heard. Along the left bank of the river are the ruins of several monasteries: Rocker, a Friary of the Augustinians; Strickacre, a Franciscan Priory of Strick, founded in 1460. The beautiful Abbey of Moyne still stands nearly perfect on a most picturesque site just over the river, and further on, north of Killala, was the Dominican Abbey of Rathfran, also delightfully situated. On the primitiveness of Errew running into Lough Conn there was a Monastery of Priests, where are still comparative recent times. A fine round tower in Killala itself, still in perfect preservation, indicated the ancient celebrity of the place as an ecclesiastical centre. Indeed it may be safely stated that in no other portion of Ireland of equal extent were the labours of St. Patrick and the holy founders of religious institutions who came after him so arduous and full of interest as in this beautiful district of Tír na nÓg.

Tireragh and Tirawley need not rely entirely for their fame on the traditions of the past, near or remote. Under the present occupant of the See of Killala religion has made quiet but very gratifying progress. One may judge of the learning and ability of Dr. Conolly, from the fact that in Maynooth he held a distinguished place in the class that produced such men as the Cardinal Primate of Ireland and Archbishop Carr of Melbourne. After several years of fruitful work as professor and master in the Diocesan Seminary called in 1892 from the parish of Croesmolina to the Diocesan seminary of Muckross. His rule has been characterized by prudence, and justice that is well tempered with mercy. Amongst his most conspicuous services to the twin cause of religion and education must be reckoned the building and equipping, from funds raised almost exclusively from his own faithful priests and people, of the splendid seminary that now graces the town of Ballina, and bids fair to revive the old name of the School of Killala founded by St. Patrick. The bishop lives in a plain but commodious dwelling at Ballina, hard by the diocesan seminary, which since its opening has been the dearest object of his episcopal zeal.

Ware, Antiquities of Ireland, ed. Harris (Dublin, 1739); Annals of the Four Masters, ed. O'Donovan; Lewis, Topographical Dictionary of Ireland (London, 1837); Travels in the Western Part of Ireland; Niscolais, ed. Thomas (Niscolais, 1838); Knox, Notes on the Dioceses of Tuam, etc. (Dublin, 1904); Healy, Life and Writings of St. Patrick (Dublin, 1903).

JOHN HEALY.

KILLALOE (Laoní) Diocese of, a suffragan of Cashel; it comprises the greater part of County Clare, a large portion of Tipperary, and parts of King's and Queen's Counties, Limerick, and Galway. Its Irish name is Cill-da-Lua, so named from St. Lua, an abbot who lived about the end of the sixth century, and whose oratory can still be seen in Friar's Island, near the town of Killaloe. Though St. Lua gave his name to the diocese, St. Flannan is its patron saint. He was of royal lineage, his father being the saintly Theodoric, King of Thomond, who towards the close of his life received the monastic habit from St. Colman at Lismore. St. Flannan came from the north of Ireland, and is said to have been consecrated at Rome by John IV about 640. In the time of St. Flannan, the Diocese of Killaloe was not so extensive as it is at present. It did not then include the old dioceses of Roscrea and Inniscathay. It was only when these were suppressed at the end of St. Finbarr's life, in the first quarter of the twelfth century, that Killaloe assumed its present shape, which is almost coterminous with the boundaries of the ancient Kingdom of Thomond. The parish of Seir Kieran in King's County, though in Thomond, was allowed to remain subject to the Diocese of Osory, out of respect to the memory of St. Kieran.

The old See of Roscrea grew around a monastery founded there by St. Cronan about the middle of the sixth century. This monastery became a famous school, and it was within its walls that the scribes who wrote for St. Cedd and St. Bede resided. The monks of Roscrea now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, for which Tadhg O'Carroll, chief-tain of Ely, made a costly shrine in the twelfth century. The Diocese of Roscrea was coextensive with the territory of the O'Carrols, added to that of the O'Kennedys. Ware holds that St. Cronan was Bishop of Roscrea, that the Church of Roscrea was modelled on the Church of St. John the Baptist in Canterbury, and that the irregularity of the Lateran Council of 1179 was due to the fact that Roscrea became an episcopal see. Like the Diocese of Roscrea, the Diocese of Inniscathay grew around the monastery of Inniscathay, founded by St. Senan in the early part of the sixth century. There is no question about St. Senan being the first bishop of the Diocese of Inniscathay, which comprised the Barony of Moyarta, Clonderlaw, and Itbreckin, in Clare; the Barony of Connello, in Limerick; and in Kerry, the ancient region of the Hy-Fidgente. The last Bishop of Inniscathay was Hugh O'Brechain, who died in 1188. Nevertheless there were titular bishops of the see up to the close of the fourteenth century. The remains of the cathedral church of Inniscathay and a round tower now mark the ancient see of St. Senan. The Clog-oir, too, still in existence in County Clare, is a highly-prized relic of Inniscathay. St. Breccan's churches of Carmantle, Doora, and Clooney, St. Cronan's abbey of Lus na Tola's church at Dysert, St. Senan's church at Ballinaclash, and St. Molua's church at Bishop's Island, near Kilkee, St. Caimin's church and school at Inisaltra, St. Brendan's and St. Cronan's abbey at Birr and Roscrea may be named amongst hundreds of churches, schools, and hermitages, which covered Killaloe like a network and which, in their decay attest to the devotion to the Catholic Faith of the far-famed Dalgais.

Some of these foundations deserve mention. Inisaltra, a green little island in Lough Derg, was a celebrated nursery of sanctity and learning in Thomond. It is associated principally with St. Caimin, who made Inisaltra the seat of a very famous school, which attracted pupils even from foreign countries. A fragment of the commentary on the Psalms collated with the Hebrew text, written by St. Caimin (640), is preserved in the Franciscan convent, Merchant's Quay, Birr. Birr also was a celebrated seat of learning in Thomond, founded by St. Brendan (550). The Gospels of McRegol, now in the Royal Library, were written by McRegol, Abbot of Birr, in 820. Terryglass also was a school of great repute founded by St. Columba (552). It was here that St. Patrick is said to have baptised the Dalgaic from Northern Thomond, who crossed Lough Derg in their coracles to meet him. The monastery of Lorri, founded by St. Ruadhan (550), can claim that it was within its walls that the famous Stowe Missal, now in the library of Lord Ashburnham, was written; but the desertion of Tara owing to the alleged cursing of St. Ruadhan, is without
historical foundation. The abbeys at Ennis and Quin are striking illustrations of the piety and munificence of the foremost chieftains of the Dalguis.

About 1240 Donogh Carbreach O’Brien built the monastery for Conventual Franciscan friars. It was called Killaloe and was the finest house of the order in Ireland, and ultimately it became the occasion of Ennis being made the capital of County Clare. Even in ruin it is beautiful; the east window especially is much admired for its size, grace, and symmetry. Here are buried some of the Kings of Thomond and the chieftains. The Abbey of Quin is one of the noblest remains of monastic antiquity in Ireland, and is in so perfect a state of preservation that little more than a roof is required to make it fit to house the monks and have their chant daily re-echo within its walls. It was founded by Sheds McNamara in 1402. In 1641 a college was opened at the abbey, which soon had eight hundred students. But the most interesting historical remains, despite the small town of Killaloe, the ancient seat of the bishop, which is built on a ridge commanding a fine view of Lough Derg. For here we have the oratory of St. Luna in Friar's Island, the very perfect stone-roofed oratory of St. Flannan, and St. Flannan’s cathedral, built in 1160 by Donald O’Brien, King of Limerick, near the site of Brian Boru’s royal palace of Kincora. St. Flannan’s cathedral was, till the early years of Elizabeth’s reign, the Catholic cathedral of the Diocese of Killaloe. Since then it has been in Protestant hands. Owing to the cruel persecution of the Catholic religion and its bishops and priests, and the suppression of the monasteries in Clare at the opening of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the churches and monasteries fell into decay and ruin, the Holy Scriptures being offered up on some rock on a mountain-side, or some lowly “Mass house”. It is only since the time of Catholic Emancipation, a glorious era in the annals of Killaloe when the priests of Clare gave powerful aid to O’Connell to win the Clare election, that a “second spring” has come, and that Thomond has been again covered with handsome and commodious churches.

The first successor of St. Flannan in the Diocese of Killaloe whose name has come down to us, is Cormac O’Mulcaigh, who died in 1019; and from the death of St. Flannan to the time of the learned O’Leargheas in 1160, the names of only five prelates have been recorded. But from this period the succession becomes regular and complete. In 1179, Constantine O’Brien, fifth in descent from Brian Boru’s, was Bishop of Killaloe: he attended the Council of Lateran. Conor O’Heny, another Bishop of Killaloe, also attended the Council of Lateran in 1215. Cormac Ryan, a Franciscan friar, and brother of a chieftain, was consecrated Bishop of Killaloe in 1576. He had a remarkable career. From the time of his appointment he used his marked ability and great organising power in aid of the Earl of Desmond, who championed the Catholic cause, and succeeded in obtaining for him the support of Gregory XIII and Philip of Spain. For years he shared in all the perils of the insurrection, and he was regarded by Elizabeth and her minions as a most formidable opponent. When the Desmond insurrection ended in disaster, he escaped to the Continent, and died at Lisbon in 1617. John O’Moloney was another eminent Bishop of Killaloe. He was born in Killan, County Clare, in 1617, was a doctor of the Sorbonne, and his appointment to Killaloe, had been canon of Rouen, in France. He was named bishop by Propaganda in 1671, at the urgent request of the Catholics of the diocese, his qualifications for the exalted office being set forth in various testimonials from the doctors of the University of Paris, and several prelates and archbishops. In 1683 he was named by the Irish bishops to visit France and endeavour to induce the French king and his minister to found an Irish ecclesiastical college in Paris. He succeeded in his mission, and a few years later the Irish college, of which he is regarded as the founder, was opened. In 1689 he was named Bishop of Limerick, retaining Killaloe in administration, but he was soon forced to flee to France, where he died in 1702 at the Sulpician house at Issy, near Paris. The present bishop is the Most Reverend Dr. Fogarty, born in 1859 near Newnagh, County Tipperary. Before his elevation to the episcopate he was vice-president of Maynooth College, where he had been for fifteen years previously a distinguished professor of dogmatic and moral theology. His consecration took place in 1904, at the pro-cathedral at Ennis, the seat of the bishop and also of a well-equipped diocesan college.

The diocesan chapter, including dean, archdeacon, and canons, was re-established by papal decree on 11 February, 1903. Catholic population, 137,574, according to census of 1901; non-Catholic population, 8529; parishes, 57; secular clergy, 142; parochial and district churches, 143; houses of regular clergy, 2; vis. Franciscans at Ennis, Cistercians at Roscrea; convents of Sisters of Mercy, 12; Convent of Sacred Heart, 1; number in community, 198; monastic houses, 6; number in community, 63.

Annals of Four Masters (Dublin, 1846); LANIGAN, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland (Dublin, 1839); HANLY, Ancient Schools and Scholars (Dublin, 1891); Dwyer, Diocese of Killaloe (Dublin, 1878); FRONT, History of Clare (Dublin, 1893); MALONE, Life of St. Flannan (Dublin, 1902); MESCALL, Story of Inniscagg (Dublin, 1903); STOREY, Early Christian Art in Ireland (London).

M A I C H B R E E N.

KILLARNEY. See KERRY AND Aghadoe, Diocese of.

KILMACDUagh. See GALWAY and KILMACDUagh, Diocese of.

KILMORE, Diocese of (Kilmoresis), Ireland, includes almost all Cavan and about half of Leitrim. It also extends into Fermanagh, and half of both Meath (Kilmahin Wood) and Sligo (Ballintrillick). It is accordingly seen to be roughly coincident with ancient Breffney, embracing both Breffney O’Rourke and Breffney O’Reilly. St. Fedlimid, or Felim, who flourished in the early part of the sixth century, is the first known Bishop of this half of that primitive diocese. The appointment of the diocese, and his feast is celebrated on 9 August, the day of his death. A holy well near the old Catholic cathedral of Kilmore still bears his name.
From Hugh O’Vinn, appointed 1136, to Andrew MacBrady, consecrated in 1445, the bishops of this see were often styled Episcopi Breifna; and no bishop outside of Brefny is known to have ever claimed jurisdiction over it. With a hiatus or two, all its rulers during this period have been ascertained. Many of them are also sometimes called bishops of Triburna, probably from the name of a village near Butlersbridge, close to which village was the episcopal church and most probably the episcopal residence. The spot now marked by the grave-yard of Urney (Triburna) contains some remains of this very ancient structure.

Towards the middle of the fifteenth century the above-mentioned Andrew MacBrady (1445-55) rebuilt on a much larger scale the primitive church of St. Pedemil, situated about seven miles due south of Triburna, and in 1454, with the approval of Pope Nicholas V, made it his cathedral. Thenceforth this church (cill mór, i.e. great church) imparted its name to the surrounding parish and also to the diocese, just as the church of Triburna did before, or just as the town of Cavan has given its name to the whole County of Cavan. Bishop MacBrady lived at Kilmore. During the penal times many of his successors, in striving to discharge their sacred functions, suffered untold hardships. Richard Brady (1580-1607), for instance, was three times thrown into chains. In 1601 the friary of Multifarnam, in which he sought refuge, was burned over his head by the English soldiers. As late as the middle of the eighteenth century, Bishop Andrew Campbell (1755–1799 or 1770), to escape the dangers that beset him, had to go on his visitations disguised as a Highland piper. A beautiful oil-painting representing him so attired is preserved in the dining-room of the diocesan college at Cavan. The cathedral chapter of Kilmore originally consisted, besides the bishop, of eleven canons, together with a dean and an arch-deacon. But in 1636 the latter two titles alone remained. Of later years they too have wholly disappeared. The seal of the ancient chapter of “Tibrina” was dug up at Urney about sixty years ago.

In 1638 Kilmore was described as having forty parishes. In July, 1704, in compliance with the provisions of the act passed the previous year for “registering the popish clergy”, thirty-nine Kilmore “popish parish priests” gave in their names. “Curates or assistants” were excluded, being placed on the same footing as regulars, and “had to depart out of this Kingdom in the 20th July” under divers pains and penalties. It is worth noting that twelve of these thirty-nine priests had been ordained by Oliver Plunket, the saintly Primate of Armagh; and one of them, the Rev. Owen McHugh of Killeasher, at Rome, in 1682, by Pope Innocent XI. Three parishes claim to have been founded by St. Patrick in person: Drumlease, Clooneclare, and Oughteragh (now Ballinamore).

Father Maguire, a well-known controversialist, died parish priest of the last-mentioned place. Drumlease derives its name (drum-lias, ridge of the huts) from the sheds. St. Patrick is said to have raised there; and the neighbouring village of Dromahair was for long called Carrig-Padruig, or Patrick’s Rock. The saint, struck by the scene of beauty of the surroundings, designed to establish there his primatial see. For twenty years he left his foster-son and destined successor, Benignus, in charge of it; and it was only towards the end of his life that he reluctantly changed his intention, and adopted Armagh.

In the seventh century the diocese gave illustrious names to the Church; to the parish of Mullagh we owe St. Kilian (d. 688), the Apostle of France; to Killinskere, St. Ultan (d. 656); and to Templeport, St. Aidan, or Mogue (d. 651). Inishmaghath, in the next century, was probably the birthplace of the scholarly St. Tighernach; Ballaghameohan, in the previous century, was under the care of St. Moling (or Lasair; d. 563), the founder of Devenish; his copy of the Gospels, which was encased in a reliquary about the year 1001, is now in the Dublin Museum.

The most famous religious house in Kilmore was St. Mary’s friary in Cavan town, founded by the O’Reily’s in 1300. The Dominicans were the first religious to be introduced; in 1393 they left and were replaced by Francisians. After the Suppression, in the time of James I, the monastery was converted into a courthouse. In the beginning of the last century it was used as a Protestant place of worship. The crumbling tower of this church is all that remains of it. In its graveyard the remains of three noted Irishmen were interred: Owen Roe O’Neill, Ireland’s noblest soldier, who died at Cloughoughter in 1649; Hugh O’Reilly, Bishop of Kilmore (1625–28), Primate of Armagh (1620–52), and founder of the Catholic Confederacy; most probably also Myles O’Reilly, surnamed the Slasher, Ireland’s greatest swordsman. Their graves were purposely concealed through fear of desecration, and cannot now be pointed out.

The other chief family of Brefney, the O’Rourke’s, founded Creevelea (creve, branch, and liath, grey) beside Dromahair in 1508, and brought thither the Francisians. A beautifully chased silver chalice, bearing an inscription declaring that it was presented to this monastery in 1619 by Mary the wife of “Thaddeus Ruaire”, is still in use in Butlersbridge chapel in the parish of Cavan. Creevelea, as the annals declare, and as its ruined chancel and cloistered kitchen and the most imposing of the many noble structures that the Francisians had. The priory of Drumlane, established before 550, was confiscated in 1670. Its round tower is still in a good state of preservation. An abbey yet traceable beside St. Pedemil’s church in Kilmore is said to date from the sixth century, and to have been founded by St. Columcille. On Trinity Island, two
nailes to the west of it, the White Canons of St. Norbert established in 1237 or 1230 the Abbey of Holy Trinity. It was consecrated in 1570. A beautifully carved doorway, transferred from its ruins, now adorns the vestry of Kilmore Protestant cathedral, the memorial church of the Anglican bishop Beecham.

The Protestant cathedral and episcopal palace and gardens are located on the sites once sanctified by St. Fedlimid and St. Columbea. At Mounteenonnaught, at Ballylinch in Kilmore, and also at Drumullanmore there existed as late as the seventeenth century long houses. Dr. Archdall, though chargeable with no crime but that of being endowed; in 1605 they were granted by King James I to Sir Edward Moore, ancestor of the Earls of Drogheda. Kilmainham Wood, County Meath, a preceptory belonging to the Knights Templars, was erected by the Preston family some time in the thirteenth century. On the shores of Lough Melvin in Ballagheameen, Leitrim, St. Tighernagh founded a convent for his mother St. Mella, who died before 787. It was known as Doiremelle. He also built for himself the monastery of Killachad somewhere in County Cavan. On Church Island in the lake just mentioned, d. 546, St. Patrick's bell-tower, had a caretaker called Kilclare. Finally on Lackagh mountain, near Drumkeeran, St. Natalis (d. 563) founded the monastery of Kilnaile, whose beeves cell may still be traced on the bleak mountain top amid the rocks and brown heather.

The Catholic population of the diocese in 1901 numbered 109,319—a decline of nearly one-third since the census of 1871—and its non-Catholic population, 24,447, a somewhat greater decrease. It has 42 parishes, and usually 104 or 105 priests. St. Patrick's College, Cavan, opened by Dr. Conaty in 1874, replaces St. Augustin's College, Killala. Bishop Bowler, d. 1839; it is one of the finest diocesan buildings in Ireland. The Poor Clares, brought to Cavan town in 1861, care for an industrial school or orphanage. In 1872 they established a second convent at Ballyjamesduff. The Sisters of Mercy have convents at Belturbet, Ballina and Cootshell. All the communities are in charge of the technical and primary schools. Infant and intermediate schools for boys are at Manorhamilton and Ballyjamesduff. The Most Rev. Andrew Boylan, CSSR, (b. 1842), a native of the diocese, consecrated Bishop of Kilmore in 1907, died on 25 March, 1917.

**Brady, Life of St. Patrick (Dublin, 1907); Brady, Episcopal Succession in England, Ireland and Scotland, I (Rome, 1876), 187-76; Briscoe, Irish History (Dublin, 1845), 83-64; Cotton, Patro Dei. 86. 178-56; V. 228.**

**Joseph Meehan.**

**Kilwardby, Robert.** Archbishop of Canterbury. Cardinal-Bishop of Porto and Santa Rufina, died at Viterbo, 11 Sept., 1279. Nothing is known of his birth or early life, except that he studied at Paris and probably Oxford. For many years he taught grammar and logic at Paris with special success, devoting particular attention to the development of the use of the syllogism, during which time he composed numerous treatises on grammar and philosophy. Of these works "De divisione scientiarum" was widely studied, as is evidenced by the numerous MS. copies still extant. Later in life he also wrote some theological works: "De passione Christi" and "De sacramento alterius", and commentary on St. Paul's Epistles. Subsequently, having joined the Order of Preachers, he abandoned his secular career and became a Dominican, devoting himself to theology and the study of the Scriptures and the Fathers. In 1261 he was chosen provincial of his order in England, an office which he held till 1272. Shortly after he ceased to be provincial he was chosen by Pope Gregory X. to fill the See of Canterbury, which had then been vacant for two years. As archbishop-elect he, together with other nobles and prelates, proclaimed Edward I as King of England on the death of Henry III, and appointed a regency to govern the kingdom till the new king returned from the Crusades. He was consecrated at Canterbury on 20 Feb., 1273, by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, William de Cobham, the pope having named him as the consecrating prelate. On 8 May he received the pallium, and he was enthroned at Canterbury in September of the same year, he being the first friar to become metropolitan.

As archbishop he showed little interest in politics, but was very involved in the administration of his spiritual duties. Having held a convocation in London, he entered upon a thorough visitation of the province. This was interrupted in 1274, as he had to leave England to attend the Council of Lyons. Here he distinguished himself as an ardent supporter of the pope's authority, and his own reputation as a great master of theology added weight to his advocacy. On his return to England he resumed his canonical visitation, travelling through the large dioceses of Winchester and Lincoln. In 1276 he visited the University of Oxford, where he condemned several errors, depriving masters who held erroneous opinions, and took other steps to defend the doctrine. In the same year (16 June, 1276) he had the consolation of attending the translation of the relics of St. Richard at Chichester, whose life he had encouraged his brother Dominic, Ralph Bocking, to write. As primate he held two important provincial synods in 1273 and 1274, in which the lower clergy were granted fuller representation than had formerly been allowed. In his private life he was noted for his sanctity, his charity to the poor, and his success as a peacemaker. He was a great benefactor of his own order, and bought the site for a Dominican house at Cowley in Berkshire. In 1278 he succeeded the II nominated Kilwardby as Cardinal-Bishop of Porto and Santa Rufina, and on 25 July he left England for Italy, taking with him all the registers and archives of Canterbury Cathedral. This unfortunate loss has never been recovered, and the earliest records of the see are those of his successor Archbishop Pockham, who vainly endeavoured to recover the lost papers. The change of life was too severe for an old man, and he fell ill shortly after joining the papal court at Viterbo. There he died in the following year and was buried in the convent of his own order.

**Kilwardby, BENEDICTINE ABBEY of, in Ayrshire, Scotland, in the town of the same name, where a church was said to have been founded early in the eighth century by St. Winning. Winning has been identified by some scholars with St. Finnian of Moville, an Irish saint of much earlier date; other authorities say he was a Welshman, called Vynnyn, while the Aberdeen Breviary published 1854 gives Scotland as his birthplace. What is certain is that there was a Christian church at Kilwinning, and also a monastery of Cuddes, several centuries before the foundation of the Benedictine house by Hugh de Morville, Constable of Scotland, and a great territorial magnate of the district, somewhere between 1146 and 1161. Timothy Pont, who had been prior of the Abbey, now lost, and who wrote in 1608, gives 1171 as the date, and Richard de Morville (one of the murderers of St. Thomas of Canterbury) as the founder; but the weight of evidence is in favour of Hugh and the earlier date. The structure of this monastery," says Pont, "was solid and grave, all of freestone cut in the church fair and sturdily after ye modell of ylat of

**Edwin Burton.**
Glasgow, with a fair steeple of 7 score feet of height, yet standing quhen I myselve did see it. "The length of the church was 60 feet, breadth of the nave sixty-five feet; and the monastic buildings covered several acres.

A community of Tyronesian Benedictines was brought from Kelso; the abbey was soon richly endowed by royal and noble benefactors, possessing grants of four and a half miles of land, and the tithes of twenty parish churches, and a revenue equivalent to some £20,000 a year. For nearly four centuries Kilwinning remained one of the most opulent and flourishing Scottish monasteries. The last abbot was Gavin Hamilton, who whilst favouring the Reformation doctrines was also a liberal patron of Quidelues. He was forced to take the field in a fight outside Edinburgh in June, 1571. The suppression and destruction of the abbey soon followed, and its possessions, held for a time by the families of Glencarin and Raith, were erected in 1603 into a temporal lordship in favour of Hugh, Earl of Eglinton, whose successors still own them. The Earls of Eglinton have taken some pains to preserve the remains of the buildings, which include the great west doorway with window above, the lower part of the south wall of nave, and the tall gable of south transept with its three lancet windows. The "fair steeple" was struck by lightning in 1822 and fell down five years later.

Collections towards a History of the Abbey of Kilwinning in Arch. and Histor. Coll. of Ayr and Wigtown, 1 (Edinburgh, 1879), 115–225; ed. Donnell (Glasgow, 1870), 299–568; HAY, Scotia Sacra in MS. Advoc. Library, Edinburgh, 805; RAN, Kilwinning Abbey (Ardrossan, s. d.); Wylie, Hist. of Mother Lucreia, Notes on the Abbey (Glasgow, 1879); Gordon, Monasticon (Glasgow, 1898), 494.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Kimberly, Vicariate Apostolic of (Kimberley, zinc), suffragan of Adelaide, erected by Leo XIII, 5 May, 1887. The Vicariate of Kimberley embraces the whole district of that name, and is under the Apostolic administration of the Bishop of Geraldton. The territory forms one of the six land districts into which Western Australia is divided, and in this, the north-west portion of the state, a plentiful supply of gold is found. The Bishop of Perth, Dr. Matthew Gibney, whose diocese was charged with the administration of the Kimberley Vicariate, was early engaged in dettaorticizing the aborigines of the district. Under his direction, a reserve was thrown open to the aborigines of the district.

On 4 June, 1890, he set out in person, with Abbot Ambrose of the Trappist Order, to observe the conditions of the locality, and the journey resulted in the establishment of a mission station, the Holy House of the Sacred Heart, at Beagle Bay. The Bishop of Geraldton, Dr. Gibney, represented by the recommendation of Cardinal Moran, the fathers of La Trappe took charge of the mission. The natives, computed at between five hundred and six hundred, were found mostly on the western coast in the vicinity of Beagle Bay. The country was well wooded, deficient in water courses, but abounding in springs, with luxuriant vegetation in the neighbourhood of the swamps. A temporary monastery was constructed of wood covered with large sheets of bark, and at a few yards distance was erected a church of the same poor material. Difficulty was experienced in maintaining the staff of not less than ten promised to the Government in return for certain concessions, and the abbot was forced to leave the community for a year (February, 1891–March, 1892) through the necessity of obtaining recruits.

On the departure of the Trappists for Europe, the Pallotine Fathers, or Fathers of the Fious Society of Missionaries, were introduced into the territory under the instrumentality of the Bishop of Geraldton, under whose jurisdiction the vicariate had meantime passed. Besides the chief house at Beagle Bay, the mission has flourishing stations at Broome and Disaster Bay, and from the beginning good results have been achieved in the work of Christianizing the natives. In 1903, the mission was given to the undertaking by the erection of a commodious monastery and convent; the missionary society, too, was strengthened by the coming of one priest and five lay brothers. Since that date a new church and school have been raised. In June, 1907, nine sisters of the Order of St. John of God arrived at the mission from Subiasco, Perth. This community, under the direction of Mother Antonia O'Brien, is engaged in teaching the girls and attending to the sick. During the last three years remarkable progress has been made; the mission at the present time (1910) numbers four priests, twelve brothers, and nine sisters. There are churches at Beagle Bay and at Broome. Schools have also been established at these two towns. Father, who has resided from Perth, has an attendance of 56 girls and 55 boys. The latter, also a mixed school founded from the Beagle Bay institution, has 39 pupils. Both are in charge of the sisters of St. John of God. (See Australia, Period of Comparative Calm.)

Australasian Catholic Directory (1910); Annuaire Pontifical Catholique (Paris, 1909); Missiones Catholicas (Rome, 1907), 617; Moran, History of the Catholic Church in Australia (Sydney, s. d.), 350 seqq.; Generale Catholicas (1908).

P. J. MACAULEY.

Kimberly in Orange, Vicariate of (Kimberley, zinc), or Orangeburg, in South Africa, which at the present date is under British rule. Kimberley in Orange became in the division of the Vicariate of Good Hope part of the Eastern District, and later on part of the Vicariate of Natal. In 1886 it became a separate vicariate comprising Basutoland, Griqualand-West, Bechuanaland, and the Orange River Colony (then Free State). On 9 May, 1894, Basutoland was separated and made an independent prefecture. At the present day the vicariate includes the Orange River Colony, Griqualand-West, and Bechuanaland, and since the late Anglo-Boer war all this territory is under British rule. The whole vicariate lies between the Tropic of Capricorn and the southernmost point of the Orange River Colony, and between 22° and 30° East Longitude. Before the discovery of diamonds the white population was practically composed of Boers. The number of Catholics was insignificant. The towns now in existence were then mere small villages or had no existence at all. But in 1870 Kimberley began to attract attention; diamonds had been first discovered about three years previously by John O'Reilly, and immigration brought to South Africa and especially to Kimberley multitudes of Europeans, most of them Irish and English. By the time it was recognized that there was already a priest in Bloemfontein, Father Hoendervangers of the Order of Saint Norbert, who had followed the troops as military chaplain during a war between the British and Boers in 1854. He built a church which was replaced by a new one in 1858. When Father Hoendervangers left Bloemfontein he was replaced by Father Victor Bompard, sent by Dr. Joliivet to minister to the scanty Catholic population. For some time the number of Catholics remained limited to eight or ten. All of them were poor and consequently unable to support the priest who very often saw himself upon the verge of starvation. However, Father Bompard never swerved from his duty; he was always ready to face sacrifice. His greatest trial was neither starvation nor physical sufferings, but the fruitlessness of the soil he had to cultivate. Being obliged to live in the midst of an element prejudiced against anything which might remind them of the former way of life, Father Bompard lived on his labours were to remain apparently fruitless for several years. The Boers were at that time, as they are now, unwilling to hear of another creed than their own. Their ministers never wearied of railing at and abusing pope and priests. Owing to such a spirit conversions have been always few; many prejudices, how-
ever, have been overcome by schools conducted by nuns of various orders.

When Kimberley started into existence the number of Catholics in the locality necessitated the frequent visit of the priest and very soon the establishment of a parochial church—St. Michael's. Father Richard Hidien used to visit them occasionally. Father Hidien finally established a Catholic Society and began the erection of an hospital. A poor and small chapel was first erected, but owing to the increase of the Catholic congregation, a larger and more substantial one was planned and built. Its erection is due to the indefatigable Father Hilary Lenoir, O.M.I. The whole vicariate is greatly indebted to him for all the missions he has founded or helped to found; Kimberley, Mafeking, and Harrismith, have thanks to him, their churches and presbyteries. When, in 1886, a separate vicariate was erected, the Right Reverend Anthony Gaughrine, O.M.I., was appointed the first vicar Apostolic; he was elected in May, 1886, consecrated on 10 August, 1886, and died in Kimberley on 15 January, 1901. On 29 January, 1902, his brother, the Right Rev. Matthew Gaughrine, O.M.I., was elected to replace him, and was consecrated Bishop in Tonver on 16 March, 1902. Under the jurisdiction of these two bishops the Vicariate of Kimberley has seen its churches and schools multiplied. In 1910 the vicariate possesses: 16 churches and chapels; 19 priests (of whom 16 belong to the Order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate); one college under the management of the Christian Brothers, where over 500 boys receive a thorough education. The Sisters of the Holy Family conduct 6 parochial schools and 3 boarding schools. The Sisters of Mercy have two schools, a boarding school in Mafeking and a parochial school in Vryburg. The Sisters of St. Jactud conduct at Taungs a school for natives. Taungs has been up to the present day the only native mission. It was founded in May, 1888, by Father Porto, O.M.I., and counts over 400 Catholics. The total number of children frequenting Catholic schools is at present over 1200. Besides the schools, there is in the Vicariate of Kimberley an establishment for orphans, the poor, and the aged; it is managed by the Sisters of Nazareth. The devotedness and self-sacrifice of these sisters have not a little contributed to overcome the prejudices of Protestants who help them generously in the upkeep of their establishment, where over one hundred and fifty children and over 500 adults are cared for. It is to be noted that all the primary schools are in part supported by the Government. Besides the 16 Oblates and the 3 secular priests, 3 lay brothers, 11 Christian Brothers (Irish), 42 Sisters of the Holy Family of Bordeaux, 14 Sisters of Nazareth, 5 Sisters of St. Jactud, and 12 Sisters of Mercy are carrying out the work of regeneration in the vicariate.

One of the great obstacles to evangelization in this vicariate is caused by the fact of the population being scattered and unsettled. This prevents the priest from being in continual touch with his flock. The success of the work on the native has not seen an increase of mission work amongst the natives, who far outnumber the white population. At present the mining industry seems to be the only source of material wealth, and its duration is uncertain. In the farming districts, though communication has been facilitated by the construction of railways, the future seems precarious owing to droughts, cattle diseases, locusts, etc. As a consequence the population is unsettled and shifting, and sacerral vocations within the vicariate are hardly to be expected for the present. Catechisms and prayer books in the native language have, however, been compiled by Father Porto who made an extensive tour of Bechuanaland, in 1898, and discovered that the natives, while akin in race and speech to the Basutos, are more rooted in fetishism.


A. LANGOUEY.

KIMCHI, DAVID. See COMMENTARIES ON THE BIBLE.

Kingdom of God (in Matthew, generally, KINGDOM OF HEAVEN).—In this expression the innermost teaching of the Old Testament is summed up, but it should be noted that the word kingdom means rule as well; thus it signifies not so much the actual kingdom as the sway of the king—cf. the Chaldaic μαγιαρα, Dan., iv, 28-29. The Greek βασιλεία of the New Testament also has these two meanings—cf. Aristotle, "Pol.", 11, xi, 10; 11, xiv; 11, xiii, 10. We find the teaching of the New Testament foreshadowed in the theocracy sketched in Ex., xix, 6: "In the establishment of the kingdom, I Kings, viii, 7: "They have not rejected thee, but me, that I should not reign over them." Still more clearly it is indicated in the promise of the theocratic kingdom, II Kings, vii, 14-17: "It is God Who rules in the theocratic king and Who will avenge any necessity which the Psalter the same thought is found; cf. Ps. 6, 1; xiii; 6, xxi; 23; lxxxviii, 12, etc. In these passages it is constantly insisted that God's throne is in heaven and that there is His kingdom; this may explain St. Matthew's preference for the expression "kingdom of heaven" as being more familiar to the Hebrews for whom he wrote. The Prophets dwell on the thought that God is the Supreme King and that by Him alone all kings rule; cf. Isaías, xxvii, 16, 20. And when the temporal monarchy has failed, this same thought of God's ultimate rule over His people is brought into clearer relief till it culminates in the grand prophecy of Dan., vii, 13 sq., to which the thoughts of Christ's hearers must have turned when they heard Him speak of His kingdom. In that vision the power of ruling over all the forces of evil as symbolised by the four beasts which are the four kingdoms is given to "one like the son of man".

At the same time we catch a glimpse in the apocryphal Psalms of Solomon of the way in which, side by side with the truth, there grew up among the carnal-minded the idea of a temporal sovereignty of the Messias, an idea which was (Luke, xix, 11; Matt., xviii, 1; Acts, vii, 25) to be handed on to the following generations; cf. especially Ps. Sol., xvii, 23-28, where God is besought to raise up the King, the Son of David, to crush the nations and purify Jerusalem, etc. In the Greek Book of Wisdom, however, we find the most perfect realisation of what was truly implied by this "rule" of God—"She [Wisdom] led the just man through direct paths and shewed him the kingdom of God", i.e. in what that kingdom consisted.

In the New Testament the speedy advent of this kingdom is the one theme: "Do penance; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," declares the Baptist; and, Christ's opening words to the people do but repeat that message. At every stage in His teaching the advent of this kingdom, its various aspects, its precise meaning, the way in which it is to be attained, form the staple of His discourses, so much so that His discourse is called "the gospel of the kingdom". And the various shades of the expression which the expression bears have to be studied. In the mouth of Christ the "kingdom" means not so much a goal to be attained or a place—though those meanings are by no means excluded; cf. Matt., v, 3; xii, 14—"it is rather a tone of mind (Luke, xvi, 2, 21), it stands for an influence acting on men's minds if they would be one with Him and attain to His ideals; cf. Luke, ix, 55. It is only by realising these shades of meaning that we can do justice to
the parables of the kingdom with their endless variety. At one time the "kingdom" means the sway of grace in men's hearts, e.g. in the parable of the mustard seed (Matt. iii. 31 sq.; cf. Matt. xiii. 31 sq.); and thus, too, it is opposed to and explained by the opposite kingdom of the devil (Matt. iv. 8; xii. 25-26). At another time it is the goal at which we have to aim, e.g. Matt. iii. 3. Again it is a place where God is pictured as reigning (Mark v. 37 sq.; cf. the second petition of the "Our Father"—"Thy kingdom come"—we are taught to pray as well for grace as for glory. As men grew to understand the Divinity of Christ they grew to see that the kingdom of God was also that of Christ—it was here that the faith of the good thief excelled; "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." So, too, as men realised that this kingdom stood for a certain tone of mind, and saw that this peculiar spirit was enshrined in the Church, they began to speak of the Church as "the kingdom of God" (cf. Col. i. 13; I Thess. ii. 12; Apoc. xi. 6 sq.; x. 10 sq.; xi. 9 sq.; xii. 7 sq.). And He presents it to the Father; cf. I Cor. xv. 23-28; II Tim. iv. 1. The kingdom of God means, then, the ruling of God in our hearts; it means those principles which separate us off from the kingdom of the world and the devil; it means the benign sway of grace in men's hearts in such a way as to be that Divine institution whereby we may make sure of attaining the spirit of Christ and so win that ultimate kingdom of God where He reigns without end in "the holy city, the New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God" (Apoc. xxi. 2).

Kings, First and Second Books of, also known as First and Second Books of Samuel.—For the First and Second Books of Kings see KINGS, THIRD and FOURTH BOOKS OF.—In the Vulgate both titles are given (Liber Primus Samuei, quem nos Primum Regum dicimus, etc.); in the English editions and the Protestant versions the second alone is recognized, the Third and Fourth Books of Kings being styled First and Second Books of Kings.

To avoid confusion, the designation "First and Second Books of Samuel" is adopted by Catholic writers when referring to the Hebrew text, otherwise "First and Second Books of Kings" is commonly used. The testimony of Origen, St. Jerome, etc., confirmed by the concordance summary appended to this book, as well as by the Hebrew MSS., shows that the two books were originally formed but one, entitled "Samuel." This title was chosen not only because Samuel is the principal figure in the first part, but probably also because, by having been instrumental in the establishment of the kingdom and in the selection of Saul and David as kings, he may be said to have been a determining factor in the history of the whole period comprised by the book. The division into two books was first introduced into the Septuagint, to conform to the shorter and more convenient size of scrolls in vogue among the Greeks. The Book of Kings was divided into two at the same time, and the four books, being considered as a consecutive history of the Kingsdoms of Israel and Judah, were named "Books of the Kingdoms" (Bashanot Ḳeḇəloḵi). St. Jerome retained the division into four books, which from the Septuagint had passed into the Itala, or old Latin translation, but changed the names "Books of the Kingdoms" (Libri Regum) into "Books of the Kings" (Libri Regum). The Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel and of the Books of Kings was first divided in Bomberg's edition of the rabbinical Bible (Venice, 1516-17), the individual books being distinguished as I B. of Samuel and II B. of Samuel, and I B. of Kings and II B. of Kings. The division into two books was adopted in the subsequent editions of the Hebrew Bible and in the Protestant translations, and thus became current among non-Catholics.

King, James Version. See Versions of the Bible.

Kings, First and Second Books of, also known as First and Second Books of Samuel.—For the First and Second Books of Kings see KINGS, THIRD and FOURTH BOOKS OF.—In the Vulgate both titles are given (Liber Primus Samuei, quem nos Primum Regum dicimus, etc.); in the English editions and the Protestant versions the second alone is recognized, the Third and Fourth Books of Kings being styled First and Second Books of Kings. To avoid confusion, the designation "First and Second Books of Samuel" is adopted by Catholic writers when referring to the Hebrew text, otherwise "First and Second Books of Kings" is commonly used. The testimony of Origen, St. Jerome, etc., confirmed by the concordance summary appended to this book, as well as by the Hebrew MSS., shows that the two books were originally formed but one, entitled "Samuel." This title was chosen not only because Samuel is the principal figure in the first part, but probably also because, by having been instrumental in the establishment of the kingdom and in the selection of Saul and David as kings, he may be said to have been a determining factor in the history of the whole period comprised by the book. The division into two books was first introduced into the Septuagint, to conform to the shorter and more convenient size of scrolls in vogue among the Greeks. The Book of Kings was divided into two at the same time, and the four books, being considered as a consecutive history of the Kingsdoms of Israel and Judah, were named "Books of the Kingdoms" (Bashanot Ḳeḇəloḵi). St. Jerome retained the division into four books, which from the Septuagint had passed into the Itala, or old Latin translation, but changed the names "Books of the Kingdoms" (Libri Regum) into "Books of the Kings" (Libri Regum). The Hebrew text of the Books of Samuel and of the Books of Kings was first divided in Bomberg's edition of the rabbinical Bible (Venice, 1516-17), the individual books being distinguished as I B. of Samuel and II B. of Samuel, and I B. of Kings and II B. of Kings. The division into two books was adopted in the subsequent editions of the Hebrew Bible and in the Protestant translations, and thus became current among non-Catholics.

Contents and Analysis.—I—II Books of Kings comprise the history of Israel from the birth of Samuel to the close of David's public life, and cover a period of about a hundred years. The first book contains the history of Samuel and of the reign of Saul; the second, the history of the reign of David, the death of Saul marking the division between the two books. The contents may be divided into five main sections: (1) I, i—vii, history of Samuel; (2) viii—xv or, better, xv, history of Saul's government; (3) xvi—xxxi, Saul and David; (4) I, i—xx, history of the reign of David; (5) xxi—xxiv, appendix containing miscellaneous matter. The division between (3) and (4) is sufficiently indicated by the death of Saul and by David's accession to power; the other sections are marked off by the summaries, historical charts, and lists of personages included in the xxv, however, which is an introduction to what follows, according to the subject-matter belongs to (2).

(1) History of Samuel.—Samuel's birth and consecration to the Lord, i, i—ii, 11. Misdeeds of the sons of Heli and prediction of the downfall of his house, ii, 12-36. Samuel's call to the prophetic office; his first vision, in which the impending punishment of the
by the other tribes, ii, 8–32. Abner, the commander of Ishboeth’s forces, having quarreled with his master, submits to David and is treacherously slain by Joab, iii. Ishboeth is assassinated; David punishes the murderers and is acknowledged by all the tribes, iv, 5.

David at Jerusalem.—Jerusalem is taken from the Jebusites and becomes the capital, v, 6–16. War with the Philistines, v, 17–25. The ark is solemnly carried from Carithaism to Sion, vi. David thinks of building a temple; his intention, though not accepted, is rewarded with the promise that his throne will last forever, vii, 2. Victory over the Ammonites is gained by the capture of Rabbath, vii, 24–31. Amnon revives Thamar, the sister of Absalom; the latter has him assassinated and flies to Gessur; through the intervention of Joab he is recalled and reconciled with his father, viii, 1–14. Rehoboam succeeds Solomon, ix. Daughters of Jerusalem fly from Jerusalem; Siba, Mibphiboeth’s servant, brings him provisions and accuses his master of disloyalty; Semei curses David; Absalom goes in to his father’s concubines, xv–xvi. Achithophel counsels immediate pursuit, but Absalom follows the advice of Chusai, David’s adherent, to delay, and thus gives the fugitive king time to cross the Jordan, xvii. Battle of Mahanaim; Absalom is defeated and slain by Joab against the king’s order, xviii. David’s intense grief, from which he is aroused by Joab’s remonstrance. At the passage of the Jordan he pardons Semei, receives Mibphiboeth back into his good graces and invites to court Berzella, who had supplied provisions to the army, xix, 1–39. Jealousies between Israel and Judah lead to the revolt of Seba; Amasa is commissioned to raise a levy, but, as the troops are collected too slowly, Joab and Abisai are sent with the bodyguard in pursuit of the rebels; Joab treacherously slays Amasa. Summary of officers, xix, 40–xx.

(5) Appendix.—The two sons of Respha, Saul’s concubine, and the five sons of Merob, Saul’s daughter, are put to death by the Gabaonites, xxx, 1–14. Various exploits against the Philistines, xxx, 15–22. David’s psalm of thanksgiving (Ps. xvii), xxxi. His last words”, xi, 1–31. Early Davidic and Da- videntian poems, xxxii, 8–38. The numbering of the people and the pestilence following it, xxxiv.

UNITY AND OBJECT.—I–II Books of Kings never formed one work with III–IV, as was believed by the older commentators and is still maintained by some modern writers. Although the consecutive numbering of the books in the Septuagint and the account of David’s last days and death at the beginning of III Kings seem to lend colour to such a supposition. The difference of plan and method pursued in the two pairs of books shows that they originally formed two distinct works. The author of I–II gives a more or less brief sketch of each reign, and then refers his readers for further information to the source whence he has drawn his data; while the author of I–II furnishes such full and minute details, even when they are of little importance, that his work looks more like a series of biographies than into his good graces and invites to court Berzella, who had supplied provisions to the army, xix, 1–39. Jealousies between Israel and Judah lead to the revolt of Seba; Amasa is commissioned to raise a levy, but, as the troops are collected too slowly, Joab and Abisai are sent with the bodyguard in pursuit of the rebels; Joab treacherously slays Amasa. Summary of officers, xix, 40–xx.

(5) Appendix.—The two sons of Respha, Saul’s concubine, and the five sons of Merob, Saul’s daughter, are put to death by the Gabaonites, xxx, 1–14. Various exploits against the Philistines, xxx, 15–22. David’s psalm of thanksgiving (Ps. xvii), xxxi. His last words”, xi, 1–31. Early Davidic and Dav-
that it is impossible to determine the length of the period covered by them. The position taken by the author of III–IV, with regard to the facts he relates, is also quite different from that of the author of the other two sections of the book: he either praises or blames the various rulers, especially with respect to forbidding or allowing sacrifices outside the sanctuary, while the latter rarely expresses a judgment and repeatedly records sacrifices contrary to the prescriptions of the Pentateuch without a word of censure or comment. Lastly, there is a marked difference in style between the two sections of the book: the latter shows strong Aramaic influence, whereas the first two belong to the best period of Hebrew literature. At the most, it might be said that the first two chapters of the third book originally were part of the Book of Samuel, and were later detached by the author of the Book of Kings to serve as an introduction to the history of Solomon; but even this is doubtful. These chapters are not required by the object which the author of the Book of Samuel had in view, and the work is a complete whole without them. Besides, the summary, II, xx, 23–26, sufficiently marks the conclusion of the history of David’s time (the chapter is so closely connected with the following that they have been belonged to the Book of Kings from its very beginning.

The general subject of I–II Kings is the foundation and development of the Kingdom of Israel, the history of Samaria being merely a preliminary episode intended to explain the circumstances which brought about the establishment of the royal form of government. On closer examination of the contents, however, it is seen that the author is guided by a leading idea in the choice of his matter, and that his main object is not to give a history of the first two kings of Israel, but to relate the providential foundation of a permanent royal dynasty in the family of David. This strikingly appears in the account of Saul’s reign, which may be summarised in the words: elected, found wanting, and rejected in favour of David. The detailed history of the struggle between David and Saul and his house is plainly intended to show how David, the chosen of the Lord, was providentially preserved amid many imminent dangers and how he ultimately triumphed, while Saul perished with his house. The early events of David’s rule over united Israel are told in few words, even such an important fact as the capture of Jerusalem, which scarcely merit a mention, is in itself little insisted on, but his zeal for God’s worship and its reward in the solemn promise that his throne would last forever (II, vii, 11–16) are related in full detail. The remaining chapters tell how, in pursuance of this promise, God helps him to extend and consolidate his kingdom, and does not abandon him even after his great crime, though he punishes him in his tenderest feelings. The conclusion shows him in peaceful possession of the throne after two dangerous rebellions. The whole story is thus built around a central idea and reaches its climax in the Messianic promise, II, vii, 11 sqq.

A L T H O U G H T O N E S T A T E M E N T .—The Talmud attributes to Samuel the whole work bearing his name; this strange opinion was later adopted by St. Gregory the Great, who nately persuaded himself that Samuel wrote the whole book. The death of David and the ascension of Solomon are variously placed. The books of Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings form one book in the LXX, and in the Apocrypha the two books are divided into 1 Kings and 2 Kings. The book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer.” But the wording of the text indicates that there are three distinct works. Besides, the unity of plan and the close connexion between the different parts exclude composite authorship; we must at least admit a redactor who combined the three narratives. This redactor, according to Hummelauer, is the prophet Nathan; the work, however, can hardly be placed so early. Others attribute it to Ezra, or Neheims, Eschias, or Edras. None of these opinions rests on any solid ground, and we can only say that the author is unknown.

The same diversity of opinion exists as to the date of composition. Hummelauer assigns it to the last days of David; two others, Cornelis Leemans and Haenricus van Marle, place it under Roboa; Kaulen, under Abiam the son of Roboa; Haenricus, not long after David; Ewald, some thirty years after Solomon; Clair, between the death of David and the destruction of the Kingdom of Judah. According to recent critics it belongs to the seventh century, but received retouches as late as the fifth or even the fourth century. No sufficient data are at hand to fix a precise date. We can, however, assign certain limits of time within which the work must have been composed. The explanation concerning the dress of the king’s daughters in David’s time (II, xi, 25) presupposes that a considerable period had elapsed in the interval, and points to a date later than Solomon, during whose reign a change in the style of dress was most likely introduced by his foreign wives. How much later is indicated by the remark: “For which reason Siecleag belongeth not to the kings of Judah till this day” (I, xxv, 8). The expression kings of Judah implies that at the time of writing the Kingdom of Israel had been divided, and that at least two or three kings had reigned over Judah alone. The earliest date cannot, therefore, be placed before the reign of Abiam. The latest date, on the other hand, must be assigned to a time prior to Josiah’s reform (621 b.c.). As has been remarked, the author repeatedly records without censure or comment violations of the Pentateuchal law regarding sacrifices. Now it is not likely that he would have acted thus if he had written after these practices had been abolished and their unlawfulness impressed on the people, since at this time his readers would have taken scandal at the violation of the Law by such a person as Samuel, and at the toleration of unlawful rites by a king like David. The force of this reason will be seen if we consider how the author of III–IV Kings, who wrote after Josiah’s reform, censures every act of the former kings, yet is silent on this subject. (II, iii, 2, explains it. The purity of language speaks for an early rather than a late date within the above limits. The appendix, however, may possibly be due to a somewhat later hand. Moreover, additions by a subsequent inspired revisor may be admitted without difficulty.

SOURCES.—It is now universally recognized that the author of I–II Kings made use of written documents in composing his work. One such document, “The Book of the Just,” is mentioned in connexion with David’s lament over Saul and Jonathan (I, i, 18). The can-tile of Anna (I, ii, 3–4) points to a document later than this, which deals with the history of David; the narrative of the hymn of thanksgiving (II, xxii, 2–51; cf. Ps, xcvii), and his “last words” were very probably also drawn from a written source. But besides these minor sources, the writer must have had at hand, at least for the history of David, a document containing much of the historical material which he narraes. This we infer from the passages common to I–II Kings and the First Book of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), which are shown in the following list:

| I K. xxvi | Par. x, 1-12 |
| ii, 1-2 | ii, 1-12 |
| ii, 3-5 | ii, xi, 1 |
| v, 1-10 | xii, 26-31 |
| v, 11-25 | xxv, 14-39 |
| i, 11-19 | vi, 12-23 |
| ii, 1-19 | vii |
| xvi, 1-3, 43 | xvi, 1-3, 43 |
| xxv, 25-29 | xxiv |
| xvi, 1-3, 43 | xvi, 4-6 |
| | xxiv |
| | xvi, 4-6 |
| | xxiv |
Although these passages often agree word for word, the differences are such that the author of Paralipomenon, the later writer, cannot also have copied from I-II Kings, and we must conclude that both authors made use of the same document. This seems to have been an official record of important public events and of matters pertaining to the administration, such as was probably kept by the court "recorder" (II Kings, viii, 10, 16). And only by the same connotation do we understand the "Chronicles of King David." (I Par., xxvii, 24.) To this document we may add those others mentioned in I Par. (xxix, 29) as sources of information for the history of David, namely, the "Book of Samuel," the "Book of Gad," and the "Book of Nathan." These were works of the three Prophets, as we gather from II Par. (xxvii, 29), and hardly neglect writings recommended by such names. Samuel very probably furnished the matter for his own history and for part of Saul's; Gad, David's companion in exile, the details of that part of David's life, as well as of his early days as king; and Nathan, information concerning the latter part, or even the whole, of his reign. Thus between them they would have fairly covered the period treated of, if, indeed, their narratives did not partially overlap. Besides these four documents other sources may occasionally have been used. A comparison of the passages of I-II Kings and I Par, given in the last section above shows further that both writers frequently transferred their source to their own pages with but few changes; for, since one did not copy from the other, the agreement between them cannot be explained except on the supposition that they more or less reproduce the same document. We have therefore reason to believe that our author followed the same course in other cases, but to what extent we have no means of determining.

The Critical Theory.—According to recent critics, I-II Kings is nothing but a compilation of different narratives so unskillfully combined that they may be separated with comparative ease. In spite of this comparative ease in distinguishing the different elements, the critics are not agreed as to the number of sources, nor as to the particular source to which certain passages are to be ascribed. At present the Wellhausen-Budde theory is accepted, at least in its main outlines, and is very generally applied to this theory, II, ix-xx, forms one document, which is practically contemporary with the events described; the rest (excluding the appendix) is chiefly made up of two writings, an older one, J, of the ninth century, and a later one, E, of the end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century. They are designated J and E, because they are either due to the authors of the Jahwist and Elohist documents of the Hexateuch, or to writers belonging to the same schools. Both J and E underwent modifications by a revisor, J' and E respectively, and after being welded together by a redactor, RJE, were edited by a writer of the Deuteronomic school, RD. After this redaction some further additions were made, among them the appendix. The different elements are thus divided by Budde:—

J.—I, ix, 1-xxxxv; xi, 1-11, 15; xiii, 1-7a, 15b-18; xiv, 1-46; xvi, 14-23; xvii, 5-6; xlv, 20-30; xx, 1-10, 18-39; 42b; xxii, 1-4, 6-18, 20-23; xxvii, 1-4xxx; xxxv, 1-9, 10b, 12-32; iii; iv, 1-3, 6-10, 17-25; vi, 1-33; xii, 1-9, 13-31; xiii-xx, 22.

E.—I, 1-4; ii, 1-48; vii, 1; xv, 2-34; xvii, 11, 14-58; xviii, 1-4; xix, 1-4; xx, 1-18; xxi, 1-9; xxi, 10; xxi, 12; xxi, 12-xxv; xxix; xxxvii. I, 1-6, 10-13, 16-18; II, 1-4; ii, 1-28; ii, 11-22a, 23-26; iii, 1-iv, 1a; vii, 2-12; 22; x, 17-24; xii.

RJE.—I, 1, 25-27; xi, 12-14; xv, 1; xviii, 21b; xix, 2-3; 7; xx, 11-20, 40-42a; xxii, 10b; xxiii, 14b-18; xxiv, 16, 20-22a. I, 1, 5.
seemance, differ in every detail. This is the case with the two accounts of Saul's disobedience and rejection, with the two narratives of David's sparing Saul's life, and of his seeking refuge with Achish. Such narratives cannot be identified, unless the improbability of the events be admitted (3) and it be considered probable that Saul should on two different occasions have disregarded Samuel's directions and that the latter should repeat with greater emphasis the announcement of his rejection? Or that in the game of hide-and-seek among the mountains David should have twice succeeded in getting near the person of Saul and should on both occasions have refrained from harming him? Or that under changed conditions he should have entered into negotiations with Achish and become his vassal? Even where the circumstances are the same, we cannot at once pronounce the narratives to be only different accounts of the same occurrence. It is not at all strange that Saul in his insane moods should twice have attempted to spare David, or that the loyal Ziphites should twice have betrayed to Saul David's whereabouts. The two accounts of Saul among the prophets at first sight seem to be real doublets. The expression used in the other case—"Wherefore do they say to Saul, David enquired of the Lord?" (xix. 21)—naturally imply that the proverb did not exist before, but may be understood to say that it then became popular. The translation of the Vulgate, "Unde et exivit proverbium", is misleading. There is no double mention of David's flight from court. When in xxi, 10, he is said to have fled from the face of Saul, nothing more is affirmed than that he fled to avoid being taken by Saul, the meaning of the expression "to flee from the face of" being to flee for fear of some one. The double narrative of Saul's election is obtained by tearing asunder parts which complement and explain one another. Many a true story thus handled will yield the same results. The story as it stands is natural and well connected. The people, disgusted at the conduct of the sons of Samuel, and feeling that a strong central government would be an advantage for the defence of the country, request a king. Samuel receives the request, but will not appoint the time and place for the election. In the meanwhile he anoints Saul, who is later designated by lot and acclaimed king. All, however, did not recognize him. Influential persons belonging to the larger tribes were very likely piqued that an unknown man of the smallest tribe should have been chosen. Under the circumstances Saul wisely delayed assuming royal power till a favourable opportunity presented itself, which came a month later, when Naas besieged Jabes. It is objected, indeed, that, since the Jabesites did not send a message to Saul in their pressing danger, they were slow in sending a message which Saul has not yet been presented, but the reluctance of a double narrative is clearly indicated. But even if the Jabesites had sent no message, the fact would have no significance, since Saul had not received universal recognition; nothing, however, warrants us to read such a meaning into the text. At all events, Saul on hearing the news immediately exercised royal power by threatening with severe punishment anyone who would not follow him. Difficulties, it is true, exist as to some particulars, but difficulties are found also in the theory of a double account. The two accounts of Saul's death are really contradictory; but only in one determining detail: the murder of the Amalecites who brought to David the news of Saul's death, and nothing indicates that the writer intends to relate it as true. We need have little hesitation in pronouncing it a fabrication of the Amalecites. Lying to promote one's interests is not unusual, and the hope of winning David's favour was a sufficient inducement for the man to invent his story.

With regard to the apparent contradiction between xvi, 14-23, and xvii, it should be remarked that the circumstances are quite different. Soom. xvi. 12-13 and xvii, 55-xviiii. 5. This form of the text is held to be the more original, not only by some conservative writers, but by such critics as Cornill, Stade, W. R. Smith, and H. P. Smith. But though this text, if it were certain, would lessen the difficulty, it would not entirely remove it, as David still appears as a boy unused to arms. The apparent contradiction disappears if we take xvi, 14-23, to be out of its chronological place, a common enough occurrence in the historical books both of the Old and of the New Testament. The reason of the inversion seems to be in the desire of the author to bring out the contras between David, upon whom the spirit of the Lord came from the day of his anointing, and Saul, who was thenceforth deserted by the spirit of the Lord and troubled by an evil spirit. Or it may be due to the fact that with xvii the author begins to follow a new plan, and that therefore he has to choose a point of transition of some details concerning David's family, if xvii, 17-21, is original. According to the real sequence of events, David after his victory over Goliat returned home, and later, having been recommended by one who was aware of his musical skill, he was persuaded to go to the court of Saul. This form is preferred by Ewald, as it connects the history of Saul more closely with that of the person of Saul. This explanation might seem inadmissible, because it is said (xvii, 2) that "Saul took him that day, and would not let him return to his father's house." But as "on that day" is often used in a loose way, it need not be taken to refer to the day on which David slew Goliat, and room will thus be left for the incident related in xvi, 14-23. It is not true, therefore, that it is impossible to reconcile the two accounts, as is asserted. The so-called contradictory statements may also be satisfactorily explained. As xxii is a summary of Samuel's administration, the words "the Philistines... did not come any more into the borders of Israel" must be taken to refer only to Samuel's term of office, and not to his whole lifetime; they do not, therefore, stand in contradiction with xiiii, where an invasion during the reign of Saul is described. Besides, it is not said that the Philistines were not further attacked by the Israelites; the following clause: "And the house of the Lord was against the Philistines, all the days of Samuel", rather supposes the contrary. There were wars, indeed, but the Philistines were always defeated and never succeeded in gaining a foothold in the country. Still they remained dangerous neighbours, who might attack Israel at any moment. Hence it could well be said of Saul, "He shall save my people out of the hands of the Philistines" (ix, 16), which expression does not necessarily connote that they were then under the power of the Philistines. Ch. xiii, 19-21, which seems to indicate that the Philistines were occupying the country, is generally acknowledged to be misplaced. Further, when Samuel delegated his powers to his sons, he still retained his office, and when he did resign it, after the election of Saul, he continued to advise and reprove both king and people (cf. i, xiii, 23); he can therefore be truly said to have judged Israel all the days of his life. The last contradiction, which Budde declares to be inexplicable, rests on a mere quibble about the verb "to see". The context shows clearly enough that when the writer states that "Samuel saw Saul no more till the day of his death" (xv, 25), he means that Saul had no further dealings with Saul, and not that he never beheld him again with his eyes. Really, it is likely that a redactor who, we are told, often harmonizes his sources, and who plainly intends to present a coherent story, and
not merely a collection of old documents, would allow glaring contradictions to stand? There is no sufficient reason, then, why we should not grant a historical character to the section I, i—II, viii, as well as to chapters and other ancient versions. Other intermediates, namely, like touches, minuteness of detail, bright and flowing style—which move the critics to consider the latter part as of early origin and of undoubted historical value, are equally found in the first.

The Hebrew Text, the Septuagint, and the Vulgate—The text has come down to us in a rather unsatisfactory condition, by reason of the numerous errors due to transcribers. The numbers especially have suffered, probably because in the oldest manuscripts they were not written out in full. In I, vi, 19, seventy men become "seventy men, and fifty" and thirty, in xii, 18; seventy from the footnotes II, vii, 26, changed into horsemen. Michol, who in II, vi, 23, is said to have had no children, in II, xvi, 8, is credited with the five sons of her sister Merob (cf. I, xviii, 9; xxv, 44; II, iii, 15). In I, xii, 19, Goliath is again slain by Elchanan, and, strange to say, though I, x, 21, speaks of the man who slew the brother of the giant, some critics here also see a contradiction. Badan in I, xii, 17, should be changed to Abdon or Barak, and Samuel, in the same verse, to Samson, etc.

Many of these mistakes can readily be corrected by a comparison with the Septuagint, the version that is closest to the Hebrew text in all the ancient versions. Others anticipate all dates and translations, and are therefore found in the versions as well as in the Massoretic (Hebrew) text. In spite of the work of correction done by modern commentators and textual critics, a perfectly satisfactory critical test is still a desideratum. The Septuagint differs considerably from the Massoretic. Besides some transpositions, it contains a number of additions; while on the other hand it omits (in the Vatican MS, printed in the Sixtine and Swete's edition) some passages, of which I, xvi, 12-31, 55—57, xvi, 10-11, 17-19, are the most important. Many passages many have been interpolated in the Massoretic text of double translations. The Septuagint is without doubt to be preferred to the Massoretic text in many instances; in others the case is not so clear. The Vulgate was translated from a Hebrew text closely resembling the Massoretic; but the original text has been interpolated by additions and duplicate translations, which have crept in from the Itala. Additions occur, I, iv; v, 6, 9; vii, 18; x, 1; xi, 1; xii, 15; xiv, 22, 41; x, 3, 12; xvi, 36; xlii, 11, xxx; xii, 15; i, 20; x, 23; x, 19; xii, 21, 27; xiv, 30; duplicate translations, I, ix, 25; xii, 32; xx, 15; xiii, 13; i, 11, 18; iv, 19; x, 19; xv, 12.

Catholic: Gooch, Special Intro. (New York, 1901), 251-65; CONNOLLY, Introduzione (Paris, 1897), 1-240; HUMMELAUER, "Comm. in Libros Salm. (Paris, 1898); FÄLLOT, "Scritti di V. G. (Florence, 1899); STEINER, "Jüdisches Handbuch" (1899); VISSER, "Handbuch" (1900); BAVEL, "Handbuch" (2d ed., Freiburg im Breisgau, 1900); KERSTEN, "Handbuch" (2d ed., Freiburg in the Breisgau, 1900); HAMPÜLL, "Über die Auslegung und Anwendung des J. O. in der modernen Zeit" (1874); SCHOEN, "Die Bücher Salm. (1900); WIEBEN, "Die Bibel der Juden" (1900).

Non-Catholic: HEBRROBERT, "Die Bücher Salm. (1900); GODTHJELL, "Die Bucher Salm. (1900); H. F. SMITH, "Comm. on the B. of Salm. (New York, 1896); WIEBEN, "Theological des

Kings, The Three. See Magi.

Kings, Third and Fourth Books of. — The historical book called in the Hebrew Melachim, i.e. Kings, is in the Vulgate, in imitation of the Septuagint, styled the Third and Fourth Book of Kings. This designation is justified, inasmuch as the historical narration contained in I and II Kings is here continued, and, especially, because the history of David's life, begun in I and II, is here concluded. It is, on the other hand, an independent work, distinct from the Books of Samuel (i.e. I and II Kings) in its origin and its style, as well as by reason of the purpose it has in view. It was written two centuries later, in the middle of the first century B.C. (i.e. 185). Its division into three parts is confirmed by the passage, just in the middle of the history of Ochosias—did not exist in early times, and has only been introduced later into the Hebrew editions from the Septuagint and the Vulgate. A division into three parts would be more in keeping with the contents. The second part (II Kings, xii—17) is perhaps the most interesting, and contains the enactments concerning the succession to the throne and his last instructions, comprises the history of Solomon: his God-given wisdom, the building of the temple and royal palace, the splendour of his reign, his great fall on account of which God announced to him the breaking up of his realm. The second part (II Kings, xii—17) gives an historical survey of the kindred Kingdoms of Judah and Israel: Jeroboam's falling away from God and worship of the golden calf, the continuous wars between the succeeding kings of Israel and Judah up to Achab, the endeavours on the part of Elias to bring back to God the people misled by Achab, the destructive alliances between the house of Achab and the house of David, the miracles, prophecies, and activity of Eliseus, the destruction of the race of Achab by Jehu, Athaliah's abortive attempt to destroy the house of David, the other line of contemporaneous kings of Judah and Israel until the end of the last-named kingdom, with an epilogue setting forth the causes of the fall of the latter. The third part (IV Kings, xviii—xxv) treats of the history of the Kingdom of Judah after the reign of Ezechias: his miraculous deliverance from the power of the Assyrians, his bestial conning with the Babylonians, which gave rise to the Babylonian Captivity and Exile, the historical account of the reign of Manasses, whose sins evoked the pronouncement of the ruin of Judah, of Josias, who restored the temple, renewed the covenant with God, and endeavoured to stamp out idolatry, of the last kings up to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, with a short postscript concerning the Judeans who had remained behind, and the delivery of King Josachim from his imprisonment. The Books of Kings were not completed in their present form before the middle of the Exile. Indeed IV Kings, xxv, 27-30, relates that Josachim was released from bondage (562), and admitted to the court of Babylon for "all the days of his life".

According to the Babylonian Talmud (Baba bathra, fol. 15, 1), the Prophet Jeremias is the author. Not a little among both older and newer critics is the question of whether this is the case, and whether it is the best possible solution of the problem. It is indeed remarkable that Jeremias' activity is not alluded to—his name not even mentioned—although he stood in close relation to the events of the last few years, while everything other prophets (e.g. Elias, Eliseus, Isaia) did for kings and people is carefully noted. In case
Jeremiah was the author, we have to accept the explanation that he did not consider it suitable to relate here what he had set forth at length in his prophesy. Paul, and the Lord can overlook all the seed of Israel. IV Kings, ii, 3, 4; ix, 3-9; xi, 11, 33-39; xiv, 7-11; xvi, 12 sqq.; IV Kings, x, 30-33; xiii, 3; xii, 16; xxi, 15-17; xxiv, 3-20, bring out the same idea. In this manner the writer teaches that the unlawful cult offered in the high places and the idolatry practised in the Temple and of the adorations of the prophets were the cause of the downfall of Israel and of Judah. Still this is not the entire purpose of the work. The repeated calling to mind of the promises of the God Who had pledged a permanent reign to David, the acknowledgment of the mercy of the God Who, on account of David, Ex. 28:58; II Kings, jx, 14, and Josias, had suspended the judgment pronounced upon Judah—all this served to revive the hope and confidence of the remnant of the people. From this they were to learn that God, just in His wrath, was also merciful in His promises to David and would be faithful to His promise of sending the Messiahs, whose kingdom should endure. Not the word, but the idea and the action, might be called an historical elucidation and explanation of Nathan’s oracle (II Kings, vii, 12-16).

The writings upon which the Books of Kings are based and to which they refer more than thirty times are the “book of the words of the days of Solomon” (I Kings, vii, 5, 7, 11, 12, 22, 27, 29, 31) (A. V., book of the chronicles) of the kings of Israel” (xiv, 19; etc.), and the “book of the words of the days of the kings of Judah” (xix, 29; etc.). In the opinion of many, these “chronicles” are the official annals kept by the chancellors of the different kings. However, it is by no means certain that the office designated by the Hebrew word ma‘azir signifies chancellor (Vulg. a commentarius); still less certain is it that it was part of the duty of the chancellor, who belonged to the king’s household, to keep these annals. It is true that David (II Kings, viii, 10), Solomon (I Kings, iv, 3), Ezechias (IV Kings, xvii, 18), and Josias (II Par., xxxiv, 8) counted among their officials a ma‘azir, but whether the other kings of Judah and of Israel employed such an officer we find nowhere indicated. Even if it were historically certain that so-called year-books were kept in the two kingdoms by such an office, there is little probability that this was true in Israel in spite of so many revolutions and regicides, there remains still the question whether these are really the “chronicles” which serve as a basis for the Books of Kings. The chronicles of other peoples, as far as they have been preserved, are in cuneiform characters and comprise the annals of their petty states, not the rise to the glory of the kings, their deeds of arms, the edifices they built, etc. Our historical work, however, also relates the sins, prevarications, and other atrocities of the kings, which were not likely to be recorded in the year-books by court officials during the lifetime of their kings. According to IV Kings, xxxi, 17, “The act of Manasses . . . and his sin which he sowed . . . is not written in the book of the words of the days [A. V. book of the chronicles—II Kings, xxxi, 17] of the kings of Judah?“
chronicles of the kings of Judah" (A. V. I Kings, xiv, 29). The writer of II Par., x-xii, gives an account of the same which in contents and form is almost identical, and refers to "the books of Semeias the prophet, and of Addo the seer" (II Par., xii, 5). The same holds of the history of the following kings of Judah. After an account, often in almost the same words, now elaborate and then again more concise, we find in the Book of Kings the "book of the chronicles" and in II Par. the "prophetic writings" given as sources. It must be added that, while in the life story of four of the seven kings in II Par., reference to the source is omitted, these are also absent in the Books of Kings. Is it then not probable that it is one and the same source whence both writers have gathered their information? The "book of the chronicles" quoted in III and IV Kings the writer of II Par. designates by the then usual appellation, "the book of the kings of Judah and Israel". The prophetic writings referred to by this writer are divisions of the last-named book. This the writer states explicitly (II Par., xx, 34) of "the words [or the writings] of Jehu the son of Hanani"; (his source for the history of Josiah): they are "collated into the books of the kings of Israel and Judah"; also (II Par., xxxii, 32—Vulg.) of "the vision of Ithai, son of Amos"; it is embodied in "the book of the kings of Judah and Israel". Consequently, the source utilised by both writers is nothing else but the collection of the writings left behind by the successive kings. That the author of the Book of Kings has thoroughly consulted his sources, is constantly evident. Thus he is able to describe the labours and miracles of Flavius Josephus and Eusebius as witnesses to the reliability of our book of sacred history. Especially notable in this respect are the inscriptions concerning the Oriental races discovered during the last century.

---

**Chronology of the Kings.**—First a table in which the data of the Bible are put together. For the kings of Judah, s. signifies son, b. brother, of the preceding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Length of Reign</th>
<th>Year of Accession</th>
<th>Bible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>yrs. mos. d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijah</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeroboam</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obadiah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atithiah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash, s. of Omri</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasias</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa, s.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joashan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achara</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschobia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joas, b.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joash, s. of Joas</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedeias, s. of Joas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Since the deciphering of the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions, the chronology of the period of Kings before 730 B.C. has become untenable. We give here the points of chronological contact between the Assyro-Babylonian history and Sacred Scripture, as also those of Egyptian history.

---

**Notes.**

1. From Assyrian to Judah.

1. 854 B.C. Salophalaras II, in the summer of his sixth year, vanquished Benadad of Syria (III Kings, xx, 1), the predecessor of Hasar, with other kings, among them Achab of Israel, in the battle of Karkar.

2. 842 B.C. Salophalaras II, in his eighteenth year, receives a tribute from Jehu.

3. 738 B.C. Thelgathphalaras III (Phul, IV Kings, xv, 19) receives, in his eighth year, tribute from Manahem.

4. 733 B.C. War between the Thelgathphalaras and Rasin of Syria; siege of Damascus. "Joashas of Judah", i.e. Achab, brings presents from the Thelg-

---

Elias and Eliseus with such minuteness and in so fresh and vivid a manner as to make it plain that the original narrator was an eyewitness. This is why he consults the sources and refers the reader to them in his account of the life of almost every king; not a few expressions have been taken over verbally (cf. III Kings, viii, 8; ix, 21; xii, 10; IV Kings, xiv, 7, etc.). The authenticity of his history is further strengthened by its agreement with the accounts of II Par. The difficulties which appear at the superficial perusal of these Sacred Writings vanish after an attentive study, what seemed contradictory proving to be an amplification or else entire new matter. In many places the historical reliability of the Books of Kings is confirmed by what the prophetic writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Osee, Amos, Micheas, and Sophonias report concerning the same events, either by direct mention or by allusion. Even profane historians of antiquity, Berosus, Manetho, and Menander, are quoted by...
phalasar. Conquest of Israelitish territory by Thegathpalasar.
(5) 731-0 (? B.C. "Pakacha", i.e. Phacee (Hebr. Pakacha), is killed, and "Assi", i.e. Osea, is set over Israel, by Thegathpalasar.
(6) 722-1 B.C. Samaria is taken possession of, in the early part of Sargon’s reign, by the Assyrians.

B. From Scripture.—
(1) Towards the end of Solomon’s reign, Jeroboam I fled into Egypt to S-esae. In the fifth year of the reign of Roboam, Jerusalem was plundered by the same Sesse (I Kings, xi, 40; xiv, 25). Sesse I probably reigned about 940-19 B.C.
(2) In, or shortly before, the fourteenth year of Asa’s reign, "Zara the Ethiopian" (Hebr. Zerach) declared war against Asa (II Par. A. V. II Chron.), xiv, 9; cf. xv, 10 sqq.). Some commentators think that Zara was a king of Egypt, namely, Osorkon I or II. The first was the successor of Sesse I. The second cannot be placed chronologically.
(3) Benadad II (III Kings, xx, 1), the contemporary of Salmanasar II, was contemporary with Achab and Joram of Israel. Joram died during the reign of Benadad’s successor, Hazael. According to Assyrian sources, Benadad was, in 846, still King of Syria.
(4) Hazael, who, according to Assyrian inscriptions, was already ruling in 842, was contemporary with Jehu, Joas of Judah, and Joash of Israel (IV Kings, xiii, 22). In 805, Ramman-nirari III conquered Damascus under the Syrian King Marri, who was possibly the Biblical Benadad (III), contemporary of Joash of Israel (ibid., v. 25).
(5) Manahem honours Phul, King of the Assyrians, ninth of Osee, is taken by the Assyrians (IV Kings, xvii, 5, 6; xviii, 10, 11). Salmanasar reigned from January, 726, to January, 721. Sus (or Seve), mentioned in IV Kings, xvii, 4, as ‘’king of Egypt,’’ is not identified with certainty. Some think him to be Sabaka, whose chronology, as also that of Theraes (IV Kings, xix, 9), has not been determined. Under Sargon of Assyria is mentioned, in the year 707, one Sib’u, or Sib’e, as “prince [nurtan, or sultan] of Musri.”
(10) Ezechias received, in or shortly after his fourteenth year, an embassy from Merodach-Baladan (V. D. Berodaich Baladan), who was King of Babylon from 721 to 710, and again, for 9 months, in 703. See IV Kings, xx, 1, 6, 12.
(11) Sennacherib of Assyria besieged Ezechias at Jerusalem. The date given for this event, “in the fourteenth year of King Ezechias” (IV Kings, xviii, 13; and Is., xxxvi, 1) is either misplaced or incorrect. The event took place, according to IV Kings, xx, 6, after the recovery of Ezechias in his fourteenth year (i.e. fifteen years before his death), and after the arrival of the Babylonian embassy.
(12) Death of Josias in a combat with Nechao, King of Egypt (IV Kings, xxix, 29). Nechao (Necho II) ascended the throne in 610.
(13) Battle near Carchemish (Characim, Karchemish) between Nechao and Nabuchodonosor of Babylon in the fourth year of Joakim (Jer., xlvi, 2; cf. xxy, 1; and IV Kings, xxiv, 1). According to the account of Hierothes in Flavius Josephus, Nabuchodonosor, after having slaughtered the Egyptian army near Carchemish, marched on to Syria and Palestine in order to invade Egypt. Arrived at the confines of

### Kings of Israel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Length of Reign</th>
<th>Year of Accession</th>
<th>Bible Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxix, 27</td>
<td>Jeroboam I.</td>
<td>22 yrs. mon. d.</td>
<td>2 Asa</td>
<td>III Kings, xiv, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xx, 30</td>
<td>Nabuchadnezzar</td>
<td>12 yrs. mon. d.</td>
<td>3 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xv, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxiii, 1</td>
<td>Elia</td>
<td>24 yrs. mon. d.</td>
<td>4 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xvi, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xvii, 13</td>
<td>Zemariam</td>
<td>7 yrs. mon. d.</td>
<td>5 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xvi, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xx, 31</td>
<td>Amri</td>
<td>12 yrs.</td>
<td>6 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xvi, 10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxii, 5</td>
<td>Abchax</td>
<td>22 yrs. mon. d.</td>
<td>7 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xvi, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxii, 2</td>
<td>Ochosia</td>
<td>12 yrs.</td>
<td>8 &quot;</td>
<td>III Kings, xxii, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxii, 12</td>
<td>Jero</td>
<td>28 yrs.</td>
<td>9 Joran</td>
<td>IV Kings, iii, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxv, 5</td>
<td>Joesa</td>
<td>17 yrs.</td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, iv, 7; v, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvi, 7</td>
<td>Josias</td>
<td>16 yrs.</td>
<td>11 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvii, 1, 8</td>
<td>Jeroboam II</td>
<td>41 yrs.</td>
<td>12 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvii, 1</td>
<td>Zacharias</td>
<td>6 yrs.</td>
<td>13 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxviii, 1</td>
<td>Solum</td>
<td>1 yrs.</td>
<td>14 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxviii, 1</td>
<td>Manahem</td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>15 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxviii, 2</td>
<td>Phaszia</td>
<td>2 yrs.</td>
<td>16 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxviii, 4</td>
<td>Phacee</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>17 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvi, 9</td>
<td>Osea</td>
<td>9 yrs.</td>
<td>18 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvi, 11</td>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>19 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Par., xxxvi, 9</td>
<td>Ezechias = 9 Osea</td>
<td>19 yrs.</td>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td>IV Kings, xv, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxiv, 29</td>
<td>Jeroboam I.</td>
<td>22 yrs.</td>
<td>21 &quot;</td>
<td>I Kings, xix, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 2</td>
<td>Phacee</td>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>22 &quot;</td>
<td>I Kings, xix, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 10</td>
<td>Assayas</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>23 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 17</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>24 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 20</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>30 yrs.</td>
<td>25 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 19</td>
<td>Achan</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>26 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 21</td>
<td>Josaphat</td>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>27 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 12, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 22</td>
<td>Joas</td>
<td>18 yrs.</td>
<td>28 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 12, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Par., xxv, 23</td>
<td>Ochosia</td>
<td>5 yrs.</td>
<td>29 &quot;</td>
<td>II Kings, x, 12, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with presents (IV Kings, xv, 19-20). That Phul is identical with Thegathpalasar III is apparent from the fact that, in the year 729, according to Assyrian inscriptions, Tukulti-paletarsaras, and Babylonian inscriptions Pulu, becomes King of Babylonia, and that this same king, according to the same sources, died in 727.
(6) Phace and Raazin, King of Syria, besiege Acha in Jerusalem (IV Kings, xvi, 5). Achaas calls Thegathpalasar to his assistance (ibid., v. 8).
(7) Damascus is taken by Thegathpalasar, and Raazin is killed (IV Kings, xvi, 9). Achaas visits Tukulti-paletarsaras, and is returned to Damascus (ibid., v. 10).
(8) Thegathpalasar, during the reign of Phacee, takes possession of Israel’s territory. Phacee is conspired against and slain by Osee, and the latter becomes king (IV Kings, xv, 29, 30).
(9) Salmanasar besiegers Samaria, which, in the third year of the siege, the sixth of Ezechias, and the this country, he received the news of the death of his father, Nabopolassar. Returning to Babel to assume his administration, he confided the Jewish, Phoeni-.
(14) Nabuchodonosor takes Judea (Jechonias) as a prisoner to Babylon, and begins to rule (ibid., v. 10).
according to Israelitish dating, it was 589. Jer., lii, 81. "In the seven and thirtieth year of the captivity of Joachin, king of Judah, in the twelfth month, the fifth and twentieth day of the month, Evilmerodach king of Babylon, in the first year of his reign [i.e. 582 B.C.], lifted up the head of Joachin, king of Judah, and brought him forth out of prison" (incorporated in IV Kings, xxv, 27), evidently follows Babylonian dating. All these datings point to 598 as the year when Joachin was carried away.

(16) In his eighth year, or the beginning of his ninth year, Sedecias revolted against Nabuchodonosor and called to his assistance Egypt, namely, the newly elevated Pharaoh Hophra (D. V. Ephrée), who ascended the throne in 589 (probably the first half of the year)—IV Kings, xxiv, 20 (cf. xxv, 1); Jer., xxxvii, 4 (A. V. xxxvii, 5); xliv, 30; Ezckh., xvii, 15.

(16) The siege of Jerusalem began in the tenth month of the ninth year of Sedecias (IV Kings, xxv, 1; Jer., xxxix, 1; II, 4). According to Jer., xxxi, 1, the tenth year of Sedecias coincides with the eighteenth year of Nabuchodonosor. Jerusalem was taken in the eleventh year of Sedecias, the nineteenth year of Nabuchodonosor, in the fourth month (IV Kings, xxv, 8; Jer., lii, 29). According to Babylonian chronology, this was the eighteenth year of Nabuchodonosor (Jer., lii, 29).

(17) The fourth month of the eleventh year of Sedecias falls in the nineteenth year (Israelitish chronology) of Nabuchodonosor. From this it appears that the fourth month (Thammuz) of the first year of Sedecias falls in the ninth year of Nabuchodonosor. As Joachin's abdication took place in the eighth year of Nabuchodonosor, it is very probable that Sedecias became king in this, the eighth year.

The table on the opposite page gives the chronology of the kings of Judah and of Israel, as nearly as possible in accordance with the figures of the Bible, in conjunction with the data of profane history. In this connexion it must be noted that: (1) The years B.C. are figured from Nisan to Nisan, which month usually began with the new moon after the vernal equinox; (2) the years during which the kings reigned are understood to be enumerated in accordance with their accession to the throne, and not according to the beginning of the year therefore, to consider the dates B.C. here given as—within a year, earlier or later—more or less inaccurate. Dates marked with an asterisk (*), however, be regarded as reasonably exact.

The inaccuracies in the chronology of the Bible are attributable to various causes. In many cases they are due to what should be "corrections" on the part of the copyists, who did not understand certain passages or sought to bring certain dates into agreement with an error of long standing. Thus the discrepancy of twenty years excess in the reign of Azarias has also been carried through the synchronisms of the Israelitish kings, Zacharias, etc. The synchronistic comparisons between Joatham, Achaez, and Ezckhias, on the one hand, and Phacee and Osee, on the other, form a very inaccurate combination, brought into the Bible by the speculations of successive copyists and commentators.

The statement, tolerably accurate chronologically, concerning the beginning of Osee's reign, "in the twentieth year of Joatham" (IV Kings, xv, 20), who, be it noted, only reigned sixteen years (v. 33), seems to have originated with some one who did not wish to mention the godless Achaez. The twenty years of the reign of Phacee, in whose second year Joatham became king, stand in relation to the twentieth year of Joatham like cause and effect. The synchronisms of Ezckhias with Osee got into the Bible through the undoubtedly genuine "twelfth year of Achaez", during which Osee became an independent king, by means of the following arithmetical calculation:—
Phææce became king in the 52nd year of Azarias. 1735, 12th, Achaz.
Ose 725, 12th, Places.
Azarias reigned 52 years.
Joatham 16.
Achaz 16.
Total 81 years to Ose.
52 years to Azarias.
50 years to Ose.
Total 84 years to Ezechias.
Subtract 81 years to Ose.
There remain 3 years of Ose till Ezechias became king.

That the reverse is not the case, that is, that the twelfth year of Achaz is not the result of a calculation, is shown by the fact that the other possible calculations would produce the fourth, and not the twelfth, year of Achaz. The other reckonings are as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 years of Azarias</td>
<td>52 years of Azarias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years to Ose</td>
<td>16 years to Joatham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less 68 to Achaz.

50 years to Ose

There remain 4 to Achaz when Ose becomes king.

The year 68 of Azarias = 17 Phææce = 16 Joatham = 4 Achaz = 1 Ose.

From this it appears that not the "twelfth year of Achaz", but the "twentieth year of Joatham", is reckoned. The calculation was correct in regard to Ose's beginning as vassal of Assyria. But some one else confused this with the declaration of independence of Ose in the twelfth year of Achaz, and thus arrived at the "third year of Ose" before the beginning of Ezechias, whence resulted further synchronistic statements between Ose and Ezechias. That these synchronisms are not historical, but must have been introduced into the Bible by a "speculator", is proved by what follows:—

VIII.—42

pression of the unfriendly attitude towards the Assyrians which was favoured by Ezechias. This is the light in which we can understand the unwise Assyrian against Juda. But cause and effect must be connected according to time. As to the year 713 or shortly afterwards (for the delivery of Ezechias), there can, then, be no discussion. The year 703 is probably correct; Merodach-Baladan had then regained the throne of Babylon, and Sennacherib already ruled in Assyria. Thus the recovery of Ezechias would have
taken place in about 704. While this would be his fourteenth year, 718–7 would then be his first, which calculation also agrees with other data. Cf. Winckler, ‘Alttest. Unters.’, 135.

(2) If Jehu is said to have been king in 728–7, then Achara could not have reigned more than seven or eight years. For in this case the father would at most have been only seven years older than the son (cf. what follows). For a joint reign of Exekias and Achara is out of the question, and the supposition that Exekias was not his son is in view of II Kings, xvii, 1, and II Par., xxviii, 27, without sufficient basis. Neither can another interpretation of the word son, accepted a number of times in the Books of Kings by Herzog, be considered a fortunate hypothesis.

By the anticipation of the twenty-nine years’ reign of Achara there resulted a shortage of ten years which has probably been made up by lengthening the reign of Manasses by ten years.

The year 730 as the beginning of Osee’s reign is, according to Biblical statistics, reasonably certain. For in his sixth or seventh year, and in the twelfth year of Achara, he rose against Salamanasar (IV Kings, xvii, 9; cf. xiv, 9), and in his ninth year Samaria was taken. The year 722–1 being the ninth, 730 is consequently the first. The Assyrian account of the death of Phacea and the nomination of Osee is usually placed by Assyriologists at about 734–732, since Thelaghphalas was not in Palestine again after 732. The reasoning is not convincing. The course of events after 735–4 is probably as follows. The Antiassyrian party in Palestine, of which Rasin of Damascus was the head and moving spirit, organized an uprising and endeavoured to draw the other nations into it. Hence the alliance between Rasin and Phacea again, which declined to participate in the uprising, and their endeavour, on the death of Joatham, to keep his son Achara from the throne. Achara appealed to Thelaghphalas for assistance. The latter immediately made for his object, namely, the subjection of Syria and the conquest of Damascus, without neglecting to occupy also the surrounding districts which belonged to Israel. Cf. IV Kings, xvi, 7–9; and xx, 29. After the fall of Damascus in the summer of 732, Tyre and Israel must have been conquered, but, when winter approached, Thelaghphalas turned all further operations over to his own, which, according to his own inscription (dispatched against Tyre), and retired to Ninive. The territory of Israel was taken possession of, perhaps partly while the monarch was still in command; but, before Samaria could be taken, Osee, supported by the Antiassyrian party, had executed his stroke and caused Phacea to flee. Sargon was the victor on the annexation of Tyre, Israel, and Ascalon to 731–30, and the appointment of Osee as Assyrian vassal king over Israel need not be placed before 730. (Cf. Winckler, op. cit., 132, eqq.)

The chronology of the kings of Juda, as approximatively deduced above, has still to be compared with their ages at the commencement of their respective reigns—given in Holy Scripture for most of them. If we assume that, in the co-regencies which we have considered, the age at the beginning of the co-administration is indicated, we arrive at about the following dates of birth—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age at Start of Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roshom (grandson of David)</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josaphat</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achara</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasses</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joas</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amasias</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoel</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joatham</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variants 42, 20, and 8, in connection with Ocho-
Pastor at St. Raphael, Glengarry, since 1804, was nominated first vicar-Apostolic of the district. His consecration took place on 31 December, 1829, in the Ursuline chapel at Quebec. The bishop continued to reside for some years at St. Raphael, which thus became the first episcopal see in the new province and the second established in all Canada. It was to Glengarry that the bishop brought, in 1803 and 1804, the members of the Ursuline nuns of Bonaventure, who afterwards became the Ursulines of Glengarry, despoiled in Scotland in 1802. In 1804, to minister to the scattered Catholic settlers and Indians in the vast Province of Upper Canada, there were but two priests, the Rev. Alexander Macdonell (afterwards bishop) and an assistant. About 1814 the number of priests had increased to six, two at St. Raphael, one at Perth, one at Kingston, and two at Sandwich. The vicariate was created a diocese by Pope Leo XII in a Brief dated 27 January, 1826, and Kingston was named the see. It was the first diocese established in a British colony since the so-called Reformation. In this year Bishop Macdonell applied for a coadjutor, and the Rev. Thomas Weld, an English priest, was consecrated Bishop of Amycla and coadjutor of Upper Canada on 6 August, 1826. The state of his health did not permit Bishop Weld to come to Canada. He remained some years in England, and, going to Rome, he was made Cardinal by the Pope on 17 February 1844.

The beginning of a diocesan seminary was made at St. Raphael, where Bishop Macdonell established the College of Iona, under the direction of Rev. William P. Macdonald, afterwards vicar-general for twenty years. He was also the editor of "The Catholic", the first Catholic journal published in the English language in Canada. It was a vigorous polemical weekly, and was issued at Kingston in 1830–31, and at Hamilton from 1841 to 1844.

The bishop had resided at York, now Toronto, for some years, and came to Kingston in 1836. One of his earliest acts was to obtain from the Legislature an Act of Incorporation for the Regiopolis College at Kingston. The cornerstone of the college was laid on 11 June, 1838. This building is now used as a hospital by the Sisters of the Hôtel Dieu. The college became a famous seat of learning, and continued its useful work until it was temporarily removed to Queen's University in 1869. On another site in the city, Regiopolis College was reestablished by the late Archbishop Cleary, and is now in a flourishing condition under the presidency of the archbishop, the Most Reverend Dr. Gauthier. A new coadjutor was appointed in 1835 in the person of the Rev. Remigius Gaulin, who became the second Bishop of the diocese of the vicarate-apostolic of Northern Canada erected before 1200. Pope Alexander III confirmed the royal foundation to the second abbot, Reinierius, in 1174; and by 1229 the abbey was in a position to send out a colony to the newly-founded monastery of Culross, in Fife, Scotland. Killoss was richly endowed by David's successors, and also by private benefactors, among its possessions being the valuable salmon fisheries on the River Findhorn, granted by Robert Bruce and confirmed by James I and James IV. The abbots were mitred, with a seat in Parliament, and the house had a special prominence and influence as the burying place of the church and books for the library; but the most illustrious of the twenty-four abbots who ruled the monastery was his successor, Robert Reid, who held the priory of Beauty in commendam, together with the Abbey of Killoss. This wise, learned, and excellent prelate was sent as the king's commissioner to Henry VIII to treat for peace,
and again to France in connexion with the marriage of James V. He erected a new library and other buildings at his abbey, and carefully administered the property of the house. He became Bishop of Orkney in 1541, and his nephew Walter succeeded him as abbot. Walter conformed to Protestantism, and alienated most of the nobility, which were led into a tempest of persecution. In 1561 in favour of Edward Bruce, created Lord Bruce of Kinnloss, a title still enjoyed by his descendant the Earl of Elgin, although the lands of Kinnloss were sold in 1643 to Brodie of Lethen, which family now owns them. Only a few fragments remain of the abbey buildings, including the west cloister, fragment of a temple, and a two-storied building with groined roof, traditionally called the "priest's chambers." The church has entirely disappeared.

**D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.**

**KINO, EUSEBIO, a famous Jesuit missionary of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; b. 10 August, 1644, in Welschtirol (Anuaniensia); d. 15 March, 1711. Kuhn (his German name; Kino representing the Italian and Spanish form) entered the Upper German Province of the Society of Jesus in 1669. He received his degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology in 1673 and was professed as a Jesuit. He was then named to the post of Superior of the Province of New Spain in 1667.**

**KINO INDIAK** (pronounced Kii-o-wa, Latin spelling, Spanish form: Cayugas; Comanche form: Kiowa, from Ka-i-gwu, the name used by themselves, of uncertain etymology).—An important Plains tribe, constituting a distinct linguistic stock, the Kiowa, now located in western Oklahoma, but formerly residing in the mountains about the heads of the Missouri River, in western Montana, in close alliance with the Cree. From this position they gradually drifted southward along the Plains, and after having been driven from the Black Hills region by the Sioux about the year 1800, made their principal headquarters upon the upper Arkansas. About the year 1790 they made war with the Comanche with whom they were long at enmity, and since they had been closely confederated, and in company with whom they made constant raids far down into Texas and old Mexico, even as far as Zacatecas, until finally confined upon a reservation in 1869. In this southern movement they were accompanied by a small detached tribe of Athapascan stock, commonly known as Kiowa Apaches, who, in everything but language, are a component part of the Kiowa tribe. The Kiowa made their first treaty with the Government in 1837. In 1867 they joined with the Comanche, Cheyenne, and Arapaho in the noted Medicine Lodge treaty, by which they agreed to open up a reservation, but it was not until after the decisive battle of the Washita, under General Custer, 27 November, 1868, that they fulfilled their promise. Among their noted chiefs of this period were Setangy, or Satank, "Sitting Bear," Settai or Satanta, "White Bear," the "orator of the Plains," and Gu-pigo, "Lonel Wolf." In the later troubles Setangy was shot to pieces while resisting military arrest, Settai committed suicide in prison, and Lone Wolf, with a number of others, was deported to Florida for a term of three years.

In 1873 the first educational work in the tribe was undertaken by the Quaker woman C. Battey, but he was compelled to desist a few months later in consequence of the general outbreak of the confederated southern Plains tribes (1874-1875), in which Lone Wolf headed the hostile Kiowa. Since then there has been no serious disturbance. Under an agreement negotiated in 1872, but not essentially modified before its final ratification in 1900, the reservation of the associated tribes was thrown open to white settlement, each Indian receiving an allotment of 160 acres, besides his share of the selling proceeds, and they are now American citizens. Before their subjection to reservation reservation, the Kiowa was a typical equestrian Plains tribe, living in buffalo-skin tents, dressing in buckskin, with paint and feathers, depending almost entirely upon the buffalo for subsistence, without agriculture, pottery, basketry, or fixed abode, constantly raiding in every direction, and with a reputation even among Indians for turbulent ferocity. They were used to bows and arrows, lance, and shield, which last was made of toughened buffalo hide. There was no single head chief. Instead of a clan system (see Indians) they had a division into six (formerly seven) bands, including the Kiowa-Apache. On occasion of tribal gatherings, as at their great annual Sun Dance, each of the bands occupied an appointed place in the camp circle.

They had also a military organization of six orders, each with its own ceremonial dance and regulations.
Kircher, Athanasius, celebrated for the versatility of his knowledge and particularly distinguished for his knowledge of the natural sciences, was born on 2 May, 1602, at Gehis a small town on the northern bank of the Upper Rhone (Buchonia); d. at Rome, 28 Nov., 1680. From his birthplace he was accustomed to add the Latin epithet Bucho, or Buchonian, to his name, although later he preferred calling himself Paliensis after Fulda, the ancient capital of the country where the Athanasius was given him in honour of the saint on whose feast he was born. John Kircher, the father of Athanasius, had studied philosophy and theology at Mainz, without, however, embracing the priestly calling. As soon as he had obtained the doctor's degree in the latter faculty, he went to lecture on theology in the Benedictine house at Seligenstadt. Athanasius studied humanities at the Jesuit College in Fulda, and on 2 Oct., 1618, entered the Society of Jesus at Paderborn. At the end of his novitiate he repaired to Cologne for his philosophical studies. The journey thither was on account of the confusion caused by the Thirty Years' War, attended with great danger. Together with his study of speculative philosophy the talented young student devoted himself especially to the natural sciences and the classical languages, for which reason he was shortly afterwards called to teach these branches at the Jesuit College in Helvetia. In Mainz, where Kircher (1625) began his theological studies, he attracted the notice of the elector through his ability and his skill as an experimentalist. In 1628 he was ordained priest, and hardly had he finished his last year of probation at Speyer when the chair of ethics and mathematics was given to him by the University of Würzburg, while at the same time he had to give instructions in the Syrian and Hebrew languages. However, the disorders consequent on the years obliged him to only once to go first to Lyons in France (1631) and later to Avignon.

The discovery of some hieroglyphic characters in the library of Speyer led Kircher to make his first attempt to solve the problem of hieroglyphical writing, which still baffled all scholars. At Aix he made the acquaintance of the well-known French senator, Nicolas Peiresc, whose magnificent collections aroused in Kircher the highest interest. Recognising in Kircher the right man to solve the old Egyptian riddle, Peiresc applied direct to Rome and to the General of the Jesuits to have Kircher's call to Vienna by the emperor set aside and to procure a summons for the scholar to the Eternal City. This generous intention was favoured by Providence, inasmuch as Kircher, on his way to Vienna, was shipwrecked near Civitá Vecchia, and arrived in Rome before the knowledge of his call thither had reached him. Until his death (28 Nov., 1680), Rome was now to be the principal scene of Kircher's manifold activity, which, soon developed in such an astonishing way that pope, emperor, princes, and prelates vied with one another in furthering and supporting the investigations of the learned scholar. After six years of successful teaching in the Roman College, where he lectured on physics, mathematics, and oriental languages, he was released from these duties that he might have freedom in his studies and might devote himself to formal scientific research, especially in Southern Italy and Sicily. He took advantage of a trip to Malta to explore thoroughly the various volcanoes which exist between Naples and that island. He left Rome in 1638 the Strait of Messina, where, besides the noise of the surge, a dull subterranean rumble attracted his attention. At Trapani and Palermo his interest was aroused by the remains of antediluvian elephants. But before all else he tried to discover the subterranean power of the volcanoes of Etna and Stromboli, then in eruption; public attention had been called to such mysterious phenomena by the frightful eruption of Vesuvius in 1630.

When Kircher left Messina in 1638 to return to Naples, a terrible earthquake occurred which destroyed the city of Euphemia. Like Pliny before him (A.D. 79), Kircher wished to study at close range this powerful conclusion of nature. On reaching Naples he once climbed Vesuvius, and had himself lowered by means of a rope into the crater of the volcanic mountain and with the help of his pantometer ascertained exactly the different dimensions of the crater and its inner structure. As the firstfruits of his travels he published, for the Knights of Malta, "Specula Meditensis Encyclica sive syntagma novum instrumentorum physico-mathematicorum" (Messina, 1638). It was forty years later that the fully matured results of these investigations appeared in Kircher's great work, the "Mundus Subterraneus", in two volumes (Amsterdam,
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1678), which enjoyed the greatest repute in his time; not only did it give an incentive to the more searching investigation of subterranean forces, but it contributed much to their final explanation. When again in Rome, Kircher began collecting all kinds of antiquities and ethnologically important remains, thus laying the foundation of the well-known museum which, as the "Museum Kircherianum", still attracts to-day so many visitors to the Roman College. Epoch-making also were Kircher's labours in the domain of deciphering hieroglyphics, and, on the excavation of the so-called Phaenician obelisk, he succeeded in supplying correctly the portions which had been concealed from him. It must be remembered that in those days little or no attention was paid to this subject, and that it was therefore in itself a great service to have taken the initiative in this branch of investigation, however lacking his efforts may have been in the fundamental principles of the science as it is known to-day. Kircher also gave an impetus to the intimate study of the relations between the different languages: Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldaic, Syrian, Samaritan, Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Persian, Ethiopian, Italian, German, French, and Portuguese.

Thus in the most varied branches of science Kircher played the rôle of pioneer. Even medicine received his attention, as is shown for example by his treatise, "Scrutinium physico-medicum contagiosi luis, que pestis dicitur" (Rome, 1658). He also tried to form the langue geologique (an "epigraphia seu archaeographia linguarum, quo omnibus totius mundi populis poterit quia correspondere", Rome, 1663). His scientific activities brought him into scientific correspondence with scholars labouring in the most different fields, as the numerous volumes of his extant letters show. It is to his inventive mind that we owe one of the earliest of our counting machines: the speaking-tube and abacian harp were perfected by him. He was also the inventor of the magic lantern which has since been brought to such perfection and is to-day almost indispensible.

That the most valued judgements should be formed and expressed on a man of such encyclopaedic knowledge was only to be expected. He tried to find a grain of truth even in the false sciences of alchemy, astrology, and horoscopy, which were still in his time much in vogue, nor is it surprising that in the province of astronomy he did not at this early date develop a Copernican System.

With all his learning and the vast amount of adulation which he received on all sides, Kircher retained throughout his life a deep humility and a childlike piety. In 1629 he had intimated to his general his desire to devote his life exclusively to the spreading of the Faith in baptism, but this wish remained unfulfilled, and, to console himself for this disappointment, he erected during his last years a sanctuary (della Mentorella) in honour of the Mother of God on the crest of the Sabine Hill near Rome, whither, during his lifetime as now, thousands made pilgrimages and found healing from their ailments. In this sanctuary Kircher himself was buried, and at the beginning of the twentieth century this place of pilgrimage was distinguished by a gigantic statue of our Divine Redeemer on the neighbouring crest of Gussandgole. To give an approximate idea of Kircher's literary activity it is only necessary to remark that during his sojourn in Rome, no less than forty-four folio volumes came from his pen. A full list of his writings is to be found in Sommervogel, "Bibli. Scriptorum S. J.". Besides the works already named, it is sufficient to mention here: "Magna sive de arte magnetica" (Rome, 1640); "Cologne, 1646); "Lingua egypitica restituta" (Rome, 1643); "Ars magna lucet et umbra" (Rome, 1644); "Musurgia universalis sive ars consone et dissoni" (Rome, 1650); "Itinerarium extaticum s. officium secularis" (Rome, 1650); "Iter extaticum secundum, mundi subterranei prodromus" (Rome, 1657); "Obe- liscus Pamphilii" (Rome, 1650).

KISALUDY

Kisaludy, a parish, also a royal and parliamentary burgh and chief or county town of Orkney, in the north of Scotland (the name is Scandinavian, "Kirkju- varg", i.e., "church-bay"). The original church was dedicated to St. Olaf (died 1030), and the lands of the parish are still called St. Olas. The importance of Kisaludy is due, first, to its having long been the residence of the Norse earls of Orkney, who, while nominally under the Kings of Norway, were practically independent; and, second, from its having become the seat of the bishops of Orkney. Magnus, Earl of Orkney, was treacherously killed by his cousin Haco about 1115; and his nephew Ronald undertook, if he recovered possession of the islands from Paul, Haco's son, to build a stone minster at Kisaludy in memory of his uncle Magnus, whose sanctity was said to be attested by miracles soon after his death. Ronald eventually became sole ruler of Orkney, and St. Magnus's church was begun in 1137, and was constituted the cathedral of the See of Orkney, which had been founded in 1102 (as a suffragan of Trondheim, in Norway), the bishop's seat having been originally at Birsay.

The cathedral was not completed by the founder, but additions were made by successive bishops of Orkney, this fact accounting for the great variety of architecture which it presents. It is one of the two ancient Scottish cathedrals (the other being Glasgow) which have been preserved entire to the present day; and, though not of any great size, remains, both within and without, one of the most striking and impressive churches in the kingdom. Its total length (outside) is 234 feet, width of transept 101 feet, height of tower 133 feet. The tall steeples surmounting the tower was struck by lightning in 1671. The three bells in the tower are all of pre-Reformation date, though one was recast in 1682. The cathedral escaped destruction in the sixteenth century, owing to the zealous efforts of the bishop; but it fell into decay in succeeding centuries, there being no funds to keep it in repair, until in 1805 and 1845 a certain amount of restoration was done by private benefactors and by the Government. Many ancient tombs of former bishops remain in the cathedral, the choir of which is now used as a Presbyterian place of worship. Only a fragment of the episcopal palace—a tower built by Bishop Reid in 1540—now remains, and the castle's castle has entirely disappeared.

KISALUDY

Kisaludy (Sáhók, Sáhók), a Sáhók, poet; b. at Sáhók, Hungary, 27 Sept. 1772; d. at Sáhók, 25 October 1844. He went to school at Raab and later studied philosophy and law at Freiburg. In 1792 he became a lay brother and engaged in the study of law, and having joined the army, was appointed to the Hungarian legions in Vienna. During his sojourn there he was especially attracted to the Hungarian writers living in Vienna at that time. In 1793 he was transferred to Italy, and remained at Milan during the revolution of 1848. After the return of Napoleon to 1796, Kisaludy was sent a prisoner of war to France, and confined in Provence, but was given his freedom the same year; went to Klagenfurt, and from there was transferred to the Wallis regi-
ment and sent to Würtemberg. He took part in the Rhine campaign in 1799, but sent in his resignation the same year. He married his early love, Roszi Ságedly, in 1800.

In 1802 Kisfaludy participated in the insurrection of the Hungarian nobles, as orderly officer to the Palatine, by whose command he later wrote an account of the uprising. He became a member of the Hungarian Academy in 1830, and was chosen an honorary member in 1835. He lost his wife in 1832, but later married again, shortly after which his second wife also died. The last years of his life were spent in his native town. Kisfaludy is particularly prominent as a lyric poet. His love-songs, which appeared under the name of "Liebesieder Himly's", the first part in 1801, the second in 1807, assured him an immense popularity among his associates. The songs revealed the influence of Roszi Ságedly's love, both before and after their marriage. The metrical rendering of his poems is that of the sonnet; they undeniably show the influence of his stay in Provence, and the impress of Petrarch's songs, and yet they are in no wise servile imitations of the latter. His "Märchen aus der Ungarischen Vorzeit" is the best of his later works; he also tried the field of drama, but with little success.

(2) Károly Kisfaludy, author, brother of the above; b. at Tét, 5 Feb., 1788; d. at Pesth, 21 Nov., 1830. He was the originator of the romantic tendency in the national Hungarian literature and comedy, also pioneer in the field of Hungarian novel-writing. His birth having cost his mother her life, he was brought up by his sister. He pursued his studies at Raab, but did not finish his studies as his elder brothers did, as his mother died while he was a boy. A successful military career, taking part in the wars with Italy. He resigned his commission in 1811, causing a breach with his father, which, in spite of repeated attempts at reconciliation, was never healed; nevertheless he was not disinherited. Even during his military career, Kisfaludy assiduously cultivated literature, and henceforth he devoted himself to it. When he could no longer expect any pecuniary assistance from home, he earned his living as an artist in Vienna and Italy and, later, on his return to Hungary. At the same time his literary energy was not dormant. Besides poetry, he wrote plays and dramas. In 1818-19 he experienced not a little dramatic success. About this time he published his first work in the field of Hungarian comedy, which likewise met with popular favour. He made up for his lack of early education by deep study, he became still more capable of his language, more modern, his productions little by little bearing evidence of this culture.

His style was rather romantic than classical, and not infrequently approached modern realism. His influence, especially on the public, became ever greater, so that in a certain sense he was the centre of the Hungarian literary life in Pesth. In 1821 he published the first volume of his annual "Aurora", the leading literary review of his time, which numbered the most prominent writers among its contributors. After Kölosey, he was the first to cultivate the ballad, he also wrote elegies, Italian verse, and national songs. Of his prose works, his humorous ones are better than the more serious, as his comedies are better than his dramas; the Hungarian national novel also owes its ascendancy to him. An early death snatched him away in the midst of his literary activity. The Kisfaludy Society, so named in honour of him, was established in 1836, and is devoted to the cultivation of good literature. The Hungarian national theatre also honors him by giving yearly one of his plays. He is not alone in his books, but still his influence on the writers of his day, whose leader and model he was, is in this way proving himself of immortal service as the regenerator of Hungarian literature. Many editions of his works were issued by Franz Toldy, and one in six volumes by Bánóczi (Budapest, 1839).

Toly, "Lives of Hungarian Poets" (Pesth, 1870), in Hungarian; Szentgyörgyi, "Lives and Works of Hungarian Writers" (Budapest, 1899), IV, 400-27, in Hungarian.

A. Aldády.

Kiss.—Four times in the Epistles of St. Paul we meet the injunction, used as a sort of formula of farewell, "Salute one another in a holy kiss" (ἐν φιλαμέναις δίψης), for which St. Peter (1 Pet., v, 14) substitutes "in a kiss of love" (ἐν φιλαμέναις διαφήμαι). It has been suggested by F. C. Conybeare (The Expositor, 3rd Ser., ix, 461, 1884) on the basis of Philo's "Questiones in Exodum" (ii, 78 and 118) that this was an imitation of a practice of the Jewish synagogues. The evidence adduced, however, is very slight. In any case it seems probable that in those very early days the custom of Christians so saluting each other was not necessarily confined to the time of the liturgy. Such salutations were no doubt used somewhat promiscuously even between those of opposite sexes in token of fraternal solicitude and charity (πιετας et caritas pignus, as St. Ambrose, "Hexaem.", VI, i, 68, points out), and the modesty and reserve which so many of the pre-Nicene Fathers inculcate when speaking of this matter must be held to have reference to other occasions than the kiss of peace in the liturgy. This is also implied by Tertullian, who speaks of the pagan husband's reluctance that his Christian wife should "meet one of the brethren with a kiss" (alculat fraudum ad oculum convenire, "Ad Pastor.," ii, 4). So far as the second interpretation is concerned, it was so interpreted that any synaxis of the faithful where there was reading of the Scriptures terminated in a salutem of this kind, and it is even possible that the appearance of the kiss in certain liturgies at the Mass of Catechumens is due to the same cause. In any case we have definite evidence that a kiss was on some occasions bestowed outside the actual liturgy. After baptism the newly initiated, whether infants or adults, were embraced first by the baptizer and then by the faithful who were present (see Cyprian, "Ad Fidum Episc.," Ep. ixi, 4, and Chrysostom, Hom. i, "De Mort. et Leg. Scrip."). The kiss of the Roman period and that in some of the later rituals of baptism is probably a survival of this practice.

Again a kiss was and still is given to the newly ordained by the bishop who ordains them. Similarly after the consecration of a bishop and, at a later date, after the coronation of a king, the personage so exalted, after he was enthroned, was at first kissed, while a kiss, no doubt suggested by the Scriptural example of the prodigal son, was enjoined in many of the rituals for the absolution of a penitent. Of the kiss solemnly exchanged between those newly betrothed something will be said under Μαντακος (q.v.), but we may note here that the kiss was customarily bestowed a last kiss, which then had a quasi-liturgical character, upon the dying or the dead. The prohibition against kissing the dead which was issued by the
Counsel of Auxerre, a.d. 578, almost certainly had some relation to the abuse at that time prevalent of placing the Blessed Sacrament in the mouth of the dead or burying it with them. It may be added that throughout the Middle Ages an almost religious solemnity found expression in the public sumptuousness of a kiss, a token of amity. Remarkable examples of this may be found in the history of the quarrels of Henry II with St. Thomas of Canterbury, and of Richard Cœur de Lion with St. Hugh of Lincoln. In the latter case the bishop is recorded to have taken hold of Richard by his mantle and kissed him with a kiss which overcome by such persistence, recovered his good humour and bestowed on the saint the salute which was his due.

Kiss of Peace.—It is not easy to determine the precise link between the "holy kiss" and the liturgical "kiss of peace", known in Greek from an early date as εἰκών (i.e. pax, or peace). This latter may be quite primitive, for it meets us first in the description of the liturgy given by St. Justin Martyr (Apol., I, 65), who writes: "When we have completed the prayers we salute one another with a kiss (ἀλληλον φιλαμενω δευτερων υπερεικεν τω εικων) wherever there is bread and wine the bishop and the bishop's cup is placed. This passage clearly shows that in the middle of the second century the usage already obtained—a usage now claimed as distinctive of the liturgies other than Roman—of exchanging the kiss of peace at the beginning of what we call the Offertory. The language of many Oriental Fathers and of certain contemporary canons further confirms this conclusion as to the primitive position of the Pax. Thus St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat. Myst., v, 3) speaking of the time between the washing of the celebrant's hands and the Sursum Corda which introduces the Anaphora, or Preface, says, "Then the deacon cries out aloud: 'Embrace ye one another and let us salute each other. . . . The kiss is the sign that our souls are united and that we banish all remembrance of injury'." Many other Fathers (e.g. Origen, Pseudo-Dionysius, and also St. John Chrysostom, 'De Comp. Cordis', i, 3) speak in a similar tone and use language which implies that the Pax preceded the oblation of the elements. Even the so-called "Canons of Hippolytus", referred by some to Rome in the third century, though Funk ascribes them to a much later date, imply that the kiss was given at the Offertory. The same was undoubtedly the case in the Monarabic and the Gallican liturgies. Later, after the kiss of peace was united to the Commonion, and it must have followed shortly after the Pater Noster as it does at present. Thus Pope Innocent I in his letter to Decentius (a.p. 416) blames the practice of those who give the Pax before the Consecration and urges that it was meant as a token that "the people give their assent to all things already performed in the mysteries".

Another clear testimony of about the same date occurs in a sermon attributed to St. Augustine, but probably written by St. Caesarius of Aries (P. L. XXXVIII, 1101): "After this [the Lord's prayer], Pax vovera Vittu fnde (And with thy holy kiss pe desceoun) conveys the salute to the sub-deacon, and the sub-deacon to the canons or clergy in the stalls. The Western Church, however, has not been the only one to discover that the ceremony of the Pax could not be decorously maintained when manners had grown less austere. Among the Greeks there is some early reference to this. Just before the Creed, which itself precedes the Anaphora, the celebrant says, "Peace be to all", and then he kisses the gifts (veiled), while at the same time the deacon kisses his own oration, or stole. In the Syrian rites, the deacon touches the priest's hands, then moves his own hands down his face to his breast. In the later Byzantine liturgy, the deacon then kisses the gifts, and before he finally leaves the altar, the deacon kisses. The sweetness of peace is, in the Western Church, the result of a long tradition. It seems to be pretty generally held that this position before the Offertory was the primitive position of the liturgical kiss of peace even at Rome. Dom Cabrol and others incline to the view that the kiss formed the natural sequel to the commemoration of the living and of the dead, and that all these three elements, which originally belong to the Offertory, were deliberately transferred elsewhere in the course of some revision of the Roman Liturgy. The commemoration of the living and of the dead being inserted separately in the great consecratory prayer, or Canon of the Mass, while the Pax was made to follow the Pater Noster, having been attracted to that position by the words "Forgive us our trespasses," etc. (Cabrol, "Origines Liturgiques," Paris, 1906, pp. 360-361). However, the rival theory, that there were originally two occasions when the kiss of peace was given, one before the Offertory and the other before the Communion, does not lack probability; for St. John Chrysostom, in the Prayer Book of Serapion, and Anastasius Sinaita seem all to know of some such rite before Communion, and the practice of kissing the bishop's hand before receiving the Blessed Sacrament (see Card. Rampaolla, "S. Melania giunore", note 41) may possibly be connected with it. According to this second theory, the bishop would kiss the Pater, the Roman and the Oriental liturgies omitted one of these salutations, the Oriental retaining that at the Offertory, the Roman that at the Communion. In any case it is certain that in the early Middle Ages the kiss of peace was most intimately associated in idea with the reception of Communion (see Pseudo-Legrand, "Confesionalia", xxxv, in Wasserschleben, "Bussordnungen", p. 315), and it seems probable that the omission of the Pax in Masses for the Dead was due to the fact that Communion was not distributed to the faithful at such Masses.

From a very early date also, the abuses to which this form of salutation might lead were very carefully guarded against. Both in the East and the West women and men were separated in the assemblies of the faithful, and the kiss of peace was given only by women to women and by men to men. Then in about the twelfth or thirteenth century the use of the instrumentum pacti, or osculatorium, known in English as the "pax-board" or "pax-brede", was gradually introduced. This was a little plaque of metal, ivory, or wood, generally decorated with some pious carving and provided with a handle, which was first brought to the altar for the celebrant to kiss at the proper place after the consecration; it was then placed upon the altar, and the celebrant conducted his offertory in turn at the altar rails. But even this practice in course of time died out, and at the present day the Pax is only given at High Mass, and is hardly anywhere communicated to the congregation. The celebrant kisses the corporal spread upon the altar (he used formerly in many local rites to kiss the sacred Host itself) and then, placing his hands upon the arms of the deacon, he presents his left cheek to the deacon's left cheek but without actually touching it. At the same time he pronounces the words Pax tecum (Peace be with thee); to which the deacon replies, Et cum Spiritu tuo (And with thy holy kiss pe desceoun) conveys the salute to the sub-deacon, and the sub-deacon to the canons or clergy in the stalls. The Western Church, however, has not been the only one to discover that the ceremony of the Pax could not be decorously maintained when manners had grown less austere. Among the Greeks there is some early reference to this. Just before the Creed, which itself precedes the Anaphora, the celebrant says, "Peace be to all", and then he kisses the gifts (veiled), while at the same time the deacon kisses his own oration, or stole. In the Syrian rites, the deacon touches the priest's hands, then moves his own hands down his face to his breast. In the later Byzantine liturgy, the deacon then kisses the gifts, and before he finally leaves the altar, the deacon kisses. The sweetness of peace is, in the Western Church, the result of a long tradition. It seems to be pretty generally held that this position before the
still passed among the people from lip to lip, but the truth seems to be that each one merely bows to his neighbour and touches his hand (see Brightman, ‘Liturgies Eastern and Western’, 1896, p. 655).

It is clear that in the earliest times a kiss was not only a token of love, but also under certain circumstances a symbol of profound respect. For example, the son of Simach (Ecclus., xxx. 5) describes how he would borrowers, when they wish to ingratiate themselves, "kiss the hands of the lender," to show how they esteemed the vowe". It is in accordance with this symbolism, so universally understood and practised, that the Church enjoins the kissing of many holy objects, e.g. relics, the book of the Gospels, the cross, blessed palms, candles, the hands of the clergy, and nearly all the utensils and vestments. In the Latin liturgy, the kiss at the altar is repeatedly kissed by the celebrant in the course of the Mass, and this practice is of very ancient date. The earliest of the Ordines Romani mentions it twice, but only twice: first, when the bishop ascends to the altar at the beginning, and secondly, at the Ordinary, when he comes to kiss the altar. The kiss at the throne. Innocent III speaks of the altar being kissed three times, but in the days of Durandus nine such salutations were in use, as at present. By a symbolism prevalent from a very early period the altar was regarded as typical of Christ, the God-Man, abiding permanently with His Church in the Sacrament of the Altar. The conception is preserved, for example, in the address now made to the candidate in the Ordination of a subdeacon. The appropriateness of kissing the altar before the salutation Dominus vobiscum need not be insisted upon: it clearly implies that the greeting comes, not from the priest only, but from Christ, the head and corner-stone, to the faithful who are the members of His Church. On the other hand the prayer said by the priest, on first ascending to the altar, indicates that this kiss has also special reference to the relics therein enshrined.

Kissing of the Feet.—The veneration shown in the kissing of a person's hand or the hem of his garment is accentuated in the kissing of the feet. This is probably implied by the phrase of Isaiah (xxlv. 23): “Kings...shall lick up the dust of Thy feet.” Under the influence, no doubt, of the ceremonial of kingship, as manifested in the cultus of the Roman emperors, the kissing of the feet prevailed at an early date among the usages of the papal court (see Lattey, “Ancient King-Worship”, Lond., 1909, C. T. S. pamphlet). We read of it in the first “Ordo Romanus” belonging to the seventh century, but even earlier than this the Liber Pontificalis attests that the pope “proffered respect to Pope John I (523-26), as later on Justinian II also did to Pope Constantine. At the election of Leo IV (847) the custom of so kissing the pope's foot was spoken of as an anachronism. It is not, therefore, wonderful that a practice supported by so early a tradition should still be observed even at our days, and give the solemn to the Mass by the Latin and Greek subdeacons, and quasi-liturgetically in the “adoration” of the pope by the cardinals after his election. It is also the normal salutation which papal etiquette prescribes for those of the faithful who are presented to the pope in a private audience. In his De altaris mysterio (VI, 9), Innocent III explains that the ceremony indicates “the very great reverence due to the Supreme Pontiff as the Vicar of Him whose feet were kissed by the woman who was a sinner”.


Klaczko, Julian, Polish author, b. at Vilna, 6 November, 1825, of Jewish parents; d. at Cracow, 26 November, 1906. After taking the doctor's degree in 1847 at the University of Königsberg, he went to Heidelberg to continue his studies under Gervinus, who appointed him a collaborator on the “Deutsche Zeitung”, a periodical for Russian and Polish affairs. In 1848 he spent some time in the Grand Duchy of Posen and published at Berlin his first political pamphlet, “Die deutschen Hegemonen”, an open letter to Gervinus against the incorporation of Posen in the German Confederation. About this time he resolved to become a Christian, but deferred his baptism for a time, owing to financial reverses. Klaczko was left without means, and in 1850 went to Paris, where he supported himself by his literary labours. His articles written in French, and published chiefly in the “Revue de Paris”, were so brilliant as to win speedy fame for the young author. He was allowed to visit England, and from 1857, free to enter the Church, and he was accordingly baptised. From 1857 to 1860, with the collaboration of Valerian Kalinka, he published a monthly, “Wiadomosci Polskie” (Polish News), the general tone of which was opposed to revolutionary impulses and tended to uplift the Polish mind. As a literary and aesthetic standpoint, Klaczko's articles were the most effective and most brilliant that had ever appeared in the Polish language. The periodical was put under the ban in Russian Poland and Galicia, and in 1860 also in Prussia, after which it had to be discontinued on account of a lack of subscribers.

In 1862 there appeared in the “Revue Des Deux Mondes” Klaczko's “Le poete anonyme”, the first adequate appreciation of Sigmund Krasinski, and so excellently done that it became the basis of all later accounts of the poet. This paper assured Klaczko's literary reputation among the French. Soon afterwards occurred the unfortunate uprising of 1863. While any Polish organisation or activity outside of Poland itself was now impossible, Klaczko did not forget the cause of his country. From official diplomatic sources he compiled information on all the details of the Danish and Polish questions, and in 1868 published his “Etudes et notes” (London), a veiled criticism of the policy of the Powers, to the disadvantage of all save Russia and Prussia. The “Etudes” caused a great sensation, which was increased by the author's subsequent work “Les préliminaires de Sadowa”, in which he shows how Austria was drawn into a war with Russia. Klaczko's writings bore such strong testimony to his political talents that he was appointed by Count Benst on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, holding in addition a seat in the Galician Diet at Lemberg, and in the Austrian Reichsrat. Having made a speech in the Diet which was out of harmony with Austria's policy of neutrality during the war of 1870, he resigned his public offices and returned to Paris penniless, to devote himself with renewed vigour to the artistic and literary pursuits of his youth. After several years of work he published “Causeries florentines”, a study of Dante in the form of a dialogue, containing in one volume the substance of all that scholars and critics had said on the subject. Even before this he had produced, in 1875, his “Deux chanceliers”, a brilliant portrayal of the characters and policies of Princes Bismarck and Gortschakoff. Finally, he planned an extensive work under the title of “La peinture et la Renaissance” and was interrupted by death, produced on the papacy by the worldly spirit of some pontiffs, without in the least derogating from the greatness of any epoch. Of the three volumes “Julius II”, “Leo X”, and “Clement VII and the Sack of
Klagenfurt. See Gurk, Diocese of.

Kleß, Heinrich, German theologian and exegete, b. at Münstermaifeld, in the Rhine Province, 20 April, 1800; d. at Munich, 28 July, 1840. At the age of seventeen he entered the seminary of Mainz, where he distinguished himself by his piety, his talent, and that unremitting application to study which characterized him throughout his later life. In 1824, the year after his ordination, he was appointed to the professorship of exegesis and ecclesiastical history in the same seminary, and in the following year also to that of philosophy. In 1828 he obtained the Doctorate of Theology from the University of Würzburg, after presenting the thesis "Tentamen theologico-historicum de chiliasmum primorum seculum". In 1829 the Government of Baden tendered him the chair of exegesis at Freiburg, vacated by Hug, and at the same time offered him a professorship either at Breslau or Bonn. He chose Bonn; but his position there was a difficult one. Hermes and Hermesianism reigned supreme, and the presence of Kleß, an exponent of sound Catholic principles, was viewed with unconcealed disfavour by his Rationalistic colleagues. His tact and genial manners, his attractive lectures and learned works, however, gradually won him influence. After a ten years' stay at Bonn, during which he taught dogmatics and moral theology, the history of dogma and exegesis, Kleß was induced by the conflict between Archbishop von Droste-Vischersing of Cologne and the Hermesian professors to accept the call to the University of Munich as successor to Möhler in the chair of dogmatic theology and exegesis, but a premature death carried him off within a year. Kleß's intense devotion to work enabled him to publish a number of works within a comparatively short period. "Die Religion", a work which shows his close acquaintance with the Fathers, appeared at Frankfurt in 1827. Then followed in rapid succession: "Commentar über das Evangelium nach Johannes" (Mainz, 1830); "Commentar über den Römerbrief" (Mainz, 1830); "Kurzes System der katholischen Dogmatik" (Bonn, 1831); "Encyclopädie der Theologie" (Mainz, 1832); "Aufruf an die Christen" (Mainz, 1833); "Die Ehe, dogmatisch-archäologische Abhandlung" (Mainz, 1833; 2nd ed., 1835). His most important work is the "Katholische Dogmatik" in three volumes, which went through four editions (Mainz, 1834-5, 1840, 1844, and 1861), and next to the "Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte" in two volumes (Mainz, 1837-8). A posthumous work, "Grundriss der Ethik", was edited by Himloehn (Mainz, 1843, 2nd ed., 1847). Although Kleß was animated by a thoroughly Catholic spirit, and by his "Katholische Dogmatik" helped to promote sounder Catholic ideas among the German clergy, they largely infected with Liberalism, some of his views, as, for instance, on the origin of the human soul and on the fate of children who die without baptism, are open to criticism.

See also in Kleß, Katholische Dogmatik (3rd and 4th ed.); Hotter, Nomenclator, III, 773; Heinrich in Kirchenläs., s. v.

F. Bechtel.

Kleßner, Eugène Louis. See Mtsone, Diocese of.

Kleß, Melchior, cardinal and Austrian statesman, b. at Vienna, 10 February, 1852; d. at Wiener-Neustadt, 18 September, 1860. While France was governed by Cardinal Richelieu, Austria also had her cardinal minister of State; but whereas the former had but one journées des dupes, the latter lamented his downfall for years. Kleß's parents were Protestants, and his father was a baker. He studied philosophy at the University of Vienna, and was with his parents brought into the fold of the Church by the court chaplain, Father Georg Pender, S.J. He attained the Doctorate of Theology in 1577, when he was assigned a canonry, and, even while in minor orders, he preached and held conferences at Korneuburg and in the vicinity, making many conversions. In 1579 he became doctor of philosophy and provost of St. Stephen's at Vienna, which dignity he carried with him when he entered the University, and was finally ordained to the priesthood. As early as the following year he was appointed councilor of the Bishop of Passau for Lower Austria. Rudolf II, impressed by the vigour and success of his campaign against Protestantism, entrusted him with the work of the counter-Reformation, which became his life-work. He brought back into the fold the cities of Baden, Krems, and Stein, though not without great difficulty, nor indeed without actual risk of his life. In 1585 he was made imperial councilor by Rudolf II, who three years later appointed him court chaplain and administrator of the Diocese of Wiener-Neustadt. It took him but little to restore the Catholic rule in this thoroughly disorganized bishopric. He was compelled in doing so to be constantly on guard against the monastic council, which, in a memorial on the subject, he calls, "the cause of all evil, the champion of godless prelates and priests against their bishop, a parasite." In 1598 Kleß was named Bishop of the Diocese of Vienna, which was spiritually and materially in a state of degradation. He was not consecrated until 1614, and received the purple from Paul V in 1618. In 1611 Matthias placed Kleß at the head of his privy council. As such he held full sway in the Government. He himself admits that he "spoke, wrote, and negotiated" for the emperor. It was the question of the succession to the throne which caused his downfall. Kleß had every reason to fear that his influence would wane, if Archduke Ferdinand were once formally declared to be the heir apparent. For the Bohemians, having thrown their governor out of the window of the palace at Prague for the second time, broke out into open rebellion, and Kleß could not be induced to take energetic measures against them, the Archdukes Max Emanuel and Philipp and Ferdinand of Austria. On 20 July, 1618, he was seized in an antechamber of the undecided emperor, and had him conveyed to the fortress of Ambra. A few days later he was brought to the castle of Innsbruck, whence he was transferred after a year to the monastery of Georgenberg. In November, 1622, the Castle of Sant' Angelo in Rome became his place of confinement. He was granted his freedom by the emperor in June of the following year, but was to remain in Rome. He lived to enjoy the satisfaction of seeing himself solemnly brought back to Vienna on 25 January, 1628, and reinstated as bishop. He decreed that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception on 8 December be henceforth observed in his dioceses "in the same manner as Sundays and other prescribed holy days", and in spite of the nuncio's protestation, he strove to maintain the peculiarly Viennese custom whereby Holy Communion was distributed on Good Friday. His heart reproaches him, as is shown by the high altar of the cathedral church, where, while his body rests in the cathedral of St. Stephen's,
KLEUTGEN, Josef Wilhelm Karl, German theologian and philosopher, b. at Dortmund, Westphalia, 9 April 1811; d. at St. Anton near Kaltern, Tyrol, 13 Jan., 1883. He began his studies with the intention of becoming a priest, but, owing to the Protestant atmosphere of the school which he attended, his zeal for religion was weakened. From 28 April, 1831, to 1 Jan., 1831, he studied philosophy at the University of Munich. He was intensely interested in Plato's philosophy and the Greek tragic poets. Though he clung to the Faith, it ceased to be the ruling principle of his life, and he fell into a deep melancholy. In this state he was to enter upon a secular career, when he suddenly received what he always regarded as a special illumination from heaven. Still he was not at rest. During the preceding years he had imbted certain ideas from Lessing's and Herder's writings, which he could not reconcile with the Christian Faith. After several days of personal conflict he betook himself to prayer, and to his astonishment many of his difficulties vanished at once; the remainder disappeared gradually. At Easter, 1832, he entered the theological academy of Münster, and after two terms went to the seminary at Paderborn, where he was ordained sub-deacon on 22 Feb., 1834. On 28 April he entered the Society of Jesus at Brig, Switzerland, and, to avoid any trouble with the German Government in the matter of military service, he became a naturalized citizen in one of the Swiss cantons, and changed his name to "Petters". After his ordination to the priesthood in 1837 he was professor of ethics in Fribourg, Switzerland, for two years; then taught rhetoric in Brig from 1840 till 1843. In 1843 he was appointed professor of sacred eloquence in the German College, Rome. During his residence in Rome and the vicinity (1843-74), besides pastoral work and the composition of his principal writings, he was substitute to the secretary of the General of the Jesuits (1843-56), secretary (1856-62), consultant of the Congregation of the Index, and collaborator in the preparation of the Constitution "De fide Catholicis" of the Vatican Council. He composed the first draft of the Encyclical "Etiam Patria Scholasticismi" (1843-4). He played a leading part in the revival of Scholastic philosophy and theology, and so thorough was his mastery of the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas that he was called Thomas redivivus (Thomas returned to life). With the object of combating the doctrines of Hermes, Hörner, and Günther, he composed his "Theologie der Vorzeit" and "Philosophie der Vorzeit", works which upon their appearance were pronounced in many quarters to be epoch-making. When he died, Leo XII said of him: "Erat princeps philosophorum" (he was the prince of philosophers). Some years before his death he was made a cardinal priest and the foremost extraordinary to the Benedittest Convent of St. Ambrose in Rome. The nuns of this convent honoured as a saint one of their sisters who had died fifty years before. This was reported to the Holy Office, and everyone concerned was severely punished; Kleutgen and the ordinary confessor (both men of exceptional holiness) were suspended, because of lack of prudence in directing the nuns, for awhile even from saying Mass.

Kleutgen consequently left Rome and went to the secluded shrine of Our Lady in Calcro, where he wrote the greater part of his "Theologie der Vorzeit" and "Philosophie der Vorzeit". At the urgent request of several bishops, especially Archbishop Stein, Apostolic Vicar of Calcutta, his superior general recalled him to Rome to place his talents and learning at the disposal of the council, and Pius IX removed all ecclesiastical censures as soon as he became acquainted with the works which Kleutgen had written. In 1879 the Old Catholic journal, Die Zeit, reported that Kleutgen had been condemned by the Roman Inquisition to an imprisonment of six years on account of complicity in the poisoning of a Princess of Hohenlohe; but, on 7 March, Juvelen Pelami, Notary of the Inquisition, testified that Kleutgen had never been summoned before the Holy Office, much less been given such a charge, and consequently had not been punished by it. Possessed of high gifts and vast erudition, and, in consequence, very much in the public eye, Kleutgen was also a model religious and a man of austere simplicity. He was very fond of the poor, and they in turn almost wholly adored him. While he preached, his plain, straightforward, simple language had an appeal even for the intelligence of the most illiterate; and when in conversation with the learned, who often came to consult him, his flow of speech was as free, copious, and unembarrassed as though he were relating from a book.

Kleutgen's principal works are: "Die alten und die neuen Schulen" (Mains, 1846; Münster, 1869); "Ueber den Glauben an das Wunderbare" (Münster, 1848); "Ars dieendi" (Rome, 1847; Turin, 1903); "Die Theologie der Vorzeit" (3 vols., Münster, 1853-65; 6 vols., 1867-74); "Lehrbuch der Dienerinnen Gottes" (Münster, 1869); "Die Philosophie der Vorzeit" (2 vols., Münster, 1860-3; Innsbruck, 1878), translated into French and Italian; "Die Verurteilung des Ontologismus" (Münster, 1868), translated into French and Italian; "Zu meiner Rechtfertigung" (Münster, 1868); "Vom intellektual und dem angeborenen Ideen"; "Zur Lehre vom Glauben" (Münster, 1875); "Die Ideale und ihre wahre Verwirklichung" (Frankfurt, 1868); "Ueber die Wünsche, Befruchtungen und Hofungen in Betreff der bevorstehenden Kirchenversammlung" (Münster, 1868); "Briefe aus Rom" (Münster, 1868); "Freundschaften" (Regensburg, 1872; 2 vols., 1880-5); "Die oberste Lehrgewalt des römischen Bischofs" (Trier, 1870); "De ipso Deo" (Ratisbon, 1881); "Das Evangelium des heiligen Matthäus" (Freiburg, 1882).

KLINKOWSTRÖM, Friedrich August von, artist, author, and teacher, b. at Ludwigsburg in Swedish Pomerania on 31 August, 1778; d. at Vienna, 4 April, 1853. This famous convert came from an old Pomeranian noble family. At the age of sixteen, in deference to the wishes of his father, a lieutenant-colonel in the Swedish army, Friedrich adopted the military calling, but only remained in the service from 1793 to 1802. After this he was allowed to follow his own inclination and become a painter. To perfect himself in this studies, he went to the famous Dresden Gallery. His genius for the whole came to him the mind showed a strong leaning towards the Catholic Church. After four years of successful study he was called home and obliged to remain there quietly for two years, owing to the gloomy political condition of the country after the battle of Jena. Then a great longing seized him for "Lei, tho Un.Die". He therefore first studied at Paris, where the victorious Napoleon had amassed the richest art treasures from all lands. His stay in Paris lasted nearly two years, and terminated happily with his engagement. Finally in 1810 he started for Rome. But the quickly formed friendship with Thorvaldsen, Rauch, Overbeck, and other artists, urging him to leave Rome, caused Klinkowström to be obliged to look about for an assured position. This led him to Venice to take a place as instructor, and his marriage followed in 1812.
But the grave political situation after the battle of Leipzig led the quiet artist once again to join the army. He displayed great activity in forming the volunteer corps in Leipzig, Dresden, and Aachen. After the Treaty of Paris, he returned to Vienna, where he found that during his absence his wife had been received into the Catholic Church by Father Klemens Hofbauer. When he was told of this, he exclaimed: "So Louise has become a Catholic before me." A few months after this he followed the example of his "dear Louise" and converted to the quiet years of painting and literary work. He devoted himself particularly to children's books, for which he provided designs and illustrations, gradually working up to his true calling, the instruction of youth. There had been a plan under discussion for some time in Vienna to found a school for the sons of the higher nobility. But the difficulty was to find the right man, one qualified to undertake the work and carry it out within the provisions of the Austrian School Laws. Such a one was found in Klinkowström. The new foundation was opened in 1818, and enjoyed the personal favour of the emperor; the fact that the empress also showed an active interest and even supervised personally, naturally lent assistance to the school. The founder devoted himself unsparingly to its direction, maintenance, and advancement, and his efforts were eminently successful. Contemporary opinion is unanimous in declaring that for excellence and importance Klinkowström's school took precedence over all other educational institutions of the day. His untiring zeal used up all his strength, so that, owing to ill-health and increasing suffering, he was obliged in 1834, after sixteen years of personal guidance, to give over the school to others. He died six months after this, his wife having died before him, in 1821. Both his oldest and youngest sons, Joseph and Max, entered the Jesuit Order, and became renowned preachers. The third son, Klemens, the head of the house in Austria, has acquired as Imperial and Royal Archivist a literary fame, while to the fourth son, Alphons, we are indebted for an excellent biography of his father. The only daughter joined the Order of Salesians after her father's death.

VON KLINKOWSTRÖM, Friedrich August von Klinkowström und seine Nachkommen (Vienna, 1877; Historisch-politische Blätter, lxxxi, 40 sqq.; RESERNTAL. Konventualbilder.

(2) JOSEPH VON KLINKOWSTRÖM, eldest son of the preceding, b. 30 August, 1813; d. 30 March, 1876. He received his early education at his father's school, and in 1833 entered the Jesuit novitiate at Graz, not completing his novitiate and the study of rhetoric and philosophy, he taught for three years in the lower forms of the gymnasium. He made his theology in Rome, where he was ordained priest in 1846. On his return to Graz he taught rhetoric, and subsequently, during the confusion caused by the revolution of 1848, held the position of tutor in a noble Westphalian family. When, two years later, the great popular missionary movement began in Germany, Father Klinkowström was allotted to the German missionaries, and proved himself to be unusually efficient. He continued his studies in 1852, and his sermons caused so great a sensation in Vienna that the emperor expressed a desire to see him. The result of the interview was the establishment of a Jesuit community in Vienna. Here from 1859 to 1872, in which year his strength began to fail, Klinkowström continued his preaching activity, his great gift of eloquence and his deep fervour making a great impression, especially on educated laymen.

BELOW, 100 Lebensbilder aus der österr.-ungar. Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu (Vienna, 1902).

(3) MAX VON KLINKOWSTRÖM, youngest son of Friedrich, b. 21 October, 1819; d. 28 March, 1896. Until his ordination Father Max was educated on the same general lines as his brother Joseph. From that time, however, the young scholastic led a more active life. Even while making his theology in Innsbruck he took part, under the direction of the celebrated Francis X. Weninger, in the popular missions in Tyrol and Vorarlberg. During his returns he was appointed curate-in-charge at Kirchberg, to him an unwelcome change. This was followed by a still sadder experience, when he was chosen to accompany a band of Catholic emigrants to Australia. This expedition resulted for him only in suffering and privations. After two years he was allowed to resume his chosen work of popular missions. He was a regular and highly esteemed preacher on Sundays and holy days, now at Vienna and Prague, and now at Innsbruck and Presburg, from 1857 to 1887, save for two short interruptions—in 1859, when he served as chaplain in Northern Italy, and in 1871, when he escorted a band of pilgrims to the Golden Jubilee of Pius IX. His last office, which he occupied from 1887 to 1891, was that of superior and preacher at the cathedral of Laibach. Then, after a slight apoplectic stroke, his health failed, and he spent the remainder of his life at Kalksburg near Vienna.

BELOW, 100 Lebensbilder aus der österr.-ungar. Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu (Vienna, 1902).
interest in the problems of the day, and soon became one of the most important leaders of the greater German party in Northern Germany, the Austrian Ambassadors in St Petersburg, through his efforts the year 1865 the King of Hanover created a commission for the care of the state archives and made Kloppe reporter with the title of archivist. He went over the state archives, instituting important innovations in the manner of preserving them, which have been also adopted in the Prussian archives. During the year 1866 he spent his time at headquarters near the king, in whose services he made two dangerous journeys to Frankfurt and Bavaria. After the capitulation of Langensalza he went to Vienna, where he drew up a petition for peace for his sovereign to King William of Prussia. He now settled permanently in Vienna, and entered a faithful and fruitful life as well as a devoted admirer of George of Hanover, as shown by his book, "King George V. Every inch a King" (Hanover, 1878). In 1873 he became a convert to Catholicism. In consequence of his historical investigations he had for years convinced of the truth of the Catholic Church, giving expression to this view in his three works, "Studien über Katholizismus, Protestantismus und Gewissensfreiheit" (Schaffhausen, 1857), "Wird Deutschland wieder Katholisch werden?" (Schaffhausen, 1859), and "Der evangelische Oberkirchenrat in Berlin und das Konzil von Worms" (1869).

His numerous historical writings can be divided into three groups. The first deal with German and Prussian history, the most important works being the following: "Das Restitutionssedikt im nordwestlichen Deutschland" (Göttingen, 1860); "Der König Friedrich II. von Preußen und die deutsche Nation" (Schaffhausen, 1860-7); "Tilly im dreissigjährigen Kriege" (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1861), enlarged edition under the title: "Der dreissigjährige Krieg bis zum Tode Gustav Adolfs" (Paderborn, 1891); "Die preussische Politik des Friedericianismus nach Friedrich II." (Schaffhausen, 1867); "Rückblick auf die preussische Annexion des Königreichs Hannover" (Munich, 1868). The work on Tilly found great favour among Catholics, and the Emperor of Austria, as well as the Kings of Bavaria, Belgium, and Hanover, almost simultaneously sent him their gold medals for services rendered. On the other hand, his work on Frederick II evoked sharp criticism from Prussian circles, and brought forth many replies, most of which he answered convincingly, as in his "Klein- deutsche Geschichtebaumeister" (Freiburg, 1863).

The second group of writings are on the philosopher Leibniz. In 1861 Kloppe made a proposal to the King of Hanover to publish Leibniz's works. For this purpose he thoroughly examined his entire literary remains, and subsequently published: "Die Werke von Leibniz gemäß seinem handschriftlichen Nachlass in der Bibliothek zu Hannover. Erste Reihe: Historisch-politischer und staatswissenschaftlicher Schriften" (11 vols., Hanover, 1894-84). The completion of this work, however, was made impossible, as Bismarck forbade him the use of the Hanoverian library. The French Academy of Sciences in a letter to Kloppe lamented this interdiction on behalf of science. Later Kloppe gave himself up to the exhaustive study of the history of the Stuarts. He had taken up this study with great zeal when he was in England in 1859, and in 1870 instituted further investigations of the English archives. The most important work that we have to thank him for on this subject, and one which is perhaps his masterpiece, is: "Der Fall der Verfassung und der Staat in den Staaten der Hanover in Gross-Britannien und Irland im Zusammenhang der europäischen Angelegenheiten von 1660-1714" (14 vols., Vienna, 1875-88).

The interest he took in the history of Austria, his second home, is shown in his two works: "Das Jahr 1833 und der folgende grosse Türkcnkrieg bis zum Frieden von Carlowitz, 1699" (Graz, 1882), and "Correspondenz epistolare tra Leopoldo I imperatore di Austria e P. Marco d'Aviano, Sappienza" (Graz, 1886), which was dedicated to Pope Leo XIII on the jubilee to celebrate his fiftieth year as a priest. We are indebted to Kloppe above all for the new lines of historical research which he pointed out to Catholics, his works proving incontrovertibly in defiance of all attacks that the study of original documents based on the facts carried on with an incorruptible love of truth, will expose the errors of existing history.

Compare the biography written by his son in Biographisches Jahrbuch, VIII (Berlin, 1900), 17-23.

Patricius Schlegler.

Knab, Joseph, master of religious plastic art, b. at Ploieşti, Tyrol, in 1819; d. at Munich in 1881. He was the son of poor parents, and was first apprenticed to Renn, a wood-carver at Innsbruck, after which he studied ancient German wood-carving at Munich under Entres. Later he worked in the studio of Sickinger, and became, in 1839, a professor at the polytechnical school of the "Verein für Hebung der Oberösterreichischen Künste," and in 1859 he entered the art institute of Mayer. The chair of ecclesiastical sculpture at the Academy of Munich was entrusted to him (1863) in recognition of his principal work, the "Coronation of The Virgin" in the Frauenkirche. The figure of Mary, which is more than life size, stands at the middle of the high-altar, with six angels doing her reverence. The crown is laid on her head by the Heavenly Father and His Divine Son, between whom hovers the Holy Ghost; forms of saints and angels appear in the beautiful framework. The composition and execution, the harmonious grouping and draping of the figures, show a masterly technique. Knab also studied antique art as well as nature. His manner was original. From the Middle Ages he seems to have derived only religious inspiration; the above-mentioned work breathes genuine piety. His other works, chiefly in wood, are characterized by a strong and deeply religious feeling, not at all sentimental; the softness and delicacy of his colouring are perhaps in many cases excessive. Knab is one of the Roman- tics, and frequently recalls Overbeck and Führich. Like these he is a lover of the German Middle Ages and of what appeals to the German people, into whose life and character his travels through Tyrol, Swabia, and the Rhine country gave him a deep insight. His work at the Mayer Institute, where he not only produced numerous drawings and sketches, but also trained capable scholars, was of very important practical benefit for the diffusion of a cultivated taste in religious art. Most of his works are in Bavaria (Munich, Haid- hausen, Passau, Eichstätt, Velden), but there are also some in Stuttgart, Merkemheim, and in other places. The subjects are: "Christ and the Apostles"; "Christ on the Cross"; several single statues of the Madonna (one for Lord Acton), the Madonna in a group, St. Anne (much admired at the Munich Exhibition of 1873 on account of its artistic merit) and St. Afra (Augsburg) was the first of the artist's works to attract attention. He left a son, Karl (d. 15 June, 1904), who studied painting in the school of Piloty and became a successful landscape artist.

Knappe, Albert. See Port of Spain, Archi- docese of.

Kneeling. See genuflexion.

Kneipp, Sebastian, Bavarian priest and hydrotherapist, b. at Stephansreid, Bavaria, 17 May, 1821; d. at Wörishofen, 17 June, 1897. The child of poor parents, he became a weaver like his father, but, during his time as a journeyman, constantly cherished
the hope of becoming a priest and spent all his spare time in study. With the aid of a friendly priest he was enabled to enter the gymnasium. Five years of severe study and privation brought with it a breakdown in health. Kneipp had developed a consumption. His attention was called to the value of hydrotherapy and he began some experiments on himself. While at Dillingen during the winter of 1849, he used to bathe for a few minutes two or three times a week in the Danube, and then hurry home to his room. He says: "I never derived any harm from these cold exercises but also, as I deemed, small benefit." His health was somewhat improved the next year, and he entered the Georgianum, a seminary for theological students at Munich, when he was nearly thirty. Here he continued his hydrotherapeutic experiments, discovering nothing new, but systematizing them. He soon found that the old suggestions as to the use of water were entirely too violent. He was ordained priest in 1852 and became chaplain successively in Biberach, Boos, and St. George in Augsburg. In 1855 he was made confessor to the nuns at the convent of Wörthofen and assistant in the parish; in 1880 he became the parish priest.

While still a curate he practised hydrotherapy for the benefit of the poor, and his success in curing their ailments attracted wide attention. People from neighbouring parishes began to flock to him; the rich and the poor came to be treated, and he spread throughout Germany. His little book, "My Water Cure," went through many editions and was translated into many languages, while people from all over Europe began to flock to him. Many of them were greatly benefited. Pfarrer Kneipp's system consisted of the regulation of the daily life, through simplicity of diet, and the plentiful use of cold water internally and externally. Many of the recommendations of cold water popularly attributed to him are exaggerations. He says most emphatically: "I warn all against too frequent application of cold water. Three times I concluded to remodel my system and relax the treatment from severity to mildness and thence to greater mildness still." His general rules were early to bed and early to rise, with a walk in the dewy grass in the bare feet, simple meals, no stimulants, not too much meat, and an abundance of cereals. To him we owe the idea of a great dietary made up of milk, coffee. Kneipp Societies were formed in Germany and in the United States for the better execution of his regulations. Since his death they have dwindled, and his methods are being lost sight of, showing that it was the personality of the man rather than his system which gave him fame. He discovered what was known before and had been allowed to lapse. Many well-known Europeans became his personal friends, and many prominent, and even royal, personages took up his method of treatment and were benefited. His "So sollt ihr leben" (1890) has been translated into many languages. Leo XIII made him a monsignor.

KNEIPP, MEINE WASSERKUR (1886—tr. Edinburgh, 1891), contains a sketch of his life.

JAMES J. WALSH.

Knight, William, Venerable, put to death for the Faith at York, on 29 November, 1596; with him also suffered Venerables George Errington of Herst, William Gibson of Ripon, and William Abbot of Howden, in Yorkshire. William Knight was the son of James Knight, of Batta, Duffield, Derbyshire. On coming of age he claimed some property, left to him by his father, from his uncle, a Protestant, who denounced him to the authorities for being a Catholic; he was at once seized and committed to the custody of Colyer, a pursuivant, who treated him with indignity and severity. He was sent in October, 1593, to York Castle, where William Gibson and George Errington were already confined, the latter having been arrested some years previously for participation in a rising in the North. A certain Protestant clergyman, who had chanced to develop a friendship for him, gained his freedom he had recourse to an act of treachery: feigning a desire to become a Catholic, he won the confidence of Knight and his two companions, who explained the Faith to him. With the connivance of the authorities, he was directed to one Henry Abbot, then at Jersey, who promised to bring them all together to reconcile him to the Church. Thereupon Abbot was arrested and, together with Knight and his two comrades, accused of persuading the clergyman to embrace Catholicism—an act of treason under the penal laws. They were found guilty, sentenced to be hanged, drawn and quartered, and suffered their martyrdom with joy and fortitude at York, on 29 November, 1596.

BARTHOLOMEW, Recollections in Trouble of our Catholic Forefathers related by themselves. First series, ed. by MORRIS (Lon-

Knighton (CNIHTHON), Henry, a fourteenth-century chronicler. Nothing is known of his career except that he was a canon of St. Mary's, Leicester, and that he was present when St. Benedict and the twelve monks of Fotheringhay Abbey in 1363. His chronicle was first published by Tywysden in "Historiae Anglicanae scriptores decem" (1652); a critical edition by Lumby in the Rolls Series contains an exhaustive study of the only two manuscripts which have survived. Both are now in the British Museum. This work consists of five books and covers the history of England from the accession of Edgar in 959 to the year 1386, in which it abruptly ends. The sudden conclusion suggests that the writer died in or about that year, though from an earlier passage in the work we know that he was threatened with blindness so that he may have been forced to desist through loss of sight. A later writer from the same community continues the story (book V) from 1377 to 1395. The first three books are of no historical value, as they consist of admitted transcripts from Higden, whom Knighton supplements with unacknowledged extracts from Walter of Hemingburgh. He ensured the preservation of numerous valuable documents by writing out the initial letters of the chapters in books I and II should spell Henricus CNIHTON. The really important part of his work is the fourth book, which was written from his own knowledge, and which contains facts, particularly with regard to domestic history, not to be found in any other chronicler. A feature of his work is the economic particulars in which the work abounds. He carefully records the rate of wages, the prices of grain, wine, and cattle. He throws much light on the effects of the Black Death on the labour market, and on the inroads made on the feudal system by the liberation of the adscripti glebae. He also details the evil effects of the pestilence which caused a dearth of priests that was supplied by the ordination of candidates ill-prepared and but little suited for the sacred ministry.


EDWIN BURTON.

Knights of Columbus, a fraternal and benevolent society of Catholic men, founded in New Haven, Conn., 2 Feb., 1882, and chartered by the Governor of Connecticut, 29 March, 1882. The organizers and incorporators were the Reverend M. J. McGivney, the Reverend P. F. Lawlor, James T. Mullen, Cornelius T. Driscoll, Dr. M. C. O'Connor, Daniel Colwell, William M. Geary, John T. Kerrigan, Bartholomew Healey, and Michael Curran. The purpose of the society is to develop a practical Catholicism among its members, to

EDVIN BURTON.
promote Catholic education and charity, and, through its insurance department, to furnish at least temporary financial aid to the families of deceased members. On 15 May, 1882, the organizers, as a Supreme Committee, met at the first meeting in the home of Savior Council, No. 1, New Haven. From this time on, subordinate councils were organized in the different cities and towns throughout the State of Connecticut, but it was not until 15 April, 1886, when a subordinate council was established at Westerly, R. I., that the order was extended beyond the borders of the parent state. The Supreme Committee then enacted a law providing that a Supreme Council should be established, composed of the Supreme Committee and delegates from subordinate councils, each council being entitled to one delegate for each fifty members. The number of delegates under this arrangement proved too large, the Supreme Council, on 14 May, 1886, resolved itself into a Board of Government, composed of the Board of Directors, formerly the Supreme Committee, and the Grand Knight and a Past Grand Knight of each subordinate council of the state.

Owing to the rapid growth of the society, the Board of Government, in 1892, provided for the organization of State Councils, composed of two delegates from each subordinate council in the state. On 29 April, 1893, the Board of Government was succeeded by the National Council, composed of the State Directors and the Past Grand Knight of each Council, and by one delegate from every thousand members of the insurance class. In October, 1893, associate members were first admitted to the order. The establishment of the associate class was intended for those advanced in years, or unable to pass a physical examination, but has gradually been extended to comprehend all eligible men not desiring the insurance feature. On 22 February, 1900, the first instance of the fourth degree took place in New York City, when more than twelve hundred candidates from all parts of the United States received this degree.

The order is now established in every state and territory of the United States, in every province of Canada, in Newfoundland, the Philippine Islands, Mexico, Cuba, Panama. Councils are to be established in Porto Rico and in South America. The membership, divided into two classes, insurance and associate members, 12,638 in March, 1910, 74,900 in December, 1912, 114,713 associate members, 10,000 insurance members, and 160,703 associate members, a total of 235,612. Insurance policies are issued for $1000, $2000, and $3000, to desirable risks between the ages of 18 and 60. The rate for each member increases every five years unless the age of 60 is attained, after which he pays a level premium based upon his age at initiation. The society has paid to the beneficiaries of deceased members $4,438,728.74.

The Knights of Columbus have done notable work in promoting Catholic education and charity, providing education and homes for Catholic orphans, endowing scholarships in Catholic colleges, giving lectures on Catholic doctrine, endowing hospital beds, providing sanitoria for its sick members, maintaining employment bureaux, and, in general, performing the work of the apostolate of the laity. In 1904 the order presented to the Catholic University at Washington $50,000 for a chair of American History, besides several thousand dollars for library purposes, and is at present engaged in raising $500,000 to endow 50 scholarships in the University.

The work of lectures to non-Catholics on questions of Catholic teaching and belief has always appealed to the spirit of the order, and of the past year has not been without some success. Splendid results have attended the lectures so far delivered. They have led to a better understanding of the Catholic faith on the part of non-Catholics, and a more friendly attitude towards it; they have shown that bigotry is on the wane, and that the non-Catholic mind is open to conviction. The series of lectures delivered by the Right Reverend Bishop J. J. Keane of Cheyenne, Wyo., in Denver, in 1909, inaugurated the work. At Cedar Rapids, Iowa, eighty-five per cent of the audience signed the manifesto. The proceeds of the Knights of Columbus, was non-Catholic. The work has been taken up successfully in Buffalo, Milwaukee, Houston, Los Angeles. It is a movement which does not aim at attacking any man's belief, but at building up charity among men 'and', in the words of Bishop Keane, bringing us all closer together. Catholic students in several cities have established Catholic libraries, and in many others have catalogued the Catholic books in the public libraries.

The erection of a memorial to Christopher Columbus, in the City of Washington, by the United States Government, is due in a measure to the work of the Knights of Columbus. The "Columbus Day" (12 October), which is observed at present in fifteen states of the Union (California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin), was instituted largely through the efforts of the Knights, who are now striving to make it a national holiday.

EDWARD HEARN.

Knights of the Cross (ordo Militaris Crucigerorum cum Ruba Stellae), a religious order famous in the history of Bohemia, and accustomed from the beginning to the use of arms, a custom which was confirmed in 1292 by an ambassador of Pope Nicholas IV. The grand master is still invested with a sword at his induction into office, and the congregation has been recognized as a military order by Popes Clement X and Innocent XII, as well as by several emperors.

There is much discussion as to the real beginnings of this order, some authorities, among others the Bohemianists, tracing it back to Palestine, where the first members were supposed to have borne arms against the Saracens. On the other hand, however, is the contemporary custom of establishing a religious congregation at the time of the foundation of a hospital, as well as the fact that in no document is there any trace of the Palestinian Crusaders going to Bohemia. Moreover, in a parchment Breviary of the order dated 1356 the account of foundation contains no allusion to such a lineage. The order is first found in Bohemia as a fraternity attached to a hospital at Prague under a community of Clarissæ, established by Princess Agnes, daub of Przemysl and Queen Constantia, in 1233. In 1235 the hospital was richly endowed by the queen with property formerly belonging to the German order, a gift confirmed by Pope Gregory IX (18 May, 1236), who stipulated that the revenues should be divided with the Clarissæ monastery. After three years, during which the head of the congregation had gone to Rome as the accredited representative of Abbess Agnes, and the congregation had been formally constituted an order under the Rule of St. Augustine by Gregory IX (1238), the abbess (1239) resigned all jurisdiction over the hospital and its possessions into the hands of the Holy See. Twelve days later the pope formally assigned these to the recently confirmed Knights of the Cross, who were to hold them forever in lieu to the Holy See, on condition of the yearly payment of a nominal sum. Blessed Agnes built for the order a new hospital at the Prague Bridge, which was taken as the nucleus of a house, and to the title of the order was added in latere (pede) pontis (Pragensis) [at the foot of the (Prague) bridge]. She also petitioned the Holy See for some mark to distinguish these knights from other Cruciferi, with whom they bore in common the red cross of the crus-
der. To this was added Bishop Nicholas of Prague, on the authorization of the pope, a red six-pointed star (10 Oct., 1230), probably from the arms of the first general, Albrecht von Sternberg.

The order, which by 1253 had extensive possessions in Bohemia, soon spread to neighbouring lands. The Breslau house in particular was the centre of many other foundations. It is Bohemia, in an especial manner, to which the knightly habit has adhered inestimable services. Their success in hospital work is evidenced by the rapidity with which their houses multiplied, and the frequent testimony borne to it in documents of kings and emperors. Within two decades after their foundation the care of souls had become as important as their hospital work, so quickly had the methods been replaced by prayer. Numberless churches were entrusted to them in all parts of Bohemia, particularly the West, where they formed a bulwark of the Faith during the ravages of heresy in that region; the Tabortites murdered the pastor of St. Stephen's at Prague, and the Hussites destroyed the mother-house and brought the order almost to the point of dissolution, but it recovered sufficiently to offer strenuous resistance to the advance of the Reformed teachings. In the war with Sweden the members of the order justified their claim to the title of knights during the siege of Eger, fighting side by side with the townsmen, and to the end with them their last crust. Their hospital at Prague was also the first refuge of other orders who came to work for souls in Bohemia, among others the Jesuits (1555) and Capuchins (1599). For almost a hundred and fifty years the archbishops of Prague held the post of grand master and were supported almost entirely by the revenues of the order. Only on the restoration of the possessions of the archdiocese at the end of the seventeenth century was the grand master again elected from among the members, and a general reform instituted. George Ignatius Paschial (1694–99), the first grand master under the new regime, showed himself zealous for the restoration of the primitive ideals, especially that of charity. Even to the present day the Prague monastery supports twelve pensioners and distributes the so-called "hospital portion" to forty poor.

Many knights have won enviable reputations in the world. Among others Nicholas Rosarzowa (d. 1692), celebrated mathematician and astronomer: John Francis Beckowsky (d. 1725), who established at Prague an herbarium which is still in existence, and Zimmermann, the historian.

At the present time, besides the mother-house at Prague, there are about 26 incorporated parishes, and 85 professed members, several of whom are engaged in gymnasia and the University of Prague. There are benefits at Hadris, Vienna, where the order has been established since the thirteenth century, Eger, Brux, and Schaan.

---

Knoll, Albert (Joseph), dogmatic theologian of the Order of Friars Minor Capuchins, b. at Brunneck in northern Tyrol, 12 July, 1768; d. at Bosen, 30 March, 1838. He was ordained to the presbyterate in 1788, and five years later was appointed to teach dogmatic theology in the Capuchin convent at Meran. He held this position for twenty-four years. Having been elected to the office of definator general in 1847, he went to Rome, but returned to Bosen, in 1853, where he lived the remainder of his days. While in Rome he wrote his "Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae Generalis seu Fundamentalis" (Innsbruck, 1852). The following year he published at Turin the first volume of his "Institutiones Theologiae Theoreticae seu Dogmatico-Polemica", which was followed by five other volumes, the last one appearing in 1860. In this work the author observes the "Apologia theologica" and "Obiter dicta" and is in sympathy with the recent developments in dogmatic theology. His brief but accurate descriptions of both ancient and modern heresies, his frequent and happy quotations from the writings of the Fathers, the masterly way in which he handles such difficult subjects as grace, free-will, and original sin, place him among the foremost theologians of the nineteenth century. He wrote a compendium in two volumes of the "Institutiones Theologiae Theoreticae" which was published at Turin in 1868. The last edition of the larger work, corrected and amended by Father Gottfried of Grau, was published at Innsbruck in 1891. In Knoll's "Expositio de obituum morbo", a treatise on the obligations of the Francis- can rule, has been commended as a faithful interpretation of the spirit of St. Francis.

HUTTER, Nomenclator Literarum, III, 691-2.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.
Knowledge, being a primitive fact of consciousness, cannot, strictly speaking, be defined; but the direct and spontaneous consciousness of knowing may be made clearer by pointing out its essential and distinctive characteristic. It will be helpful first to consider briefly the current uses of the verb “to know.”

To say that I know a certain man may mean simply that I have met him, and recognize him when I meet him again. This implies the permanence of a mental image enabling me to discern this man from all others. Sometimes essential more than features with external features is implied. To know a man may mean to know his character, his inner and deeper qualities, and hence to expect him to act in a certain way under certain circumstances. The man who asserts that he knows an occurrence to be a fact means that he is in belief the evidence is more obscure and indistinct than in knowledge, either because the grounds on which the event rests are not so clear, or because the evidence is not personal, but based on the testimony of witnesses, or again because, in addition to the objective evidence which draws the assent, there are other general conditions and principles. The intuition is expressed in many languages by the use of two different verbs—by γνωσις and σιβενα, in Greek; by cognoscere and scire, in Latin, and by their derivatives in the Romance languages; in German by kennen and wissen.

I. ESSENTIALS OF KNOWLEDGE.—(1) Knowledge is essentially the consciousness of an object, i.e., of any thing, fact, or principle belonging to the physical, mental, or metaphysical order, that may in any manner be reached by cognitive faculties. An event, a material substance, a man, a geometrical theorem, a mental process, the immortality of the soul, the existence and nature of God, may be so many objects of knowledge. Thus knowledge implies the antithesis of a knowing subject and a known object. It always possesses an objective character, and any process that may be conceived as merely subjective is not a cognitive process. Any attempt to reduce the object to the subject that would result in destroying the fact itself of knowledge, whichimpliesthe object, or not-self, as clearly as it does the subject, or self. (2) Knowledge supposes a judgment, explicit or implicit. Apprehension, that is, the mental conception of a simple present object, is generally numbered among the cognitions of sense, yet not itself, but only in the strict sense knowledge, but only its starting-point. Properly speaking, we know only when we compare, identify, discriminate, connect; and these processes, equivalent to judgments, are found implicitly even in ordinary sense-perception. A few judgments, the truth of a proposition, based as it were on its own merits. The latter consists in the recognition of the truth of a proposition by seeing its connexion with another already known to be true. The self-evident proposition is of such a nature as to be immediately clear to the mind. No one who understands the terms can fail to know that two and two are four, or that the whole is greater than any one of its parts. But most human knowledge is acquired progressively. Inductive knowledge starts from self-evident facts, and rises to laws and causes. Deductive knowledge proceeds from general self-evident propositions in order to discover their particular application. In both cases the process may be long, difficult, and uncertain. A man must have been satisfied with negative conception and analogical evidence, and, as a result, knowledge will be less clear, less certain, and more liable to error. (See Deduction; Induction.)

VIII.—43
III. THE PROBLEM OF KNOWLEDGE. — The question of knowledge belongs to various sciences, each of which takes a different point of view. Psychology considers knowledge as a mental fact whose elements, conditions, laws, and growth are to be determined. It endeavours to discover the behaviour of the mind in knowing, and the development of the cognitive processes of its elements. It supplies the other sciences with the data on which they must work. Among these data are found certain laws of thought which the mind must observe in order to avoid contradiction and to reach consistent knowledge. Formal logic also takes the subjective point of view; it deals with these laws of thought, and, neglecting the objective side of knowledge, separates it into its formal elements necessary to consistency and valid proof. At the other extreme, science, physical or metaphysical, postulating the validity of knowledge, or at least leaving this problem out of consideration, studies only the different objects of knowledge, their nature and properties. As to the crucial questions, the validity of knowledge, its limitations, and the relations between the knowing subject and the known object, these belong to the province of epistemology (q. v.).

Knowledge is essentially objective. Such names as the "given" or the "content" of knowledge may be substituted for that of "object", but the plain fact remains that we know something external, which is not formed by, but offered to, the mind. This must not, however, cause us to overlook another fact equally evident. Different minds will frequently take different views of the same object. Moreover, even in the same mind, knowledge undergoes great changes in the course of time; judgments are constantly modified, enlarged or narrowed down, in accordance with newly discovered facts and ascertained truths. Sense-perception is influenced by past processes, associations, contrasts, etc. In rational knowledge a great diversity of elements is produced by personal dispositions, innate or acquired. In a word, knowledge clearly depends on the mind. Hence the assertion that it is made by the mind alone, that it is conditioned exclusively by the nature of the thinking subject, and that the object of knowledge is in no way outside of the knowledge itself. To use Berkeley's words to be acquainted to be known (esse est percipi). The fact of the dependence of knowledge upon subjective conditions, however, is far from sufficient to justify this conclusion. Men agree on many propositions, both of the empirical and of the rational order; they differ not so much on objects of opinion, but much on what they really know as on what they think they know. For two men with normal eyes, the vision of an object, as far as we can ascertain, is sensibly the same. For two men with normal minds, the proposition that the sum of the angles in a triangle equals two right angles has the same meaning, and, both for several minds and for the same mind at different times, the knowledge of that proposition is identical. Owing to associations and differences in mental attitudes, the fringe of consciousness will vary and somewhat modify the total mental state, but the focus of consciousness, knowledge itself, will be essentially the same. St. Thomas will not be accused of idealism, and yet he makes the nature of the mind an essential factor in the act of knowledge: "Cognition is brought about by the presence of the known object in the knowing mind. But the object is in the knower after this fashion, for the knowledge is after the fashion of his own nature" (Summa theol., I, Q. xii, a. 4). What is this presence of the object in the subject? Not a physical presence; not even in the form of a picture, a duplicate, or a copy. It cannot be defined by any comparison with the physical world; it is not generic, a cognitive likeness, a species intentionalis.

When knowledge, either of concrete realities or of abstract properties, is said to consist in the presence of an object in the mind, we cannot mean by this object something external in its absolute existence and isolated from the mind, for we cannot think outside of our own thought, and the mind cannot know what is not somehow present in the mind. But this is no sufficient ground for accepting extreme idealism and looking upon knowledge as purely subjective. If the object of an assent or experience cannot be absolute reality, it does not follow that to an assent or experience there is no corresponding reality; and the fact that an object is reached through the conception of it does not justify the conclusion that the mental conception is the whole object. To say that knowledge is a conscious process is true, but it is only a part of the truth. And from this to infer, with Locke, that, since we can be conscious only of what takes place within ourselves, knowledge is only "conversant with ideas", is to take an exclusively psychological view of the fact which asserts itself primarily as establishing a relation between a mind and an external reality. Knowledge becomes conversant with ideas by a subsequent process, namely, by the reflection of the mind upon its own activity. The subjectivist has his eyes wide open to the difficulty of explaining the transition from external reality to the mental difficulty which, after all, is but the mystery of consciousness itself. He keeps them obstinately closed to the utter impossibility of explaining the building up by the mind of an external reality out of mere conscious processes. Notwithstanding all theorizing to the contrary, the facts impose themselves that in knowing the mind is not merely active, but also passive; that it must conform, not simply to its own laws, but to external reality as well; that it does not create facts and laws, but discovers them; and that the right of truth to recognition persists even when it is actually ignored or vitiated. The fact is precisely that the mind relates to the knowing process, but, to use the metaphor of St. Augustine, the generation of knowledge requires another cause: "Whatever object we know is a co-factor in the generation of the knowledge of it. For knowledge is begotten both by the knowing subject and the known object." (Deinde in his generatione haec causa has to be maintained that there are realities distinct from ideas without falling into the absurdity of maintaining that they are known in their absolute existence, that is apart from their relations to the knowing mind. Knowledge is essentially the vital union of both.

It has been said above that knowledge requires experience and thought. The attempt to explain knowledge by experience alone proved a failure, and the favour which Associationism found at first was shortlived. Recent criticism of the sciences has accentuated the fact, which already occupied a central place in scholastic philosophy, that knowledge, even of the physical and mental worlds, implies factors transcending experience. Empiricism fails completely in its endeavour to explain and justify universal knowledge, the knowledge of uniform laws under which facts are brought to unity. Without rational additions, the perception of what is or has been can never give the knowledge of what will certainly and necessarily be. True as this is of the natural sciences, it is still more evident in abstract and rational sciences like mathematics. Hence we are led back to the old Aristotelian and Scholastic view, that all knowledge must be known, or very knowable, or else not be knowledge. If the development of knowledge is given in experience, in order to reach its perfection. It needs reason interpreting the data of observation, abstracting the contents of experience from the conditions which individualize them in space and time, removing, as it were, the outer envelope of the concrete, and going to the core of reality. Thus knowledge is not, as in Kantian criticism, a synthesis
of two elements, one external, the other depending only on the nature of the mind; not the filling up of empty shells—a priori mental forms or categories—
with the unknown and unknowable reality. Even abstract knowledge reveals reality, although its object cannot exist outside of the mind without conditions of time and place, and in the act of knowing directly with it.

Knowledge is necessarily proportioned or relative to the capacity of the mind and the manifestations of the object. Not all men have the same keenness of vision or hearing, or the same intellectual aptitudes. Nor is the same reality equally bright from all angles from which it may be viewed. On the contrary, even though the sun may perceive rays beyond the red and the violet of the spectrum; higher intelligents may unravel many mysteries of nature, know more and better, with greater facility, certainty, and clearness. The fact that we do not know everything, and that all our knowledge is inadequate, does not invalidate the knowledge which we possess, any more than the horizon which bounds our view prevents us from perceiving more or less distinctly the various objects within its limits. Reality manifests itself to the mind in different ways and with varying degrees of clearness: Some objects are bright in themselves and are perceived immediately; others are borrowed, thrown on them light borrowed elsewhere, by showing by way of causality, similarity, analogy, their connexion with what we already know. This is essentially the condition of scientific progress, to find connections between various objects, to proceed from the known to the unknown. As we recede from the self-evident, the path may become more difficult, and the progress slower. But, with the Agnostic, to assign clearly defined boundaries to our cognitive powers is unjustifiable, for we pass gradually from one object to another without break, and there is no sharp limit between sciences and metaphysics. The same instruments, principles, and methods that are recognised in the various sciences will carry us higher and higher, even to the Absolute, the First Cause, the Source of all reality. Induction will lead us from the effect to the cause, from the imperfect to the perfect, from the contingent to the necessary, from the dependent to the self-existent, from the finite to the infinite.

And this same process by which we know God's existence cannot fail to manifest something—however little—of His nature and perfections. That we know Him imperfectly, by way chiefly of negation and analogy, is clear. But what do we know in this respect of God? We can know God only so far as He manifests Himself through His works which dimly mirror His perfections, and so far as our finite mind will allow. Such knowledge will necessarily remain infinitely far from being comprehension, but it is only by a misleading confusion of terms that Spencer identifies the unknowable with the incomprehensible, and denies the possibility of any knowledge of the Absolute because we can have no absolute knowledge. Seeing "through a glass" and "in a dark manner." is far from the vision "face to face" which our limited mind is incapable without a special light from God Himself. Yet it is knowledge of Him who is the source both of the world's intelligibility and truth, and of the mind's intelligence.

(See also AGnosticism, CERTitude, EPistemology, FAITH.)
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the knowledge of God inferior to immediate vision is imperfect and unworthy of Christ (I Cor., xiii, 9-12); Jesus repeatedly asserts that He knows the Father and is known by Him, that He knows what the Father knows. There is a difficulty in reconciling Christ's sufferings and surpassing great sorrow with the beatitude implied in His beatific vision. The answer is: since the Lord could be in the nature of Christ without allowing its glory to overflow into His sacred body, the happiness of the beatific vision too might be in the human soul of our Lord without overflowing into and absorbing His lower faculties, so that He might feel the pang of sorrow and suffering. The beatific vision may be effectually given to a saint without any sorrow and joy, resulting from the perception of different objects (cf. St. Thom., III, Q. xiii, a. 5, ad 3; St. Bonav., in III, dist. xvi, a. 2, q. 2); the martyrs have often testified to the ecstatic happiness with which God filled their souls, at the very time that their bodies were suffering the extremity of torment.

(2) Christ's Infused Knowledge. The existence of an infused science in the human soul of Jesus Christ may perhaps be less certain, from a theological point of view than from His continual and original fruition of the vision of God; still, it is almost universally admitted that God infused into Christ a human intellect a knowledge of God, and to this end He bestowed a knowledge which is not acquired gradually by experience, but is poured into the soul in one flood. This doctrine rests on theological grounds: the Man-God must have possessed all perfections except such as would be incompatible with His beatific vision, as faith or love; or with His sinlessness, as penance; or again, with His office of Redeemer, which would be incompatible with the consummation of His glory. Now, infused knowledge is not incompatible with Christ's beatific vision, nor with His sinlessness, nor again with His office of Redeemer. Besides, the soul of Christ is the first and most perfect of all created spirits, and cannot be deprived of a privilege granted to the angels. Moreover, a created intellect is simply perfect only when, besides the vision of things in God, it has a vision of things in themselves; God only sees all things comprehensively in Himself. The God-Man, besides seeing them in God, would also perceive and know through His intellect, which is able to comprehend all things within the limits of His knowledge, as if seeing them in God. The human intellect of Christ supports the existence of such infused knowledge in the human intellect of Christ: St. Paul speaks of all the treasures of God's wisdom and science hidden in Christ (Col., ii, 3); Isaías speaks of the spirit of wisdom and counsel, of science and understanding, resting in Christ (xii, 14); St. Thomas says that Christ has not given His Spirit by measure to His Divine envoy (John, iii, 34); St. Matthew represents Christ as our sovereign teacher (Matt., xxiii, 10). Besides the Divine and the angelic knowledge, most theologians admit in the human intellect of Jesus Christ a science infused in a certain way and in a manner comprehensible to the mind in the ordinary way, similar to that granted to Adam and Eve (cf. St. Thom., III, Q. 1, a. 2; QQ. viii-xii; Q. xv, a. 2).

(3) Christ's Acquired Knowledge. Jesus Christ had, no doubt, also an experimental knowledge acquired by the natural use of His faculties, through His senses and imagination, just as happens in the case of common human knowledge. To say that His human faculties were wholly inactive would resemble a profession of either Monothelitism or of Docetism. This knowledge naturally grew in Jesus in the process of time, according to the words of Luke, ii, 52: 'And Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men'. Understood in this way, the Evangelist speaks not merely of a successively greater manifestation of Christ's Divine and infused knowledge, nor merely of an increase in His knowledge as far as outward effects were concerned, but of a real advance in His acquired knowledge. Not that this kind of knowledge implies an enlarged object of His science; but it signifies that He gradually came to know, after a merely human way, some of the things which He had known from the beginning by His Divine and infused knowledge.

II. EXTENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS CHRIST. It has already been stated that the knowledge in Christ's Divinity was the beatific vision. As to the experimental knowledge acquired by Christ, it must have been at least equal to the knowledge of the most gifted of men; it appears to us wholly unworthy of the dignity of Christ that His powers of observation and natural insight should have been less than man's. But the main difficulty arises from the question as to the extent of Christ's knowledge flowing from His beatific vision, and of His infused amount of knowledge. (1) The Council of Baalae (Sess. XXII) condemned the proposition of a certain Augustinus de Roma: 'Animas Christi videt Deus tam clare, et intense quam clare et intente Deus videt seipsum'. (The soul of Christ sees God as clearly and intimately as God perceives Himself). It is quite clear that, however perfect the human soul of Christ is, it always remains finite and limited; hence its knowledge cannot be unlimited and infinite. (2) Though the knowledge in the human soul of Christ was not infinite, it was most perfect and embraced the widest range, extending to the Divine ideas already realised, or still to be realised. Nescience of any of these matters would amount to positive ignorance in Christ, as the ignorance of law in a judge. For Christ is not merely our infallible teacher, but also the universal mediator, the supreme judge, the sovereign king of all creation. (3) Two important texts are urged against this perfection of Christ's knowledge: Luke, ii, 52 demands an advancement in knowledge in the case of Christ; this text has already been considered in the last paragraph. The other text is Mark, xii, 32: 'Of that day or hour no man knoweth, neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father.' After all that has been written on this question in recent years, we see no need to add anything to the traditional explanations: the Son has no knowledge of the judgment day which He is to communicate; or, the Son has no knowledge of His creation, from His human nature as such; or again, the Son has no knowledge of the day and the hour, that has not been communicated to Him by the Father. (See Mangenot in Vigouroux, "Dict. de la Bible", II, Paris, 1889, 2268 sq.)

Since the time of the Nestorian controversy, Catho-
lics have had no ground for questioning the doctrine concerning the knowledge of Christ (cf. Leporius, "Libellus Emendationis", n. 40; Eulogius Alex., "In Phot.", cod. 230, n. 10; S. Gregorius Magnus, lib. X, epp. xxxv, xxxvi; Sophron., Ep. Syn. ad Ser-
gium"; Damascenius, "De Hsr.", n. 85; Nat. Alex., Hist. Eccl., in sec., sec. 111, n. 3, sec. 111, n. 4). As to the Fathers preceding the Nestorian controversy, Leontius Bys-
tinus simply surrenders their authority to the oppo-
sites and our doctrine concerning the knowledge of Christ: Petavius represents it as partly undecided; but the early Fathers may be excused from error, because they were closely against the Arian heresy, so that they endeavoured to establish Christ's Divinity by removing all ignorance from His Divine nature, while they did not care to enter upon an ex professo inves-
tigation of the knowledge possessed by His human nature. At that time there was no call for any such study. After the patriarchs (especially the Cappadocians) and Hugh of St. Victor exaggerated the human knowledge of Christ, so that the early Scholastics asked the question, why God's Omniscience could be communicated, while His Omnipotence was incomunicable (Lomb., "Libre Sent.", III, d. 14). But even at this period, at least a modified difference was admitted to exist between the Om-
The Tory element in the population, composed almost wholly of adherents of the Church of England, was most prominent in its resistance to that principle. Many of these were secretly opposed to the total independence of the colonies. In New York, most numerous, they had been the governing class; theirs was the state Church; their wealth and social standing gave them a large share in the direction of public affairs which they rightly judged would be lost to them by the establishment of the republic on the principles of freedom and democracy which Jefferson and, when their mother country was compelled to acknowledge the independence of the colonies, over 30,000 of these Tories voluntarily deserted themselves, most of them to England and Canada. Those who remained became identified with the political party known as the Federalists. Successful for a time in retaining the control of the newly-organized government, the leaders of that party "strove to preserve the political ascendency of Protestantism in the states both by Federal legislation affecting the naturalization of emigrants and by preventing legislation in their respective states for the establishment of Catholicism on the principles of the Roman Catholic faith and, (2) the exclusion of foreign-born citizens from all offices of trust and emolument in the government, whether federal, state, or municipal. It may be added that Roman Catholics of Irish origin, whether native or foreign-born, were at all times the special objects of the American Protestantism, and that the "foreigners", contemptuously so called, against whom the Know nothings denunciations were levelled, and who were to be excluded from the rights of citizenship, were for the most part Irish immigrants to the United States professing the Roman Catholic faith. This Native American spirit may be regarded as the natural and logical development of the liberty of conscience and personal independence which was given to the new country by its founders. To what extent the rights of the Foreigner, who professed and practiced the Roman Catholic religion, and the laws which remained on the Statute Books down to the time of the War of Independence.

With the organization of government and the adoption of a written Constitution, the question of religious toleration naturally arose, and the principle of freedom of religion was incorporated in the Federal Constitution (Art. VI) which declared that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." This liberty of conscience was further assured by an amendment adopted in 1791, which declared that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." While the policy of the National Government was thus defined, and its law-making power was restrained from legislation hostile to the principle of freedom of religion, the individual states had reserved the right to regulate the question of religion and of a state Church within their respective jurisdictions, and the elimination from the Constitutions of the various states of the religious disqualifications which they contained was deferred. Roman Catholics was accomplished slowly and not without much resistance on the part of a considerable portion of the population: Thus, it was not until 1833 that the union between Church and State in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was dissolved, and Catholics were relieved from having to pay taxes for the support of the state (Protestant) Church. New Jersey retained its anti-Catholic Constitution until 1844, and only in 1877 did New Hampshire expunge from its Constitution the provision disqualifying Catholics from holding office in that state. These, with instances from other states which might be added, show how the principle of the Roman Catholic religion still survived. Freedom of religion as asserted in the Federal Constitution was not by any means universally accepted in theory, still less in practice.
American and Knownothing movements which America has witnessed, political hostility and religious prejudice, and neither, appear as the motive and inspiration. Knownothingism was only the development and application of the principles of Native Americanism whose character and origin we have briefly sketched.

During the half-century preceding the Knownothing era, the movements involved in that movement had been frequently agitated. Catholics and foreigners were denounced, mainly from Protestant pulpits, as enemies of the Republic. Books and newspapers calculated to inflame the passions of the mob against their Irish and Catholic neighbours were extensively circulated. The bishops were excommunicated, their religion misrepresented and ridiculed, and acts of violence were committed against Catholics and their property. The burning of the Convent of the Ursuline nuns at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834, by a Native American mob, and their cruel treatment of the unoffending nuns and their pupils, were the most notable manifestations, up to that time, of the evil effect of religious hatred. In 1835 the first formal organization of the partisans of the Native American movement under that name, was effected at New York City. Various newspapers, such as "The Protestant", "The Protestant Vindicatrix", "The Downfall of Rome", with headquarters in New York and New England, as aids to the movement. The "evils of Popery" and the danger to arise to the Republic from tolerating the practice of the Catholic religion were staple topics of discussion by no considerable number of ministers of religion, and under the impulse of these incitements the spirit of religious prejudice was kept alive; there were new aggressions upon the rights of Catholic citizens, the peace and order of the community were occasionally disturbed by acts of violence, and another decade in the history of Native Americanism terminated in the bloody riots which occurred at Philadelphia, in 1844, when several Catholic churches were attacked by the Native American mob, and two of them, St. Michael's and St. Augustine's, were deliberately fired and reduced to ashes, and the safety of those that remained were so endangered by the hostile demonstrations of the mob that pistol-fire was suspended by order of Bishop Kenrick, and on Sunday, 12 May, 1844, all Catholic churches in that city were closed. Many houses tenanted by Irish Catholics were likewise wantonly destroyed by fire, some of the inmates were shot down at their own doors, and a number of other unoffending persons were murdered.

The party whose members were soon to be described as "Knownothings" was formally organized in 1852 in the City of New York. Although begun as a local society, it was designed to become a national organization. Its leaders had planned to concentrate in a single party the effect of the Native American order already in existence and the "American Republicans", the "Order of United Americans", "Sons of America", and "United American Mechanics of the United States" formed the nucleus of the new party. It adopted the title of "National Council of the United States of North America." Among the leaders at the outset were the "Star-spangled Banner" and was sometimes familiarly spoken of as "Sam". Its published ritual declared (Article II) the purpose of the organization to be "to protect every American citizen in the legal and proper exercise of all his civil and religious rights and privileges, and to resist all who Gare misused of the Church of Rome and all other foreign influence against our republican institutions in all lawful ways; to place in all offices of honour, trust or profit in the gift of the people or by appointment none but Native American Pro- testant citizens" (see American Politics, Book I, pp. 57-9). Article III declared "that a member must be a native-born citizen, a Protestant either born of Protestant parents or reared under Protestant influence, and neither, appear as the motive and inspiration. Knownothingism was only the development and application of the principles of Native Americanism whose character and origin we have briefly sketched.

During the half-century preceding the Knownothing era, the movements involved in that movement had been frequently agitated. Catholics and foreigners were denounced, mainly from Protestant pulpits, as enemies of the Republic. Books and newspapers calculated to inflame the passions of the mob against their Irish and Catholic neighbours were extensively circulated. The bishops were excommunicated, their religion misrepresented and ridiculed, and acts of violence were committed against Catholics and their property. The burning of the Convent of the Ursuline nuns at Charlestown, Mass., in 1834, by a Native American mob, and their cruel treatment of the unoffending nuns and their pupils, were the most notable manifestations, up to that time, of the evil effect of religious hatred. In 1835 the first formal organization of the partisans of the Native American movement under that name, was effected at New York City. Various newspapers, such as "The Protestant", "The Protestant Vindicatrix", "The Downfall of Rome", with headquarters in New York and New England, as aids to the movement. The "evils of Popery" and the danger to arise to the Republic from tolerating the practice of the Catholic religion were staple topics of discussion by no considerable number of ministers of religion, and under the impulse of these incitements the spirit of religious prejudice was kept alive; there were new aggressions upon the rights of Catholic citizens, the peace and order of the community were occasionally disturbed by acts of violence, and another decade in the history of Native Americanism terminated in the bloody riots which occurred at Philadelphia, in 1844, when several Catholic churches were attacked by the Native American mob, and two of them, St. Michael's and St. Augustine's, were deliberately fired and reduced to ashes, and the safety of those that remained were so endangered by the hostile demonstrations of the mob that pistol-fire was suspended by order of Bishop Kenrick, and on Sunday, 12 May, 1844, all Catholic churches in that city were closed. Many houses tenanted by Irish Catholics were likewise wantonly destroyed by fire, some of the inmates were shot down at their own doors, and a number of other unoffending persons were murdered.

The party whose members were soon to be described as "Knownothings" was formally organized in 1852 in the City of New York. Although begun as a local society, it was designed to become a national organization. Its leaders had planned to concentrate in a single party the effect of the Native American order already in existence and the "American Republicans", the "Order of United Americans", "Sons of America", and "United American Mechanics of the United States" formed the nucleus of the new party. It adopted the title of "National Council of the United States of North America." Among the leaders at the outset it was called the "Supreme Order of the Star-spangled Banner" and was sometimes familiarly spoken of as "Sam". Its published ritual declared (Article II) the purpose of the organization to be "to protect every American citizen in the legal and proper exercise of all his civil and religious rights and privileges, and to resist all who are misused of the Church of Rome and all other foreign influence against our republican institutions in all lawful ways; to place in all offices of honour, trust or profit in the gift of the people or by appointment none but Native American Protestant citizens" (see American Politics, Book I, pp. 57-9). Article III declared "that a member must be
In the Thirty-fifth Congress, which assembled in December, 1855, there were seven or five Know-Nothing members elected as such. In 1856 Horace Greeley wrote: "The majority of the Banks men"—Banks being the candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives—"are now members of Know-Nothing councils and some twenty or thirty of them actually believe in that article. Have the addressing committees declared that two-thirds of that and nearly all of that of Pennsylvania are Know-Nothings". In 1855 the Know-Nothing party suffered a serious reverse in Virginia, when Henry A. Wise, the Democratic candidate, was elected governor of that state, chiefly on the issue of his antagonism to Native American principles and practices. In December, 1856, a mob of the determined partisans of the Know-Nothing party held a convention at which they nominated Millard Fillmore as candidate for President. Opposed to them in that election were the Democratic party and the newly organized Republican party, both of whom had expressed their dissent from Native American principles. Speaking of this selection, Schouler says: "Their candidate Fillmore met with the most ignoble defeat, receiving only the eight electoral votes of Maryland, his adversary, James Buchanan, the nominee of the National Democratic party being triumphantly elected. For the North, as for the South, and their provisions too, the defeat was overwhelming. It was apparent that the American or Know-Nothing party had now nearly evaporated" (History of the U. S., IV, p. 357).

The American people had weighed the claims of the Know-Nothing party to be regarded as the saviors of the republic and had witnessed the criminal excesses to which that party had resorted in its efforts to secure political control, and the sober sense of the great mass of the people had repudiated both. Moreover the great controversy over slavery coupled with the claim of the right of a state to secede from the Union was pressing upon the attention of the country. The exclusion of new states and other questions, so that upon the election of President Lincoln (1860) Know-Nothingism as an organized party had ceased to exist, and only its disagreeable memory remained.

The history of Know-Nothingism would be very imperfectly told without some account of the wrongs inflicted upon Catholics and the criminal excesses committed by the partisans of that movement. The same bitter attacks against Catholics and the same incitements to violence could not fail to produce results similar to those which had characterized the earlier Native American movements. In 1851 the large settlement in Providence exerted over the establishment there of a community of Sisters of Mercy under the direction of Mother Xavier Warde. The cottage occupied by the sisters was attacked at night, and all the windows broken. In daytime, as the sisters passed through the streets, they were hooted at and other provocations were aimed at them and they were openly threatened with the destruction of their convent. So persistent were these threats that the Mayor requested the sisters to abandon their residence in Providence so as to avert the threatened disorder. Soon afterwards a mob of Know-Nothing partisans fully armed was assembled whose purpose of attacking the convent had been openly announced. The bishop's house and one or more of the churches were likewise marked for destruction. After fruitless appeals to the civil authorities for protection, the Irish Catholics of Providence, under the prudent and resolute lead of Bishop O'Reilly, prepared to resist the movement and repel all violent attempts. The mob marched to the convent, but, finding it guarded by a number of Catholic Irishmen, with Bishop O'Reilly present and declaring that the sisters and their convent should be protected at whatever cost, the Know-Nothing leaders decided not to molest the convent, and the mob dispersed.

In 1853, on the occasion of the visit to America of Archbishop Bedini, Apostolic Nuncio to the Court of Brazil, a great outcry was raised by the Know-Nothing element throughout the country, with whom were joined certain Italian refugees who had emigrated to escape the consequences of their criminal conduct at home. In all the cities visited by the archbishop brutal demonstrations were made against him. At Boston, Baltimore, Wheeling, St. Louis, and Cincinnati, where the Nuncio took part in various solemn religious celebrations, there were scenes of disorder, and in some cases of bloodshed, provoked by the Know-Nothing speakers both lay and clerical, as well as by the anti-Catholic press. At Cincinnati, in December, 1853, a mob of the determined Know-Nothingites, in various sorts, and carrying lighted torches and ropes, marched to the cathedral intending to set it on fire and, as was believed, to hang the Nuncio. There was an encounter with the police, and the mob was dispersed, but not until after shots had been fired and several persons wounded. During 1854 there were numerous assaults upon Catholic churches throughout the country by the Know-Nothing element. St. Mary's church at Newark, N. J., was invaded by a mob made up of Know-Nothings and Orangemen from New York City; the windows were broken, some of the sacred vestments were thrown out of the window. An Irish Catholic, shot and killed. In October of the same year, at Ellsworth, Maine, Father John Bapst, S.J., was dragged from the church, robbed of his watch and money, tarred and feathered, and ridden about the village on a rail.

On 4 July, at Manchester, N. H., St. Anne's church was attacked, its windows broken and furniture destroyed, the priest compelled to seek shelter away from his home, and the houses of Irish Catholics were likewise attacked, the inmates driven out, even the sick being dragged from their beds. At Bath, Me., the mob broke in and threw into the fire the altar and the pulpit, set fire to the building which was reduced to a heap of ashes. At Dorchester, Mass., a keg of gunpowder was placed under the floor of the little Catholic church, it was fired at three o'clock in the morning and resulted in almost the total destruction of the building. Another Catholic church, at Sidney, Ohio, was equally destroyed. At Massillon, Ohio, another church was burned, and an attempt made to burn the Ursuline Convent at Galveston, Texas. At Lawrence and at Chelsea, Mass., the Catholic churches were attacked by the Know-Nothing mob, the windows smashed, and much other damage done. St. Mary's church at Jerusalem, Me., was burned and later its cross was sawed off the spire. A fire was started in the church of Sts. Peter and Paul in Brooklyn, and the building was saved only by the intercession of the police aided by the militia, who drove off the mob. St. Mary's Church at Saugerties, N. Y., was set on fire and nearly destroyed by the fanatics, and an attempt made to burn the church at Palmyra, N. Y. The following year (1855), at Louisville, Ky., the elections were attended with such rioting and bloodshed, the result of Know-nothing agitation, that the day (5 Aug.) acquired the name of "Bloody Monday". The cathedral was invaded by the mob and was saved from destruction only by the prudence of Bishop Spalding, who, in a letter to Bishop Kenrick summing up the results of the day's proceedings, said: "We have just passed through a reign of terror surpassed only by the Philadelphia riots. Nearly one hundred poor Irish churches have been burned and some twenty houses have been consumed in the flames. The City authorities, all Know-nothings, looked calmly on and they are now endeavouring to lay the blame on the Catholics" (see "Life of Archbishop Spalding", by J. L. Spalding, p. 183).

While their ignorant followers were engaged in these lawless proceedings the leaders were exerting them-
selves in various directions to secure legislation hostile to Catholics, especially to Irish immigrants, then most of the anti-Catholic bills were proposed to authorize the visitation and inspection of convents and other religious institutions by state officials, and in Massachusetts, in 1854, such a law, known as the Nunnerys Inspection Bill, was actually passed. Under this a legislative commission was appointed and in a very offensive manner visited several Catholic colleges and convents. In several states, notably in New York, church property bills were proposed which were designed to destroy the title to Catholic church property, which for the most part stood in the name of the bishop, there being then no law for the incorporation of Catholic churches by which such title might be securely held. In Congress efforts were made to restrict the benefits of the Homestead Laws to those who were actual citizens of the United States, and the old-time proposal to extend the period of residence to twenty-one years before a person could be admitted to citizenship was constantly agitated. Of lesser importance were the laws and ordinances passed in Massachusetts disbanding various volunteer militia companies bearing the name of some Irish patriot and composed for the most part of Catholic Irishmen.

In recent years, measures were advocated in the newspaper organs, both secular and religious, of the Knownothing party. The New York Church Property Bill evoked the newspaper controversy between Archbishop Hughes and Senator Brooks which attracted attention all over the country. In addition, many booklets and pamphlets were put in circulation in support of the Knownothing claims. Much of this literature was grossly insulting to Catholics and especially to the Irish members of that Church, and the Catholic press of those days was busily engaged in meeting the charges made against the Church. Speaking of Knownothingism, the bishops (Niccolay and Hoy) in their "Life of Lincoln" (Vol. II, p. 343) said: "Essentially it was a revival of the extinct Native American faction based upon a jealousy of and discrimination against foreign born voters, desiring an extension of their period of naturalization and their exclusion from office; also based upon a certain hostility to the Roman Catholic religion."

Schouler, another non-Catholic historian, says (History of the United States, Vol. V, p. 305): "They [the Knownothings] revived the bitter spirit of intolerance against the Roman Catholic Church such as ten years before had been shown in the riots of Charleston, in South Carolina, by recruiting the handmaid of popular ignorance and bent on chaining Americans to the throne of the Vatican. . . . Catholic churches were assaulted every now and then by some crowd of Bible bigots helped on by the brawny friends of free fight inflamed by street preachers and the revelations of persecuted Jews and 'escaped nuns' etc." Speaking of the partisans of the movement, Bishop J. L. Spalding said (Life of Archbishop Spalding, p. 174) they were "the depraved portion of our native population." He added: "It was not the American people who were seeking to make war on the Church, but merely a party of religious fanatics and unprincipled demagogues who as little represented the American people as did the mobs whom they incited to bloodshed and incendiarism. Their whole conduct was un-American and opposed to all the principles and traditions of our free institutions."

Brownson spoke of their prejudices as "contemptible": "The Native-American Party," said he (Essays and Reviews, p. 428), "is not a party against admitting foreigners to the rights of citizenship, but simply against admitting a certain class of foreigners. It does not oppose Protestant Germans, Protestant Englishmen, Protestant Scotchmen, not even Protestant Irishmen. It is really opposed only to Catholic foreigners. It is a party truly an anti-Catholic party, and is opposed to everything which the Irish from this country are probably from Ireland, and the greater part of these are Catholics."

Spalding, The Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding (New York, 1873); Harsh, Life of the Most Rev. John Hughes (New York, 1860); Complete works of John Klock (New York, 1860); Spalding, Essays and Reviews (New York, 1877); United States Catholic Historical Records and Studies, II. (New York, 1901); V, V, V (New York, 1901); History of Philadelphia (Philadelphia, 1886); Sanderson, Republican Landmarks (Philadelphia, 1856); The Works of the Rev. John England (Baltimore, 1880); American Politics (Chicago, 1864) (non-partisan); O'Donnell, History of the Diocese of Harrisburg (1840); Catechism of the Catholic Church in the United States (New York, 1857); Spalding, Miscellanies (Baltimore, 1894); Flynn, The Catholic Church in America; The Whig American (New York, 1853); New England Magazine, XV (Boston, Sept., 1898); Niccolay and Hay, The Life of Abraham Lincoln (New York, 1890); Schouler, History of the United States (New York, 1901); Filesition of Truth and Boston Pilot; Norton, Starting Points for American Protestants (New York, 1852); Winning, A Defence of the American Policy (New York, 1858); Life of Mother M. Xavier Ward (Boston, 1902).

Peter Condon.

Knox, John, Scotch Protestant leader, b. at Haddington, Scotland, between 1505 and 1515; d. at Edinburgh, 24 November, 1572. All the older biographies assign his birth to 1505, but recent authorities (Lang, Hay Fleming, etc.) give grounds for the later date from contemporary evidence, and from certain facts in his career. Nothing authentic is known of his ancestry or kinsfolk, excepting that his mother was a Sinclair; his father was probably a small farmer. Educated at the Haddington burg school, he is not known to have graduated at any university, though both Glasgow and St. Andrews claim him. There is much uncertainty as to his knowledge of Latin and French, and his acquaintance with the works of some of the Fathers, and he seems to have acquired a smattering of Greek and Hebrew in later life. His mastery of vernacular Scotch is shown in his "History", as well as the fact that he had studied law, for his citations from the Pandects are apt and not infrequent. We know from his own words that he was a priest—"one of Baal's shaven sort", as he expresses it—and practised as a notary by ecclesiastical authority. In a still extant document he is styled "Johannis Knox, sacri altaris minister, sancte Andrei dioecesae auctoritate apostolica notarius". Nothing was foretold of his clerical career; and we can only surmise that he had already begun to doubt, if he had not actually repudiated, the Catholic tenets by 1540, when we first find him engaged as private tutor to certain "bairns", a profession in which he continued until 1547. The names of some of his pupils have come down to us, but we know nothing of the details of his life until 1545, when his own "History of the Reformation", written some eighteen years later and largely autobiographical in character, first brings him before us.

The most prominent exponent of the new doctrines in Scotland at this time was Wishart, who had come home from his travels in Germany a confirmed Protestant, and was expounding his tenets in Haddington and other parts of the Scottish Lowlands. Bitterly hostile to Cardinal Beaton, the great champion of the Catholic cause, Wishart (whose most devoted adherent and disciple at this time was) was deeply involved in the intrigues of the Protestant party with Henry VIII of England for the kidnapping or murder of the cardinal. Wishart was arrested in January, 1546, and burned at St. Andrews on 1 March; and on 29 May Beaton was murdered at the same place in revenge for Wishart's death. The assassination was approved and applauded by Knox, who describes...
the deed with a gleeful and mocking levity strangely unbecoming in a Christian preacher, though his panegyrists speak of it merely as his "vein of humour". Some months later we find him, with his pupils, shut up in the castle of St. Andrews, which Beaton's murderers and their friends held for some months against the English Armada and the Queen Mother. On 31 July 1547, the besiegers being reinforced by a large French fleet, the castle was surrendered, and Knox was imprisoned with some others for nineteen months on board the French galleys and at Rouen. His captivity, however, was not rigorous enough to prevent him from delivering his theological treatise, and preaching to his fellow-prisoners.

In 1549 Knox was free to return home; but he preferred to stay for a time in England, where, under Edward VI, he would feel himself secure, rather than to expose himself to fresh arrest in Scotland. He received a state licence to preach at Berwick, where he remained two years, and was then transferred to Newcastle, and at the same time appointed a royal chaplain. He preached at least twice before the young king, and in October, 1552, was nominated to the bishopric of Rochester, which he refused, declining in to the city of London. His own alleged reason for declining these preferments was that he thought the Anglican Church too favourable to Roman doctrine, and that he could not bring himself to kneel at the communion service. When Edward VI was succeeded in July, 1553, by his Catholic sister Mary, Knox continued his preaching for a time, and, as long as he remained in England, took care not to attack the new sovereign, for whom indeed he published a devout prayer. But early in 1554 he thought it prudent to take refuge in Dieppe, having meanwhile gone through a form of marriage with Maryjane, fifth daughter of Sir. Bowes, a Calvinistic lady of fashion, living in Newcastle, who had taken him as her spiritual adviser. From Dieppe he went to Geneva, partly to consult Calvin and other divines as to the lawfulness and expediency of resisting the rule of Mary Tudor in England and Mary of Guise, just appointed Regent, in Scotland; but he got little satisfaction from his advisers. In September, 1554, he accepted the post of chaplain to the English Protestants at Frankfort; but his Puritanism revolted against the use of King Edward's prayer-book and of the Anglican ceremonial. Schism arose in the congregation: Knox's opponents accused him of comparing the English services of 1554 to those of Geneva, and he was ordered by the authorities to leave Frankfort, and returning to Geneva he ministered for a time to the English congregation there. In August, 1555, however, an urgent summons from his mother-in-law, Mrs. Bowes, caused him (as he says, "maist contrarious to mine own judgement") to set out for Scotland and join his wife at Berwick. The new doctrines had made headway during his absence, and he found himself able to preach both in public and in the country houses of his supporters among the nobles and gentry. At a historic supper, given by his friend Erskine of Dun, it was formally decided that no "believer in the Evangel!" could attend mass; and the external separation of the party from Catholic practice, as well as doctrine, thus became complete. Knox, whose religion had now become entirely of the Old-Testament type, boldly proclaimed that adherents to the new religion were truly descended from the Jews and sacrificed their children to Moloch, and that the extermination of idolaters was the clear duty of Christian princes and magistrates, and, failing them, of all individual "believers". In the letter, however, which he addressed about this time, on the advice of two of his noble supporters, to the queen regent, he assumed an attitude of toleration only for toleration for his co-religionists. The letter contained at the same time violent abuse of Catholics and their beliefs, and threatened the regent with "torment and pain everlasting", if she did not act on his counsel. Mary seems to have treated the effusion with silent contempt, which Knox resented bitterly; but it was no doubt with the conviction that the time was not yet come for the triumph of his cause that he returned to his ministry in Geneva (in the summer of 1556), sending his wife and her mother thither before him. Immediately on his departure he was cited to appear before the judges in Edin- burgh, condemned and outlawed (in absence) as con- tumacious, and publicly burnt in effigy.

Until the end of 1558 Knox continued at his post in Geneva, imbibing from Calvin all those rigid and autocratic ideas of church discipline which he was subsequently to introduce into Scotland — England would have none of them — and which were to be followed by unrest, persecution, and civil war. His two sons, Nathaniel and Eleazar, were born to him at Geneva, and he was joined there by Mrs. Locke and other female admirers from England and Scotland. Glencairn and other friends tried to persuade him in 1557 to come back, on the ground that persecution was diminishing, and he actually got as far as Dieppe on his journey home. Here his courage seems to have evaporated; and after ministering for a time to the Dieppe Protestants he went back to Geneva. During 1558 his pen was constantly busy: he published his letter to the queen regent with comments, and his famous "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women", directed against Mary Tudor, Mary of Guise, Catherine de' Medici, and the youthful Mary Stuart, who had just married the French Dauphin. In other writings he declared that every Christian man (i.e. Protestant) had a right to slaughter every idolater (i.e. Catholic), if he got an opportunity. In a "Brief Exhortation to England" he insisted on the expulsion of all "drags of Popery" and the introduction of the full "Kirk discipline" of Calvin and Geneva; and in his "Treatise on Predestination" he answered the "blasphemous cavillations" of an Anabaptist. The last-named work was not published until 1560.

At length, in the first days of 1559 (Queen Mary of England having been succeeded by her sister Elizabeth a few weeks previously), Knox deemed it safe or opportune to leave Geneva for Scotland. He came to Dieppe, and, finding himself refused a safe-conduct through England, travelled by sea from Dieppe to Leith, arriving on 2 May. He had already heard by letter that the Scottish Protestants were no longer in any danger. The queen regent had indeed been denounced and condemned by proclaimation attacks on priests, disturbance of Catholic services, invasion of churches by lay preachers, and religious tumults in general. But she was already in the grip of deadly illness, was meditating a retirement to France, and, notwithstanding certain advices from that country, had neither the power nor the intention of organizing any movement to suppress the Protestant party in the realm, which was growing daily in power and influence. St. Giles's Church in Edinburgh had been
the scene of a riot, followed by the flight of the Catholic clergy. The Lords of the Congregation were practically in arms against the regent; and Knox, who had never seemed to be the least anxious for lonely martyrdom, showed himself full of fight and courage with a stout body-guard at his back. Repairing to Dundee, he found the Protestants masters and unchallenged. Striking and sudden as the storm was, Knox preached a series of inflammatory sermons which culminated on 25 May, when the mob of that city—angered, according to Knox, by the regent's having broken her pledge of toleration to the preachers (see however as to this, Lang, "Knox and the Reformers"), and under the weight of exasperation against the parish church and several of the monasteries. A private letter from Knox describes these deeds of violence and outrage as done by the "brethren"; but in his "History"—written partly for the followers of Calvin, who rebuked and condemned such works of pillage—he ascribes them to the "rascal multitude," with no reference to their having been inspired by his own harangues or encouragement.

The Protestants, entrenched in Perth (the only fortified town in Scotland), were now in open rebellion against the regent, who advanced with her troops. A truce with the Congregation resulted in a treaty, by which the Protestants were to be allowed complete freedom of worship, and no French troops were to be quartered in the town. Knox meanwhile moved on with his friends to St. Andrews, and, in spite of Archbishop Hamilton's threat that if he dared to preach there he should be saluted with "a dozen of curiously formed glass bottles," Knox proceeded there, with the result that the St. Andrews mob repeated the work of sacking and pillage which had followed his sermons at Perth. The wreck of other great abbeys, such as Socone and Lindores, followed; the Congregation was restored; Stirling was occupied by English forces and burned, the regent meanwhile retreating to Dunbar. Knox accompanied them to the capital, where the same scenes of devastation of churches and monasteries were repeated, and on 7 July he was chosen minister of the Edinburgh Protestants. "We mean no tumult, no alteration of authority," he wrote to one of his friends in Geneva, "but only the reformation of religion, and suppressing of idolatry." Knox wrote these words while actually in full revolt against the "authorities" of the regent of the realm, with the further professed desire to prevent the lawful queen, Mary Stuart, from being reinstated on the throne.

On 22 July the regent and her advisers suddenly determined to march upon Edinburgh, before the Congregation could concentrate its scattered forces, and the Protestants consequently decided to come to terms, one of the articles of the treaty being that the capital was to be free from those of its own religion. The choice of the majority would certainly not have been in favour of the new doctrines, and this and other points of the agreement were openly violated by the Congregation, who left preachers in possession of the churches, and retired to Stirling. Conscious at this juncture of the immense advantage of gaining the support of England, now a Protestant kingdom, they determined to appeal to Elizabeth, and to send Knox on a mission to her powerful minister Cecil. Knox had already written to Cecil with a letter for the queen which wore or less an apology for his hurry-pamphlet, "The Placard or Blast Against the Monstrous Blast." He sailed from Fife to Northumberland, and thence in August to Berwick, the governor of Berwick, and finally brought back to Stirling letters from Cecil more or less favourable to the demands of the Congregation for help, but indefinite in their terms. Further correspondence, however, elicited from Sadler, Elizabeth's agent, a gift of money, which encouraged the Scotch Protestants to believe that the Queen of England was on their side. Knox in a letter to Geneva, dated 2 September, describes his labours as envoy of the Congregation, and adds that ministers are now permanently appointed to eight of the chief towns in Scotland. A few weeks later, the regent being then at Leith, which she had strongly fortified and garrisoned with French troops, the Congregation took a bold step. Encouraged by English sympathy, and to escape imminent moral and religious danger, the powerful Earl of Arran took to their cause, they proceeded to depose—or, as Knox thought it more prudent to describe the measure, to suspend from office—the regent in the name of the young king and queen, whose great seal was counterfeited in order to give more legal validity to the step. Leith was vigorously besieged, but unsuccessfully, and Knox continued to appeal energetically to England for money, troops, and military commanders. The result was that Elizabeth sent a fleet to the Firth of Forth; the Congregation, thus reinforced, renewed the siege of Leith, and the regent took refuge in Edinburgh Castle, where she died on 10 June, 1560. Knox viliified this unfortunate princess to the end, but neither contemporary opinion nor the judgment of history has accepted his verdict, or his outrageous aspersions on her moral character. A month after her death the Treaty of Edinburgh was signed by representatives of England and France for the withdrawal from Scotland of the French and English troops. The Congregation held a solemn thanksgiving service at St. Giles's Church, Knox of course taking the leading part, and profiting by the occasion to prescribe to the pulpit the course which the Protestant leaders were bound to follow to secure the triumph of their cause. That triumph was indeed now imminent. Parliament met on 1 August, Knox preaching daily to crowded audiences "speciall and vehement" harangues on the need of rebuilding the temple, in other words of "restoring the privacy of religious worship by force of law" and restoring the spirit of the assembly—at which, by the way, the sovereign was not represented, and for which she had issued no writ of summons, and which was consequently not really a parliament at all—was never in doubt. The new Confession of Faith, drawn up by Knox and his friend, was inserted word for word; the authority of the pope was abolished; the celebration of Mass was forbidden—"under certain penalties", as one of Knox's biographers mildly remarks, the penalty for the third offence being in fact death. The formality of praying the young king and queen to God for the success of these enterprises was not dispensed with. Knox boldly says that such ratification was unnecessary—a mere "glorious vane ceremony". The Catholic Church of Scotland was extinct, as far as human power could extinguish it, and the Protestant religion officially established. Parliament rose on 25 August, having commissioned Knox and three other ministers to draw up the plan of church government, known as the "First Book of Discipline", which was ready by the date (20 December, 1560) of the first meeting of the newly constituted "General Assembly" of the Kirk, of which Knox was of course the most prominent member. The "Book of Discipline" was founded on the codes of various Protestant bodies, more especially on the Ordinances of Geneva and on the formularies of the German Church founded in London in 1550, both very familiar to Knox and both thoroughly Calvinistic in spirit. The opening words are that all doctrine contrary to the new evangel must be suppressed as "vieded and abhorrable" and that everyone of the "ancient superstition" must be cleared out of the land. The several districts of Scotland were to be under the spiritual charge of officials known as superintendents, until such time as ministers were forthcoming for each parish; and there was provision for a comprehensive scheme of national education, elementary, secondary,
and university. This plan, for which it has been customary to give all the credit to Protestantism, was devised on lines already laid down by the ancient Church; but as a matter of fact it was never carried into effect. Nor were the provisions for the diversion of the wealth of the old Church to national purposes and the disregard of the Protestant ministry resigned to Knox, but they had no idea of giving up their own share of the ecclesiastical plunder. "Converted in matter of doctrine", says Lang, "in conduct they were the most avaricious, bloody, and treacherous of men." Such as they were, they were the pillars of the new Church and the new religion.

In December, 1560, died the young King Francis II of France, "husband to our Jesebel", as he is styled by Knox, who lost his own wife, Marjorie Bowes, about the same time. The whole situation in Scotland was now changed. The Catholic earls sent Bishop John Lesley to invite the widowed queen to land in the Catholic north; but she distrusted them, not without reason, and confided rather in her Protestant half-brother, Lord James Stewart, who promised that she should be allowed the private celebration of Mass in Scotland. Mary landed at Leith on 19 August, 1561, and on Sunday, 24 August, she attended Mass in the chapel at Holyrood. This was followed by protests and riots; Knox publicly declared that "one mass was more fearful to him than 10,000 armed men", and in an interview with the queen inveighed against "that Roman antichrist", denounced the Catholic Church as a harlot, compared himself to Paul and Queen Mary to Nero, and indulged in much other abuse which he reports copiously in his "History" (suppressing most of Mary's replies) and calls "reasoning". The question of the queen's privilege to have her own Catholic services became a burning one: Lord James (now created Earl of Moray), Morton, Marischal, and other leading nobles and bishops supported the queen, while many of the preachers on the other. It was suggested to refer the question to Calvin; but the lords' view was meanwhile accepted, and Mary kept the Feast of All Saints with what Knox calls "mischievous solemnity". He continued his tirades against the queen both privately and from the pulpit, sometimes reducing her to tears by his violence. In the spring of 1562 he held a public controversy on the doctrine of the Mass with Abbot Quintin Kennedy, a Benedictine of Crossrague; and he also had a controversial correspondence with an able Catholic apologist, Ninian Wigt, who defended the Church of Rome.

Some months later Knox found himself in trouble for having summoned the "brethren" from all parts of Scotland to Edinburgh to defend—apparently by violence, if necessary—one Cranstoun, who was to be tried for brawling in the chapel royal. Knox's letter was interpreted by the council as treasonable, but when brought to trial he was judged to have done nothing more than his duty in summoning the brethren in time of danger. Soon after this—in March, 1564—greater surprise seems to have been caused by the second marriage of Knox, his bride being a girl of sixteen, Margaret Lauder, the daughter of Mr. John Lauder, the Laird, and the "people of God". He makes no mention of the fact himself in his "History". The Lords of the Congregation, in the summer of this year, publicly censured Knox for his violence in speech and demeanour against the queen, but Knox retorted with his usual references to Ahab and Jesebel, and maintained that idolaters must "dwell in fear where the seconers mount up against the "people of God". The Lords in vain cited the opinions of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and other Continental Protestants as entirely opposed to Knox's views, and requested him to write and ascertain their judgment on the questions at issue. Knox flatly refused to do so, as he describes himself, "the messenger from Mr. Calvin, and other Kirks", and, as he always produced Scriptural texts to back up his opinions, the Lords were silenced if not convinced. A year later he was again in conflict with the council in consequence of a vehement attack he had made from the pulpit on Mary and the young king-consort, Darnley, in their presence, about a month after their marriage. He was formally suspended for a time from preaching, but he seems to have regarded the Protestant ministry as resigned to the Church (not the council) commanded him to abstain he would obey "so far as the Word of God would permit": in other words, he would obey even the Church only so far as he himself thought fit. This particular sermon, which he printed with a preface, is the only extant specimen of his pulpit eloquence; it is extremely long, and dull to read, whatever may have been its effect when delivered.

The situation in Scotland was now, from the point of view of Knox and his friends, a gloomy one. Moray and the other lords who had protested against Mary's marriage to Darnley were now in exile; all hope of the queen's conversion to Protestantism was at an end; and her Catholic secretary Rizzio was high in her confidence, indeed her chief adviser. Whether Knox was actually privy to the foul murder of Rizzio before the queen's eyes on 9 March, 1566, is a matter of doubt; but his chief associate in the chamber at Holyrood, he was called "just and worthy of all praise" shows that his subsequent approval was beyond any doubt whatever. He thought it well at this juncture to leave Edinburgh for a time, and retired to his friends in Ayra, where he busied himself with the writing of his "History". In December he received a leave from the General Assembly leave of absence from Scotland for six months, so that he was not a witness of the events of the first half of 1567, which included the murder of Darnley, the abduction of Mary by Bothwell, and her marriage to him on 15 May, 1567. The queen was already, after the disaster of Carberry Hill, a prisoner at Lochleven, where she died on 10 July, and at once resumed, in spite of the dissuasion of Throgmorton, the English Ambassador, his pulpit invectives against the sovereign and his denunciations of the national alliance with France. On 29 July, Knox went to Stirling to preach at the coronation of the young king, James VI, when he protested against the rite ofunction as a relic of popery. The appointment of Moray to the regency brought him again into close association with Knox, who, however, after the fall of the queen, his great antagonist, never seems to have regained his former prominence in the country. "I live as a man already bereaved of all affairs", he wrote a little later to Moray's agent in England, "Foolish Scotland", he said on another occasion, "hath disobeyed God by sparing the queen", and he seemed constantly harassed and haunted by a dread of her restoration. Her escape from Lochleven appeared to justify his worst fears, but a fortnight later she was hopelessly defeated at Langside, and was a fugitive to England. Henceforth Knox's declining forces were devoted to his ministerial work, which he seems to have carried on with many intervals of weariness and depression. "With his one foot in the grave", as he describes himself, "the messenger from Mr. Calvin in January, 1569, was a great blow to him. He preached the Regent's funeral sermon in St. Giles's Church and, according to one of his admirers, "moved three thousand persons to shed tears for the loss of such a good and godlike governor". The shock of this event doubtless affected his health, and he was struck by apoplexy in the autumn, and never entirely recovered.

Knox continued to preach in his church in Edinburgh, but with the nobles, Protestant as well as Catholic, many of them his own former friends, in league for the queen's restoration, he was no longer at home or at ease. At the end of 1571 he retired to St. Andrews, where he remained for fifteen months, continuing to write, and preaching
occasionally, notwithstanding his infirmities, with his old fire and vehemence. In August, 1572, Mary's adherents having left Edinburgh, Knox was persuaded to return thither. The news of the massacre of St. Bartholomew had just reached Scotland, and Knox thundered from his pulpit (to which he had almost to be dragged), in the French ambassad- dor's denunciation of "that cruel murderer and false traitor, the King of France". On 9 November he took part in the induction-services of Mr. Lawson as minister of St. Giles's in his place; and fifteen days later, on 24 November, 1572, he died in his house at Edinburgh. Some narrations of his illness and death (by Richard Bannatyne and Thomas Merton) are printed by Laing in his edition of Knox's "Works" (vol. VI). At his burial, two days later, the Regent Morton uttered the well-known words, "Here lieth a man who in his life never feared the face of man." The facts of his life perhaps hardly justify these laudatory words. "Knox," says his learned and sympathetic biographer and editor, Dr. Laing, "cannot be said to have possessed the impetuous and heroic boldness of a Luther.

On more than one occasion he displayed a timidity or shrinking from danger scarcely to have been expected from one who boasted of his courage to suffer death in his country's cause." On his own showing he was courageous enough in his personal encounters with his unfortunate queen; but, according to another of his Protestant biographers, "he was most valiant when he had armed men at his back, and the popular idea of his personal courage, said to have been expressed by the Regent Morton, is entirely erroneous.

As to Knox's religion, it is sufficient to say, without questioning the sincerity of his convictions, that the reaction from the Catholicism of his youth seems to have landed him outside the pale of Christians united with the spirit of his Old Testament and with the gloomy austerity of the ancient prophets, he displays neither in his voluminous writings nor in the record of his public acts the slightest recognition of the teachings of the Gospel, or of the gentile, mild, and forgiving character of the Christian dispensation. Genial, amiable, and kind-hearted he may have been in private life, though it is difficult to see from what premises his panegyrists deduce his possession of those qualities; but the ferocity and unrestrained violence of his public utterances stand out, even in the rude and lawless age in which he lived, as surpassing almost everything recorded of his contemporaries, even those who were closely in sympathy with his political and ecclesiastical views. It is to his credit that he died, as he had lived, a poor man, and that he never enriched himself with the spoils of the Church which he had abandoned—"a trait in which he contrasts singularly with the Protestant laity who were his friends and adherents. Of his ability and his power of influencing those among whom he lived and laboured, there is no room to doubt. His gifts as a speaker and a preacher we have to take on the evidence of his contemporaries, whose testimony there is no need to question; of his command of his native tongue we have abundant proof in his writings, in particular in his "History", by far the most remarkable specimen of the vernacular Scots of the sixteenth century which has come down to us. The best edition of it is in his collected "Works", edited by David Laing in six volumes.

The "Life of Knox" (of whom no contemporary portrait exists) is the woodcut of him in Beza's "Icones", published at Geneva in 1680, and often since reproduced. Lord Torphichen possesses a portrait of him painted a century later, probably from Beza's. The so-called Somerville portrait, maintained by Carlyle to be the only authentic likeness of Knox, apparently represents a divine of the seventeenth century. Knox was survived by his widow, who married again, and by two sons of his first marriage (who both died childless), and three daughters of his second. Descendants of his youngest daughter still exist.


Knut. See CANUTE.

Kober, FRANZ QUHRN von, German canonist and pedagogue, b. of simple countryfolk on 6 March, 1821, at Warthhausen, Biberach, Württemberg; d. at Tübingen, 25 January, 1897. He first attended the Latin school in the neighbouring town of Biberach, and subsequently, in accordance with the desire expressed for Catholic theologians of the Diocese of Rottenburg, entered the preparatory seminary at Ebingen on the Danube. From 1840 to 1844 he pursued his studies in the seminary (Wilhelmsstift) of Tübingen, and on 4 September, 1846, was ordained priest in Rottenburg. After only a few years' cure of souls at Ulm, Franz Kober became a tutor in the seminary at Tübingen, and lectured on philology and the Pauline Epistles. From 1848 he taught canon law, to counteract the evil influence of the Josephinist professor Warmkönig, of the faculty of law, on which Catholic theological students even in Würt- temberg had depended for their training in canon law according to a custom existing in Austria since Joseph II. On 28 January, 1851, Kober became professor extraordinary in the faculty of Catholic theology, teaching pedagogy, didactics, and the Pauline Epistles. He was appointed professor ordinary of canon law and pedagogy on 8 September, 1857, having been professor extraordinary since 19 April, 1853. As such he wrote with good historico-legal method some excellent works: "Der Kirchenbann" (1857); "Die Suspension der Kirchendiener" (1862); "Die Deposition und Degradation" (1867), which belongs to ecclesiastical criminal subjects ("Das Interdit"); "Die körperliche Züchtigung als kirchliches Straf- mittel gegen Kleriker und Mönche"; "Die Gefängnis- strafe gegen Kleriker und Mönche"; "Die Geldstrafen im Kirchenrecht") in a series of essays, the majority being lengthy treatises, published in the "Archiv für das katholische Kirchenrecht" and especially in the "Theologische Quartalschrift" of Tübingen. In the last-named periodical appeared other essays on canon law ("Der Ursprung und die rechtliche Stellung der Generalkiriken"; "Der Einfluss der Kirche und ihrer Gesetzgebung auf Gesundheit, Humanität und Zivilisation"; "Medizin und Kirchenrecht"; "Die Residenz- pflicht der Kirchendiener bei feindlichen Verfolgungen und ansteckenden Krankheiten") and many book-reviews. Kober was also a frequent contribu- tor to the first and second edition of the Freiburg "Kirchenlexikon".

Sigmuller, Theol. Quartalschr., LXX (1897), 506 sqq.

JOHANNES BAPTIST SIGMULLER.

Koberger (KOBBERGER, COBBERGER) ANTHONY, German printer, publisher, and bookseller, b. about 1445; d. at Nuremberg, 3 October, 1513. He was descended from an old family of skilful artisans who had belonged to the town council as early as 1350, and was a goldsmith before he became a printer. After the completion of the first dated volume (Alcinous, 24 Nov., 1472), Koberger developed an activity reaching out in all directions, and about 200 works appeared before the year 1500.
mostly in folio form and some in bindings. In 1480 it had already outstripped Schöffer of Mainz, and, until practically the end of the fifteenth century, was the most important print-shop in the world. From a chance statement we learn that Koberger used twenty-four presses a day for his printing and employed over a hundred workmen. His publications demonstrate the generous plan on which his work was done. The paper will still outlast centuries. The type is almost exclusively strong and carefully set, and, in spite of its narrowness, gives a good, readable round script, which was later very widely used. An Antiqua type, resembling the Venetian, first appeared in 1492. The graceful Bible type of 1483, which is a facsimile of the writing used in fifteenth-century documents, deserves special mention. The beauty of the letterpress is greatly enhanced by tasteful arrangement of the sentences, often a difficult matter (for example in "Canon Law," 1482–83; "Boethius," 1486). Koberger took no less pains to have his print clear and black, using a newly-cast fount, as well as to have the books lucidly subdivided and decorated by the rubricator and illuminator. The employment of woodcuts in the Bible of 1483, which was embellished with 109 vignettes, marks a new epoch in the history of printing, and opened the way for such works as Schedel's "Weltchronik" (1493), a book which, with its 1,300 woodcuts from the drawings of the famous Wohlgemut and Pleydenwurff, was almost too profusely decorated. This latter, the greatest illustrated work of the century, greatly influenced the development of the woodcut, and especially the work of Dürer, who was drawn towards Koberger, not only as the godfather of the latter, but also by bonds of personal friendship. Towards the end of the century, the business of the printing-house greatly diminished, the last proof appearing in 1504. Publication by contract occupied a prominent place in Koberger's enterprises; this, together with the war, pestilence, and other disturbances, was doubtless the chief cause of the dissolution of the printing-house. For some years previously he had had printing done for him at Basle and Strasbourg, and from 1510 to 1525 the presses of Nuremberg, Hagenau, Strasbourg, Basle, Paris and Lyons were busily engaged with his work.

After Anthony Koberger's death (1513), his cousin Henry, who was nearly ten years his junior, took charge of the business as trustee for Anthony's children. He, too, was a business man of great ability and under Anthony's supervision had from the year 1480 displayed great business activity, especially in foreign countries. He took charge of the business under the more or less official partnership until the children were of age. The eldest son Anthony, a wayward youth, died in 1532; the second, Hans the younger, was actively engaged in the business of the house until his death in 1552. The publishing-house and the retail book trade were gradually given up before 1532, but the hereditary occupation of goldsmith and jeweller, which Anthony had never abandoned, still for a long period engaged the attentions of the family. Thus, when the family became extinct in 1629, it still possessed extensive landed property. As a printer, Koberger had built up a wholesale trade such as was seldom commanded before the discovery of the steam press. Yet he is more renowned as the founder of a wholesale publishing-house, handling all the scientific literature of his time, and dominating the book trade of the world. On the same large scale this "king of booksellers" had developed into a valuable asset of his house an honourable hawking trade. The scholarly Latin literature of the Middle Ages and its tendencies formed the main basis of his world-wide commerce. Of great merit are his special editions of the classical literature of the Fathers of the Church. His editions of the Bible are also very important; before the year 1500 fifteen different editions appeared, while the whole output of the house exceeded thirty folio editions, including some in binding. The Kobergers participated for a short time in the sale of the Reformation literature, and, at some periods were rivals of Elzevir in 1532. But further than this they took no part in the popular agitation. They remained true to the old principles of their world-renowned house, and devoted themselves to the sale of scientific works.


Kobler, Andreas, historian, b. at Mühldorf in Bavaria, 22 June, 1516; d. at Klagenfurt, 15 November, 1592. He made his preliminary studies at Salzburg, then studied theology at Vienna, and in 1536 was called to Mühldorf. Möller and Göres appear to have awakened in the young theologian his preference for the study of history. After his ordination (1540) he was a curate on the mission for four years, after which he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Graz. Later he was sent to America on account of the disturbances of 1548 in his own country, and was attached to the New York mission for five years, being occupied as professor of mathematics. Returning to Europe, he taught at Pressburg until 1587, when he was sent to Innsbruck as professor of church history. In 1585 he held this chair for four years, and was one of the college of Innsbruck from 1586 to 1666. In 1587 he became once more professor of mathematics at Innsbruck, and for two years rector of the college there. Returning then to Innsbruck, he dedicated nine years to literary work, was appointed superior (1587) of the seminary at Klagenfurt, where he was still vigorous and active in the pulpit when death overtook him in his seventy-sixth year. His literary works are for the most part on historical subjects. Besides contributions to periodicals, Kobler published: "Floriane Bauge, ein Jesuit in Paraguay" (1780); "Die Aufhebung der Gesellschaft Jesu" (1781); "Zwischen den Klostern im IX. Jahrhundert" (1786); "Die Äbtissin und Bekenner der Gesellschaft Jesu in England während der Jahre 1550–1681" (1816); "De Maistre, fünf Briefe über den öffentlichen Unterricht in Russland" (from the French); "Die Studien über die Klosterte des Mittelalters" (from the English, 1867); "Katholische Leben und Mittelalter" (from Remmig Digby's "More Catholic," 1887–9).

Kochanowski, Jan, b. at Szwyna, 1530; d. at Lublin, 22 August, 1554. He was inscribed in 1544 as a student in Crakow University, but left on account of the plague. We find him studying at Padua in 1552 under the best instructors. There he wrote many of his Latin elegies in imitation of Tibullus and Propertius; these early works have little value. Thence he travelled to France, where he lived till his mother's death in 1557, writing more and better Latin poetry. On his return to Poland he received his inheritance of Czarnola, and was for some time a courtier, first of some great lords, then at the Royal Court. During this period he produced, together with his best Latin elegies, his Polish poem Frazski (trilles). The former are the first really inspired poetry that appeared in Poland. The Frazski, comical and witty but sometimes coarse, are very instructive, showing what social life was at that time. His "Zgoda" (Concord) and the "Satsy" are political in subject. Very last of all his works is the "Lachy," the "Dzwoblasz" (The Standard) and "Wrożki" (Omens—in prose). This latter was a pamphlet warning Poles against future dangers and dissensions. He began his metrical translation of the Psalms, wrote more lyrics in Polish and Latin, and the poems "Dzwoblasz" and
"Sobotka" (description of certain old Polish customs). He is believed to have married about 1574. After Henry of Valois's flight from Poland, Kochanowski wrote two short Latin poems: the ode, "In Conventu Stesicensi", and "Gallo Crocicthi", the latter being a reply to an attack on Poland by the French poet, Philip Desportes. King Balthasar was Kochanowski's patron, and of his verses hitherto are full of political allusions to his reign. His "Odprawopaloów" (The Envoy Dismissed), dramatic in form, urged the nobles to fight Russia. In 1579 his "Psalter" was complete, written in a most beautiful style, and in 1580 appeared his last and best work, "Elegiae" (in Latin and Polish), a memorial to a little daughter's death. Kochanowski is the first true poet of his nation in point of time, and first, too, in excellence until Mickiewicz. The representative of the Polish chivalry and civilisation of his period, for his fellow-countrymen he is truly great, having created poetry and made it a gift to his nation—which none but the greatest could do. In religion, though influenced by Protestantism and the humanistic trend, he never ceased to be a Catholic, even when attacking the morals of priests and popes. He distinctly declares that disunion in religion would imperil the country, and bade innovators "go to Trent".

Gacki, O Rodzinni Jan Kochanowski (of the family of J. K.) (Warsaw, 1889); Pietrakowski, Zygmunt K. (life of J. K.) (Warsaw, 1889); Czyzak, Zygmunt J. K. (sketch of J. K.). (Warsaw, 1890); Fleckiewicz, Life of J. K. in complete edition of works. IV (Warsaw, 1897); Löwenfeld, Lateinische Dichtungen des J. K. (Warsaw, 1897); Tarnowski, Jan Kochanowski (Kracow, 1885).

S. Tarnowski.

Kochowski, Vespasian, b. at Sandomir ?, 1633; d. at Krakow, 1699. He received his education at the Jesuit College, Sandomir, served in the army, and then spent the rest of his life on his estate. Sobieski valued him so much that he took him on his famous expedition to Vienna, the literary result of which was the "Commentarius de bello adversus Turcas". This and his other Latin chronicles are the best of his time and country. The collection of his short poems, entitled "Busy Idleness", contains many beautiful verses, and many more are curiously the subjects raised from religion to very coarse topics. They are also love poems, pleasing in their simplicity and nobility of sentiment; there are beautiful lamentations on his brother's death; and there are satirical poems full of wit and humour. Of all later poets he reminds us most of Kochanowski, though the romantic element is bluer but far more than Kochanowski a writer of what may be called historical poetry, and his pieces in this style are perhaps the finest he has written. From the death of Wladislaw IV till the election of Sobieski, every event of note is celebrated by a separate poem. What strikes one most is the religiously patriotic tone of his poetry. His "Psalmody", a work of great and genial originality, is distinguished by this tone. Some psalms are merely pious; but in others his prayer falls into a description of the war with the Turks, and mingle there with such outbursts of gratitude to God for victory, that one comes to feel personally more attached to this poet than to others more famous than he was. The Biblical form adapted to secular things constitutes a point of resemblance between Kochowski's poetry and the creations of several modern poets (Mickiewicz's "Book of the Pilgrimage", Słowiński's "Anhelo", etc.). Vienna saved by the Arta of God. Passages and even a certain epic talent, but is marred by want of artistic finish, proportion, and harmony. The same may be said of "The Stone of Testimony", a poem written to defend Lubomirski. His purely religious poems, "Christ Suffering" and the "Virgin's Garden" are distinctly inferior.

Order, Life of Vesp. J. Kochowski Kochowski in Transactions of the Krakoé Acad. of Sciences, phil. dept., XXXII. Tarnowski, V. Kochowski na swoich 80-letniu (Kochowski from a contemporary standpoint) (Lemberg, 1898). S. Tarnowski.

Kögler, Ignaz (called Lai in Chinese), with Father Adam Schall (q. v.) the most important of the five German Jesuits who visited China in 1579. He worked in the old Chinese missions, b. 11 May, 1680, at Landeberg in Bavaria; d. at Peking, 30 March, 1746. He entered the Society of Jesus on 4 Oct., 1696, and taught mathematics and Hebrew from 1712 to 1714 in the University of Ingolstadt (cf. Mederer, "Annalen", Ingolstadt, 1730 and "Annales Jansenitennullen Prunti"; Eichstädt, 1808), 178-54, and went to China in 1715. On account of his extraordinary and wide learning he enjoyed great consideration at the imperial court, and held the office of president of the mathematical astronomical tribunal for thirty years. He was a mandarin of the second class, and was even from 1731 a member of the supreme court of equity (Li-pu), a position which had never before been held by a foreigner ("Welt-Bott", No. 676). In accepting these positions, however, he refused the stipends attached to them. Father August von Hallestein, his biographer, considers him "one of the most cultivated minds that ever came into these countries" (ibid., No. 587). Kögler carried on a brisk scientific correspondence with a number of European scholars, such as Eusebius Amort and T. S. Bayer, the Orientalist, sending to the last-named many valuable contributions, for his "Museum Sinicum" (St. Petersburg, 1730) (cf. "Miscellanea Berolinensia", 1737, pp. 185, 189 sqq.; Gottfr. von Murr, "Journal", VII, 240 sqq.; IX, 81 sq.; "Neues Journal", I, 147 sqq.; II, 303, sqq.). He was twice visitor of the mission, and provincial of the Chinese and Japanese province, and, during the persecution which began under Emperor Yung-ching, had the main support of the suffering mission, which, through his influence at court, he so cleverly and bravely protected, and which so deeply deplored his death.

Manuscript letters in the Vienna State Archives, Genial, Anpflanzungen, No. 419, IV; Correspondence with Amort and numerous other letters, part in the Munich State Library, M.S., lat. t. i. p. 1, no. 1306-1407; part in Reiche-Archiv, Jesuitica in genera, pp. 278-81. Printed letters in Welt-Bott, no. 157, 162, 190, 198, 199, 202, 225, 255, 573, 578, 566; Lipowsky, Geschichte der Jesuiten in China, Halle, 1860, 293; Born, Teil 4; von Laimbrechovi, Reise-Beschreibung (Vienna, 1740), 47. The catalogue of Köglers astronomical, mathematical, and historical writings, in the Bibl. des fernwäss. de la c. de J. For bibliographical information consult PLATZER, Lebensbild ander u. anderlex. (London, 1892); 272; von Richtmeier, China, I (Berlin, 1877), 888; Welt-Bott, pesisst.; Huonder, Deutsche Jesuitenmissionen des 17. u. 18. Jh. (Freiburg im Br., 1899).

A. Huonder.

Kohlmann, Anthony, educator and missionary, b. July 1773, at Kalenberg, Alsatia, in the Rhine District; 11 April, 1836. He is to be ranked among the lights of the restored Society of Jesus, and among its most distinguished members in America, where he spent nearly a quarter of a century of his laborious life. At an early age he was compelled by the troubles of the French Revolution to go to live in Switzerland, where at the college of Fribourg he completed his theological studies and was ordained priest. Soon after, in 1796, he joined the Congregation of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart. With them he laboured zealously for two years in Austria and Italy as a military chaplain. From Italy he was sent to Dillingen in Bavaria, as director of an academy, then to Berlin, and next to Amsterdam to direct a college established by the Fathers of the Faith of Jesus, with whom the Congregation of the Sacred Heart had united (11 April, 1799). The Society of Jesus in Russia having been recognised (1801) by Pope Pius VII, Father Kohlmann entered the novitiate at Dumbéu on 21 June, 1803. A year later, in response to a call for additional
workers in the United States, he was sent to Georgetown, D. C., where he was made assistant to the master of novices, and went on missionary tours to the several German congregations in Pennsylvania and Maryland.

Affairs in the Church in New York having gone badly, Bishop Carroll picked him out as the person best qualified to introduce the needed reforms and to restore order, and with his fellow Jesuits, Benedict Fenwick and four scholastics, James Wallace, Michael White, James Redmond, and Adam Marshall, he took charge there in October, 1808. It was a time of great commercial depression in the city owing to the results of the Embargo Act of 22 December, 1807. The Catholic population, he states in a letter written on 8 October, consisted of "Irish, French, and as many Germans; in all according to the common estimation of 14,000 souls". Such progress was made under his direction that the cornerstone of a new church, old St. Patrick's Cathedral, the second church erected in New York City, was laid on 8 June, 1809. He started a classical school called the New York Literary Institution, which he carried on successfully for several years in what was then a suburban village but is now the site of St. Patrick's Cathedral on Fifth Avenue. In April, 1812, he also started a school for girls in the same neighbourhood, in which he who came at his instance for that purpose from their convent at Cork, Ireland.

About the same time Father Kohlmann became the central figure in a lawsuit that excited national interest. He had been instrumental in having stolen goods restored to a man, who demanded in court that the priest should reveal from whom he had received them. Father Kohlmann refused to do this, on the ground that his information had been received under the seal of confession. The case was taken before the Court of General Sessions, where after a trial the decision rendered by De Witt Clinton was given in his favour. Its principle was later embodied in the statute law passed on 10 December, 1828, which enacted that "No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatsoever shall be allowed to disclose any confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practices of his denomination." To a report of the case when published Father Kohlmann added a presentation of the teachings of the Church on the Sacrament of Penance. (Sampson, "The Catholic Question in America", appendix, New York, 1813.) The book excited a long and vigorous controversy with a number of Protestant ministers, and was followed in 1821 by an attack on "Irunitarianism, Theologically and Philosophically considered", in which Father Kohlmann replied to the assertions of Dr. Jared Sparks and other Unitarian leaders.

New York had no bishop as yet, the first appointed having died in Italy before he reached his see, and Father Kohlmann, in governed as administrator for several years. In 1815, expecting the early arrival of the second bishop (Connolly), he returned to the college of his order at Georgetown, D. C., as master of novices, and in 1817 became superior. In 1824, when Leo XII restored the Gregorian University to the direction of the Society of Jesus, Father Kohlmann was summoned to Rome to take the chair of theology, which he filled for five years. One of his pupils then was the subsequent Pope Leo XIII; another became later Archbishop of Dublin, and the first Irish cardinal (Paul Cullen). Leo XII and Gregory XVI both held Father Kohlmann in high esteem; he was attached as consultant to the staffs of the College of Cardinals and several of the important Congregations, including that of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, of Bishops and Regulars, and of the Inquisition. The last part of his life he spent as a confessor in the church of the Gesù, where during the Lenten season of 1836 he overtaxed himself and brought on an attack of pneumonia that ended his career.

Koller, Marian Wolfgang, scientist and educator, b. Feistritz in Carniola, Austria, 31 October, 1816; d. of cholera at Vienna, 19 October, 1866. His work was very thorough; after studying the rudiments at Feistritz he went to Laibach, where he spent nine years (1802-11) in classical, philosophical, and scientific studies, and completed his school life by a course in higher mathematics at Vienna. From 1814 to 1816 he acted as private tutor in a family at Steinbach, and whilst here he was so attracted by the life and work of the Benedictines of Kremsmünster that he finally entered their novitiate on 5 October, 1816, taking the name Marian in place of his baptismal name of Wolfgang. He was ordained priest on 18 August, 1821, and after three years of very successful work in the parish of Sippachau he was recalled to Kremsmünster to teach natural history and physics. In 1830 he was relieved of the professorship of natural history and appointed director of the astronomical observatory, and during the next seventeen years by dint of indefatigable labours he increased the high repute of the observatory throughout Austria. He continued also to teach physics until 1839, when he was given general charge of the student body. His administrative abilities were so great as to attract the attention of the authorities at Vienna, where he was called in 1847. From this time on he was employed in high offices either in the University of Vienna or in the Department of Education, which was at that time undergoing a process of reconstruction. All matters pertaining to the Realeschulen, and to the polytechnic, nautical, and astronomical institutions, were placed under his immediate care, and, as a mark of appreciation for his share in the thorough organization of the Realeschulen, the emperor bestowed on him the Cross of the Order of Leopold on 27 May, 1859. In 1848 he was elected member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, and always took a very active part in its proceedings. He was also an active writer, and contributed to various scientific periodicals and articles on astronomy, physics and meteorology. To his high intellectual abilities was added the charm of a genial character, and he thus won not only the esteem but also the affection of those with whom he came into personal contact. His principal work is the "Beleuchtung der periodischen Zeitschriften", published in the "Wiener Denkschrift" (1850).

Kolping, Adolph. See GESELENVEREINE.

Konsirsk, Stanislaus, b. in 1700; d. in 1773. This great reformer of Polish schools was a Friar who, during his long period of ordination and on his visit to Rome after his ordination, had the first idea of his life's mission. Returning to Poland through France and Germany (whose systems of education he studied on his way), and at first unsuccessful in his plans, he set to compiling the "Volumina Legum", the first volume appearing in 1732. About the same time of Audun he had the courage to form a society of which he wrote much in favour of Stanislaus Leszcynski, and, subsequently travelling in the Netherlands and in France, stayed for a time at the exiled king's court. Here he became convinced that reform in politics must be preceded by reform in education, and, returning home in 1738, he attempted to
change the subject-matter and methods of education in Poland. Good school-books and teachers were necessary; the latter he tried to train himself as “Magister novitiatorium” at Rzeszow college, and then sent them either to be tutors of young noblemen or to study abroad at his own cost. In 1740 he opened a collegium nobilium at Warsaw, a most important experiment. In the first year he had but one pupil, in the second there were more than ten, while in the third he had not room for all who came. The teachers he had instructed now began to help him in writing school-books, etc. In 1754 he built a college and obtained from Benedict XIV a change in the rule of the order; henceforth every Piarist was to be a teacher. The new schools as Piarist confreres and education was no longer a privilege of the nobility alone. The classics, history and geography, natural science, philosophy, Roman and Polish law, were taught, together with the modern languages; and for the first time the Polish tongue was taught as a separate subject. Mental, rather than purely mnemonic, work was encouraged; moral education was insisted upon; emulation succeeded to fear; self-sacrifice, honour, patriotism were inculcated as the duties of a citizen. Konarski had found theathers in use; he maintained the custom, thinking these performances might become very instructive, had Racine and Corneille performed, and himself wrote a tragedy, “Epaminondas.” He also introduced discussions and debating societies for advanced pupils. Together with this, he laboured to reform style in Poland, wrote “De emendandis eloquentiae vitis,” and attacked the bad taste prevalent at the time. The Piarist schools succeeded so well that all others were obliged to follow his reform. Konarski was subjected to envious attacks, and the Papal nuncio, Durini, suspected his orthodoxy. He cleared himself by his book, “De religione honestorum hominum.”

Holland effected a complete reformation in education, he returned to politics. From 1760 to 1763 appeared his “Effective Way of Deliberating,” which proved that the right of one to member of veto to the proceedings of the whole Diet had never been a law, but an evil custom, and showed from the procedure of other parliaments that a working majority was sufficient. The impression made was very great; it became, and even the most bigoted partisans of the veto were convinced. Thenceforward this custom was doomed—in itself a great step forward and a preliminary to the constitution of the Third of May. But the book contains many other valuable ideas. His style is clear, and his book may safely be recommended to the Piarist publications (v. g. the “Diplomaticus Codex”), and the “Volumina Legum” is his work. A great admirer of French civilization and taste—which, however, were not without danger in their tendencies, as was subsequently seen—he was also the last Latin writer in Poland; his “Pastoral Lyric” (1767) are perfect in style and diction. King Stanislaus Augustus caused a medal to be struck in his honour, with the well-merited inscription, “Sapere aude.”

König, Joseph, theologian and exequte, b. at Hau sen on the Aach, District of Hegau, Grand Duchy of Baden, 7 Sept., 1819; d. at Freiburg im Breisgau, 22 June, 1900. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1845. In 1847 König was privadozent, in 1854 extraordinarius, and from 1857 to 1894 ordinary, professor of Church history, and holder of the benefices, 11 chaplaincies attached to foundations. At the close of 1909 the secular priests numbered 998, the regular 83. The diocese contains 1,476,942 Catholics, 50,037 non-Catholic Christians, and 11,372 Jews. The great majority of the inhabitants are Czechs. Of the 32 vicariates and includes 1 curatus canonicalis (cure of souls combined with jurisdiction), 2 provostships, 3 archdeaneries, 38 deaneries, 404 parishes served by secular priests, 16 parishes served by members of orders, 10 other benefices, 11 chaplaincies attached to foundations. At the population is partly German and partly Czech. Three-quarters of the parishes are wholly Czech, over one-fifth wholly German, the rest include both German and Czech Catholics. The great majority of the secular clergy are Czechs, who minister even in parishes that are partly at the University of Freiburg of German priests. This latter phenomenon is to be explained partly by the fact that the Liberal tendencies long prevalent in Bohemia have influenced German students against the priestly life; partly by the material conditions of the German parishes, which, being mainly in the mountains and far afield, repel German candidates for the priesthood. The cathedral chapter
KÖNIGHOFEN

consists of the dean, who is also vicar-general, 7 regular and 6 honorary canons; the episcopal consistory is composed of the dean and 9 councillors. The ecclesiastical education of students is divided into a preparatory seminar for priests, founded in 1802 and connected with the theological institute (1909): 6 professors, 3 tutors, 75 students; a seminary for boys, opened in 1860, with at present 142 pupils; the gymnasia of the Benedictine Abbey of Braunau. The religious community is efficiently enlivened by legends, jokes, and interesting details concerning the lives of the people. He possessed a good knowledge and availed himself very freely of the sources of medieval prose and poetry (particularly Ekehard, but also Eusebius, Bede, Hermannus Contractus, Martinus Polonus, and others). On the other hand, those sections which treat of contemporary history are very valuable. In politics he was an adherent of King Louis the Bavarian, and to his imperialistic sentiments united a very strongly marked feeling for German nationality. Greatly influenced by the Alsatian chronicler Closener, he has himself been in many cases the authority for later historians. The chapter of the "Chronik" contains an alphabetical list of historical events with dates, forms thus a kind of compendium of history, and was often copied separately. The "Chronik" was printed as early as 1474, and later at Strasbourg in 1698. The best edition is that of Hegel in "Chronica del duci Ludovico Il Giovane", VIII-LX (Leipzig, 1870-1). In addition we possess a Latin-German glossary by Könighofen, which may, however, in its essential details be traced to Closener.

KÖNINGS, Anthony, b. at Helmond, Diocese of Bois-le-Duc, Holland, 24 August, 1821; d. 30 June, 1884. After a brilliant course in humanities he entered the diocesan seminary, where he soon became conspicuous for his great piety and his eager thirst for learning. Feeling a call to the monastic life, after mature deliberation he entered in 1842 the Redemptorist novitiate at St. Tong, Belgium, but was permitted to make a religious profession on 6 November, 1845. His superiors, recognizing the ability of the young cleric, sent him at once to the house of higher studies to afford him time to prepare for the work of teaching. He was ordained priest at Wittern, on 21 December, 1864. After being engaged for some time as teacher in the philosophical college of the congregation, he was called to fill the chair of moral theology and later that of canon law. Whilst holding these posts, he was appointed prefect of students, a most important office in the congregation.

For some time he was also master of novices, and accompanied the provincial, Very Rev. F. Dechamps (afterwards Archbishop of Mechin and cardinal), to Rome. Later he visited Rome a second time to take part in the general chapter of 1855, which united all the different provinces and decided upon Rome as the residence of the superior general of the order. Father Könings was appointed rector of Amsterdam, and in 1860 of the house of studies at Wittern, which post he continued to occupy until 1865, when he was appointed Provincial of Holland. In 1870 he was sent to the province of Baltimore to take part in the work of teaching moral theology and canon law to the young clerics of the Redemptorist house of studies at Ilchester, Maryland. Therefortheon all his zeal and learning, his piety and his experience were employed in training the clerics of the congregation for the arduous work of the ministry. As professor of moral theology he soon felt the need of a suitable text-
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doubtedly an excellent preparation for his principal work, the "Chronik". The latter he began in 1832; he twice revised it, and brought it down to the year 1415. One of the first universal historical works in German prose, it includes also a territorial history of Alsace and a local history of Strasbourg. Recognizing the needs of his time, he wrote it for the Klugen, that is, cultivated, laymen, "who read such things as eagerly as learned Parsons". His narrative is therefore popular, and frequently enlivened by legends, jokes, and interesting details concerning the lives of the people. He possessed a good knowledge and availed himself very freely of the sources of medieval prose and poetry (particularly Ekehard, but also Eusebius, Bede, Hermannus Contractus, Martinus Polonus, and others). On the other hand, those sections which treat of contemporary history are very valuable. In politics he was an adherent of King Louis the Bavarian, and to his imperialistic sentiments united a very strongly marked feeling for German nationality. Greatly influenced by the Alsatian chronicler Closener, he has himself been in many cases the authority for later historians. The chapter of the "Chronik" contains an alphabetical list of historical events with dates, forms thus a kind of compendium of history, and was often copied separately. The "Chronik" was printed as early as 1474, and later at Strasbourg in 1698. The best edition is that of Hegel in "Chronica del duci Ludovico Il Giovane", VIII-LX (Leipzig, 1870-1). In addition we possess a Latin-German glossary by Könighofen, which may, however, in its essential details be traced to Closener.

KÖNINGS, Anthony, b. at Helmond, Diocese of Bois-le-Duc, Holland, 24 August, 1821; d. 30 June, 1884. After a brilliant course in humanities he entered the diocesan seminary, where he soon became conspicuous for his great piety and his eager thirst for learning. Feeling a call to the monastic life, after mature deliberation he entered in 1842 the Redemptorist novitiate at St. Tong, Belgium, but was permitted to make a religious profession on 6 November, 1845. His superiors, recognizing the ability of the young cleric, sent him at once to the house of higher studies to afford him time to prepare for the work of teaching. He was ordained priest at Wittern, on 21 December, 1864. After being engaged for some time as teacher in the philosophical college of the congregation, he was called to fill the chair of moral theology and later that of canon law. Whilst holding these posts, he was appointed prefect of students, a most important office in the congregation.

For some time he was also master of novices, and accompanied the provincial, Very Rev. F. Dechamps (afterwards Archbishop of Mechin and cardinal), to Rome. Later he visited Rome a second time to take part in the general chapter of 1855, which united all the different provinces and decided upon Rome as the residence of the superior general of the order. Father Könings was appointed rector of Amsterdam, and in 1860 of the house of studies at Wittern, which post he continued to occupy until 1865, when he was appointed Provincial of Holland. In 1870 he was sent to the province of Baltimore to take part in the work of teaching moral theology and canon law to the young clerics of the Redemptorist house of studies at Ilchester, Maryland. Therefortheon all his zeal and learning, his piety and his experience were employed in training the clerics of the congregation for the arduous work of the ministry. As professor of moral theology he soon felt the need of a suitable text-
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book, less voluminous than the old manuals and one more adapted to the peculiar conditions existing in North America. Father Konings thereupon undertook the task of writing such a handbook, which he subsequently published in two volumes (Boston, 1874).

This work, based on the moral theology of Gury, was greeted with hearty approval on its appearance, not only on account of the simplicity of its language, but also by reason of the succinct form into which he cast the teach of the great theologian St. Alphonsus. He was the first to give a methodical exposition of the views of the saint regarding the vexed question of equiprobalism. His thorough acquaintance with American law also greatly enhanced the value of his work. A devoted son of the great doctor who inherited the honors of the Catholic professorship of St. Alphonsus. Later, at the suggestion of the Rt. Rev. T. Mullen, Bishop of Erie, Pa., he published a commentary on episcopal faculties (intended for the United States), a work which was afterwards revised and enlarged by Rev. Jos. Putzer, C.S.S.R. It has since gone through four more editions. In addition to these works he published several smaller books on various theological subjects. He rendered a great service to the cause of the parochial schools by his little work, "De Absolutio Parentibus, etc.", a pamphlet which despite strong opposition, was taken by the Holy Office as an Instruction to the bishops of the United States. As a matter of fact the very words of Konings were employed in the Instruction sent by the Holy Father and incorporated in the "Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis tertii", p. 279 sq.

Since that time this Instruction has been the norm in the difficult matter of providing parents that send their children to the public schools. The gist of his pamphlet is found in his "Moral Theology".

Konings, on account of his great learning, was consulted by prelates and priests from the entire United States; he was invited to examine candidates for degrees in theology and canon law, and was summoned as an expert in trials touching ecclesiastical questions, especially in the celebrated trial resulting from the financial difficulties of the late Archbishop of Cincinnati, J. B. Purcell. His last charge was that of prefect of the second novitiate, in which the Redemptorist priests immediately after ordination and immediately after their Apostolic work of the missions. Whilst occupying this post, he fell seriously ill, but nothing could daunt his zeal. From his sick-bed he continued his work of instructing and directing with his experience the young priests committed to his care. In the midst of these labors he passed away to his eternal reward. To honor him in the Freeman's Journal (12 June, 1884), "those who studied him found him a profound theologian, and a true exponent of St. Alphonsus. The beacon light of theologians in America has gone down, but his fame will linger in the heart of the Catholic Church in America. As a scholar he was known to the world!"

Konings's writings include the following: "Theologia Moralia", two editions by Konings and two by H. Kuper, C.S.S.R.; "Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas" (New York, 1884); "De Absolutione Parentibus qui prolem sollicitis publicis et promissis instituent tradunt negligentia necesse" (Boston, 1874); "Bulla Jubilaei 1875 cum notis practicis" (New York, 1875); "SS. D. N. Leonis XIII Litterarum Apostolicae quibus extraordinarium Jubilium indicatur in usum cleri noti praecellenter illustratum" (2 editions, New York, 1881); "General Confession Made Easy" (New York, 1870), and in German "Die Generalbeichte erleichtert"; "Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis seu Tractatus de Actibus Humanitatis" (New York, 1882); "Verordnungen fur die Missionen und apostolische Werkzaehler", he left in manuscript: "Introductio in Just Canonicum"; "Compendium Juris Canonicum"; "De Jure Regularium"; and a complete set of cases in moral theology (Latin) for American students, some of which were published under the initial "R" in "The Pastor", edited by the late W. J. Wiseman.


JOHN A. HANDLEY.

Konrad, surnamed der Pfaffen (the priest), a German epic poet of the twelfth century, author of the "Rolandlied", a version of the popular "Chanson de Roland". We know almost nothing concerning his life. In the epilogue of the Heidelburg MS., the poet calls himself "der Pfaffe Kuonrat", and informs us that he translated from the French, first into Latin, and then into German, without adding or omitting. We learn further that the French original was procured for him by Duke Henry, at whose request he composed his lay. Formerly it was supposed that this Duke was Henry the Lion (1156-80), and that the poem was composed between 1173 and 1177. But it is now agreed that the duke in question was Henry the Lion, who ruled Bavaria from 1125 to 1191. The date of the composition of the poem would then be about 1131, in which year Henry is known to have made a journey to Paris, where he presumably procured the French manuscript. The lay itself was written in Bavaria, probably at Ratisbon, as is indicated also by the frequent mention of Bavarian names and places. That a translation was first made into Latin is shown by the numerous Latin endings that remain. The German version, however, is not slavishly literal. A comparison with the French original, as we know it, reveals quite a number of additions, especially in the way of passages in praise of the Norman princes and people. The crusading spirit, already noticeable in the "Chanson", is still more marked in the German poem. The fervour of the crusader has displaced the patriotic enthusiasm of the French epic, and gives the "Rolandlied" a pronounced religious tone. Charlemagne is depicted as the model Christian prince, while Roland is the personification of the Christian knight's life in battle for his Faith. Yet the influence of the folk-epic is quite evident, as, for instance, in the passage where the emperor's dazzling eyes are described. Altogether, there are 9044 verses. The form is the short rhymed couplet, the rhyme being often mere alliteration. Roland has been accredited with the authorship of the "Kaiserschronik", but not on convincing evidence.

We possess no complete MS. of the poem. The oldest and most important MS., that of Strasburg, was burned during the siege of 1870. A portion of it had appeared in print in Schiltemberg's "Thesaurus" as early as 1727. Next in importance is the Heidelberg MS., adorned with thirty-nine miniatures. The other existing MSS. are mere fragments. Editions by Grimm, "Rualandies lie" (Gottingen, 1838), based on the Heidelberg MS.; and by Bartsch (Leipzig, 1874), based on the Strasbourg MS. Selections by Piper, "Die Spielmannschiickung", II, 14-91 (in Kirsch- nem, "Deutsche National Litteratur", II).

Goldner, "Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad" (Munich, 1887); Barchfellner, "Studien zur Rolandsliedliteratur" (Halle, 1898); cf. introduction in Piper's edition.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Konrad of Lichtenau, a medieval German chronicler, d. at Urspring, in the year 1240. He descended from a noble Swabian family, and resided for some time at the imperial court. Having become a monk, probably during a temporary residence in Rome at the court of Pope Innocent III, he entered
the Premonstratensian Order, and in 1226 became Abbot of the monastery of Ursberg in Bavaria, where he died. For a long time he was reputed the sole author of the so-called "Chronicon Urspergensis," which narrates the history of the world from King Ninus to a.p. 1229. But critical investigation has shown that the work consists of several parts, of different authors, and that the first parts, down to 1215, were written, in part at least, by Ekkehard of Aura (q. v.); a continuation, from 1216 to 1223, was added by Abbot Burchard (d. 1230), Konrad's predecessor as Abbot of Ursberg. Then Konrad continued the work to 1229 and made the final reduction. Later continuators like Karl von der Eiden broke the chronicle down to 1507. The first edition was brought out by Miller and Foeni-seca at Augsburg (1515) from a copy in the possession of Konrad Peutinger. Another edition, by Melanthon and Mylius appeared at Basel (1569). It was this edition that erroneously attributed the sole authorship of the chronicle to Konrad. The last edition was printed at Strasbourg in 1609. The "Chronicon" was edited by Abel and Weiland in the "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script."(XXIII, 333–83; separate edition at Hanover, 1674.

Christian Uspergenskronik und ihr Verfasser (Berlin, 1809). The critical discussions and bibliographies were by Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 11th ed., Berlin, 1917. Bibliographie Historica Medii Aevi (Berlin, 1896), 12 v.v. Burchardus (p. 178), Chronicon Urspergensis (p. 190), and Ekkehardus (p. 400).

Konrad of Würzburg. For Konrad of Würzburg, see Conrad of Würzburg.

Konrad of Magdeburg, scholar and writer, probably at Mainz, near Schweinfurt, Bavaria, 2 February, 1306; d. at Ratisbon, 11 April, 1374. The dates of birth and death are not absolutely certain, and Konrad himself calls his native place Magenberg. He studied at Erfurt and Paris; at the latter he received the degree of Master of Arts, and he taught philosophy and theology there for several years. In 1337 he was made head of St. Stephen's school at Vienna. From 1342 he lived at Ratisbon, where he was first a parish priest, proving himself to be an able preacher. Later he became a cathedral canon, and member of the town council. In 1357 he made a journey to the Curia at Avignon. Konrad is one of the most prolific German writers of the fourteenth century. His best-known and most widely read work is his "Buch der Natur," which is still of importance for the history of culture. According to his own statement he was engaged in writing it in 1349. A Latin poem, "De naturis rerum," of the Dominican Thomas of Cantimpré (d. 1263), served as model. Konrad, however, prepared his book with considerable freedom; much of the original was omitted, his own observations were introduced, corrections were made, and so on. His work gives a survey of all that was known of natural history at that time and is, besides, the first natural history in the German language. It was widely read up to the sixteenth century, and numerous manuscript copies of it are still extant, eighteen being at Munich. The first printed edition with a date is of 1475, and was issued at Augsburg from the shop of Hans Bämler, under the title of "Puch der Natur." It was printed at least six times before 1500; some of the editions were illustrated, all are now rare incunabula. A new edition of the original text was issued by Franz Pfeiffer (Stuttgart, 1861), with an introduction; an edition in modern German verse by H. Schulz (Greifswald, 1917).

Konrad's numerous other writings there should be mentioned: the "Sphära," a small compendium in German of astronomy and physics, prepared from the Latin work of Joannes à Sacrobosco; the poem "Planetae ecclesiae in Germania" (1337); a hymn in praise of the Virgin; and a work on "Speculum fidei-cum-humanae" (1348); "De errores us Begehardorum et Beguinarum"; "De translatione imperii" (1355); the large work "OEconomica," written between 1353 and 1363; "Tractatus contra mendicantes ad Papam Urbanum V"; several biographies of saints, and some historical treatises, chiefly dealing with the local history of Ratisbon. In his writings Konrad shows himself to be a strong adherent of the pope, an opponent of the philosophy of Ockham, and a stern critic of the moral failings of his age and of the clergy.

Priffler and Schulz, see above; Braunmiller in Kirchenlexikon, s. v. Konrad von Magdenburg; Allgemeiner Deutscher Biographen, XVI (Leipzig, 1893); Creuzer, Mythologie, gives the date of death incorrectly as 1398; Lohne, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, I (3rd ed., 1861), p. 223.

Joseph Rompel.

Konrad of Würzburg, a Middle High German poet, b. about 1230; d. at Basel, 1257. He was the most important of the romancers that followed the three great masters of the Middle High German epic. His special model was Gottfried von Straßburg. He lived mostly at Strasbourg and Basel. Like Gottfried he was of burgher rank and hence is called Meister, not Hir. His poems consist of metrical romances, minnesongs, and Sprüche or sayings. Among the latter, the "Sprüche des Georg, der Ritter," is a version of the well-known Lobhenglin legend. It is preserved only in fragmentary form and is based indirectly on the French poem "Chevalier au Cygne." In this version the Grail does not figure at all. Other short narrative poems are "Otto mit dem Bein" (Otto with the Beadle), "Hans von Kempten," and the famous "Herzmähre" (Tale of a Heart), a fantastic tale of knightly loyalty and love. A more ambitious effort is "Engelhart," one of those extravagant stories of friendship so popular in the Middle Ages. For his lengthy epic Konrad used French source materials. The poem, written probably about 1277, is based on the French romance of Denis Pyramus, and has for its subject the adventures of the knight Partonopeus and the fairy Meliur. The bulky epic on the Trojan War is based on Benoît de St-More's "Roman de Troie," with additions from Ovid. It contains upwards of 50,000 verses, but not all of them are Konrad's own. The costumes and atmosphere are not at all antique but thoroughly medieval. Besides these epic, Konrad wrote also poems of allegorical or legendary content. "Der Werte Löhn" ("The World's Reward") is an allegory showing the vanity of worldly things. Noticeable sources Konrad composed poems in the legends of St. Alexius, Pantaleon, and Pope Sylvester, also stories of asceticism and martyrdom. His most important religious poem is in honour of the Blessed Virgin, entitled "Die goldene Schmiede" (The Golden Forge). The poet conceives himself as a smith who is working a precious ornament for the Virgin out of epithets and attributes. Another allegorical poem in strophes, called "Klage der Kunst" (Complaint of Art), laments the decay of taste for poetry. There is little originality in Konrad's work; its chief merit lies in its technical perfection. The "Pforten," together with songs and sayings, was edited by Barsch (Vienne, 1874); the "Schwanritter" by Roth (Frankfort, 1861); "Kaiser Otto" and "Herzemmäre" by Lambel in his "Erzählungen und Schwanä" (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1883); "Der Werte Löhn" (Frankfort, 1849); "Engelhart" by Haupts (Leipzig, 1844); "Die goldene Schmiede" by W. Grimm (Berlin, 1940); "Silvester" by the same (Göttingen, 1841); the "Trophicohnen Krieg" by A. von Keller (Stuttgart, 1858).

Arthur F. J. Rem.

Konigs, Ferdinand, German missionary of the eighteenth century, b. 2 December, 1703, at Warras-
din, Croatia; d. 10 September, 1758. Having joined the Society of Jesus in 1719, Konisg—a name that is variously written Konschak and (in its Spanish form) Consag or Gonzaga—went to Mexico in 1739, and after 1744 worked principally in the mission of Lower California, of which he was one of the most prominent apostles. He was at first superior of San Ignacio, and later visitor of the whole mission. "It is hardly possible," writes Clavigero (op. cit. in pra.) "to tell all that this zealous man accomplished notwithstanding his delicate health. A thorough explorer and the learning of the cartographer were combined with the missionary's ardent zeal for souls, and his exploration of the maritime country as far as the Rio Colorado entitles him to an important place in the history of the exploration of America.

For Konisg's literature of the following:
1. in manuscript: "Historia de las Misiones de la California," used by Venegas in his "Noticia de la California" (Madrid, 1757);
2. "Carta del P. F. C. de la Comp. de Jesús, Visitador de la Mis. de Cal.", with forty-three pages of explanation (1 Oct., 1748);
3. "Descripción de la Tierra de los Californiales," by the P. F. Gonzaga de la Comp. de Jesús, 1746", in the British Museum; various documents in Simancas, Spain, Est. leg., 5040, 118, 5042, 19;
4. (2) printed: a letter of date 1731 in the "N. Welt-Bott," no. 743;
5. "Diario de California" (Paris, 1767); account of the expedition to the Pacific under de la Conception, i.e. de las Californias.

Koran, the sacred book of the Mohammedans, by whom it is regarded as the revelation of God. Supplemented by the so-called Hadith, or traditions, it is the foundation of Islam and the final authority in dogma and belief, in jurisprudence, worship, ethics, and in social, family, and individual conduct. The name Koran, or better Qur'an, from the Arabic stem Qār'a, "to read," "to recite," means the "Reading," the "Revelation," i.e. the "Book of God." It is also called—to select a few of many titles—"Alkīthā (The Book)," "Furqān" ("liberation," "delivery," of the revelation), "Kitāb-ul-lāh" (Book of God), "Al-tanzfīl" (The Revelation). It consists of one hundred and fourteen suras or chapters, some being almost as long as the Book of Genesis, others consisting of but two or three sentences. It is smaller than the New Testament, and in its present form has no chronological order or logical sequence.

Contents and Analysis. The Koran contains dogmas, legends, history, fiction, religion and superstition. In social, family and political, threats, liturgy, fanciful descriptions of heaven, hell, the judgment day, resurrection, etc.—a combination of fact and fancy often devoid of force and originality. The most creditable portions are those in which Jewish and Christian influences are clearly discernible. The following analysis is based on Sir William Muir's chronological arrangement (op. cit. infra).

First Period. Suras 103, 91, 106, 101, 95, 102, 104, 82, 92, 105, rhapsodies, which may have been composed before Mohammed conceived the idea of a Divine mission, or of a revelation direct from Heaven. These suras are called Nahy, or the Prophet's traditions.

Sura 96, the command to "recite in the name of the Lord"; sura 111, the unity and eternity of the Deity; sura 74, the command to preach, the denunciation of one of the chiefs of Mecca who scoffed at the resurrection, unbelievers threatened with hell; sura 111, Abu Lahab (the Prophet's uncle) and his wife are cursed.

Third Period (from the beginning of Mohammed's public ministry to the death of the Holy Family): Suras 87, 97, 88, 80, 81, 84, 89, 84, 85, 83, 78, 77, 76, 75, 70, 109, 107, 55, 56, descriptions of the resurrection, paradise, and hell, with references to the growing opposition of the Korish tribe.

Fourth Period (from the sixth to the tenth year of Mohammed's ministry).—Suras 67, 33, 32, 39, 73, 79, 84, 93, 113, 34, 31, 69, 68, 41, 71, 99, 28, 4, 47, 59, 44, 57, 30, 56, 64, 48, 62, 60, 51, narratives from the Jewish Scriptures and from rabbinical and Arab legends; the temporary compromise with idolatry is connected with sura 53.

Fifth Period (from the tenth year of Mohammed's ministry to the Flight from Mecca).—Suras 46, 72, 35, 95, 39, 18, 27, 42, 40, 38, 20, 43, 12, 11, 10, 31, 16, 43, 28, 22, 21, 17, 16, 13, 29, 7, 113, 114. The suras of this period contain some narratives from the Gospel, enjoin the rites of pilgrimage, refute the cavillings of the Korish, and contain vivid descriptions of the resurrection, judgment, heaven, and hell, with proofs of God's unity, power, and providence. Gradually the suras become longer, some of them filling many pages. In the later suras of the fifth period Medina passages are often interpolated.

Last Period (suras revealed at Medina.).—Sura 98: on good and bad Jews and Christians. Sura 2: the blessed is the one who is exalted from the red heifer described in verse 67 as having been sacrificed by the Israelites at the direction of Moses. It is a collection of passages on various subjects, delivered during the first two or three years after the Flight. The greater portion relates to the Jews, who are sometimes exulted and sometimes reproved. Biblical and related traditions are interpolated. This sura contains the order to change the Qibla (or direction at prayer), a denunciation of the disaffected citizens of Medina, injunctions to fight, permission to bear arms in the sacred months, and much matter of a legislative character promulgated on first reaching Medina, with passages of a later date interpolated. Sura 3 belongs partly to the time immediately after the Battle of Bedr, which is described. Another part relates to the defeat of Ohod and the second expedition to Bedr. The Jews are referred to in terms of hostility. The interview with the Christian deputation from Naerath and the reference to the "Book of God" (see supra) is of a later date. Passages pertaining to the farewell pilgrimage are introduced with other (probably) earlier texts on the rites of pilgrimage. Sura 8 contains instructions on the divisions of the spoil taken at Bedr. Some parts are in the old Meccan style and the Korish are frequently referred to; it was written after the Meccans were enjoined, and idolaters of Mecca threatened. In sura 62 the Jews are denounced for their ignorance; the Friday service is to take precedence of secular engagements. In sura 5 the Jews are reviled; the doctrines of the Christians are controverted; it contains also civil ordinances and miscellaneous restrictions. Sura 59, on the siege and expulsion of the Banu Nadhir. Sura 4 is entitled "Women", from the large portion devoted to the treatment of wives and the relation of the sexes. There are also ordinances on the law of inheritance and general precepts, social and political. Idolatrous Meccans are to be shunned, and there are animadversions against the Jews. Sura 58: on divorce and other social questions. The "disaffected" are blamed for taking the part of the Jews. Sura 65: on divorce and kindred subjects, with some religious observations. Sura 63: menaces against the civil disorders; in its language it looks back to the expedition against the Banu Mustaliq. Sura 24: vindication of Ayisha, with the law of evidence for conjugal unfaithfulness, and miscellaneous precepts. Sura 33, composed of portions covering the year A. H. 5. The marriage of the Prophet with Zeinab, wife of
his adopted son, is sanctioned. There are various passages on the conjugal relations of Mohammed, the siege of Medina, and the fall of the Banu Qureizah. Sura 57: injunctions to fight and contribute towards the expenses of war. The disaffected are warned. Chastity, and not begetting of children, is enjoined. The Prophet legislates on war; speedy victory is promised.—The remaining suras belong exclusively to the last five years of the Prophet's life. Sura 48 refers to the truce of Hodeibah, and the prospect of victory and spoil to be obtained elsewhere. Sura 60: on the treatment of the wounded, and the right of a free Meccan to expel idolaters of Mecca to be shunned. Sura 66: on the affair of Mohammed and the Coptic maid. Sura 49: blaming the profession of the Bedouin Arabs as insincere, chiding the deputation which called out rudely at Mohammed's door, and exhorting believers against distrust and uncharitableness among themselves.

Sura 9 treats of the campaign to Tabuk (A. H. 9). It opens with the "release" promulgated at the pilgrimage of the same year and declares the antagonism of Islam to all other religions. All but Mohammedans are excluded from Mecca and the rites of pilgrimage. Idolaters are threatened with slaughter and slavery. Wars are defined as holy wars.
prophecy is no longer merely trying to convert his hearers by examples, promises, and warnings; he addresses them as their prince in general, praising them or blaming them for their conduct, and giving them laws as occasion required." "The Qur'an" in "Sacred Books of the East," 1, Oxford, 1880, pp. LXI, LXII, and LXIII.

Sources.—The sources of the Koran may be reduced to six:—(1) The Old Testament (canonical and apocryphal) and the hybrid Judaism of the late rabbinical period. During Mohammed's time the Jews were numerous in many parts of Arabia, especially around Medina. Familiarity with them is undoubtedly responsible for many Old Testament stories alluded to in the Koran. Later Judaism and Rabbinism are equally well represented (Geiger, "Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?", Wiesbaden, 1833; "Judaism and Islam", Madras, 1898). (2) The New Testament (canonical and apocryphal) and various heretical doctrines. On his journeys between Syria, Hijaz, and Yemen, Mohammed had every opportunity to come in close touch with Yemenite, Abyssinian, Ghasanid, and Syrian Christian heresies; his influence of orthodox Christianity upon the Koran has been slight, apocryphal and heretical Christian elements, on the other hand, are one of the original sources of Koranic faith. (See Muir, op. cit. infra, 66-239; Tisdall, "The Original Sources of the Qur'an", London, 1912, pp. 5-51.) (3) Sabianism, a combination of Judaism, Manicheism, and old disfigured Babylonian heathenism. (4) Zoroastrianism.—On account of Persia's political influence in the north-eastern part of Arabia, it is natural to find Zoroastrian elements in the Koran. (5) Hanifism, the adherents of which, called Hanifs, must have been considerable in number and influence, as it is known from contemporary Arabian sources that twelve of Mohammed's followers were members of this sect. (6) Native ancient and contemporary Arabian heathen beliefs and practices.—Weillhausen has collected in his "Reise des arabischen Heidentums" (Berlin, 1897) all that is known of pre-Islamic Arabian heathen belief, traditions, customs, and superstitions, many of which are either alluded to or accepted and incorporated in the Koran. From the works of Ash-Shahristsâni, who wrote a history of the various sects and creeds, and Abu-Fida, the well-known and generally admitted author of the twelfth century, it is clear that the religious beliefs and practices of the Arabs of Mohammed's day form one of the most heathen sources of Islam. From this heathen source Islam derived the practices of polygamy and slavery, which Mohammed sanctioned by adopting them.

Authorship, Compilation.—It is generally admitted that the Koran is substantially the work of Mohammed. According to the traditionalists, it contains the pure revelation of God, its primary Author. Mohammed, the Koran tells us, was inspired by the Holy Ghost, Whom he held to be an angel, and Whom he called, in later chapters, written at Medina, by the name of Gabriel.

Opinions vary as to Mohammed's ability to read and write. Some traditionalists maintain that prior to the Divine revelation he could neither read nor write, but that immediately afterwards he could both do; others believe that even before the revelation he could read and write; while others, again, deny that he could ever do so. Thus it is uncertain whether any of the suras were written down by the Prophet himself or all delivered by him orally and afterwards written down by others from memory.

The Koran is written in Arabic, in hymned prose, the style differing considerably in the various suras, according to the various periods of the Prophet's life. The language is universally acknowledged to be the most perfect form of Arabic speech, and soon became the standard by which other Arab literary compositions had to be judged, grammarians, lexicographers, and rhetoricians presuming that the Koran, being the word of God, could not be wrong or imperfect.

Mohammed's hearers began by trusting their memories to retain the words of the revelation they had received from him. Later, those who could write traced them in ancient characters on palm leaves, tanned hides, or dry bones. After the Prophet's death all these fragments were collected. Zaid ibn Harithah, Mohammed's uncle, was charged by Abu-Bekr, the first caliph, to collect all that could be discovered of the sacred text in one volume. The chapters were then arranged according to their length and without regard to historical sequence. The revision made twenty years later affected details of language and grammar rather than the arrangement of the text.

The best and most accessible edition of the Koran is that of Flügel, "Al-Quran: Corani textus Arabicus" (Leipzig, 1834 and since). Maracci's famous Latin translation of the Koran, with a refutation and commentary, is still unique and useful: "Alcorani textus Latinus" (1898). The standard English versions are those of Sale (London, 1734), with a still useful introductory essay; Rodwell (London, 1861), arranged in chronological order; and Palmer in "Sacred Books of the East" (Oxford, 1880).

Arabic commentary by Tabari, Zamakhshari, and Rabi'awi. The classical work on the Koran is Nöldeke, "Geschichte des Korans" (Göttingen, 1900); revised ed. Schuclly (2 vols., Leipzig, 1909). See also Schinz, "Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed" (3 vols., Berlin, 1885); Muir, "The Canon, its Composition and Teaching" (London, 1903); Bell, "Historical Development of the Quran" (London, 1885); Wehrart, "A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran" (4 vols., London, 1882); Soundes, "Dictionary of Islam" (London, 1885); s. v. Quran; Tisdall, "The Original Sources of the Qur'ân" (London, 1905); Hirschfeld, "New Researches into the Composition and Rectification of the Quran" (London, 1882); Füredi, "Islamismus" (Milan, 1902); Lives of Mohammed by Muir (London, 1858; 1897); Speiser (Alhabbad, 1861); Weil (Stuttgart, 1894); Kirmse (Leipzig, 1894); Grimm (Münster, 1892-95); Beel (Copenhagen, 1903); Marquoloth (London, 1906). History of Arabic literature by Broekelmann, Hant, Psehl, and Nicholson. See bibliography to MOHAMMED AND MOHAMMEDANISM.

Gabriel Oubssani.

Koros. See Chriion, Diocese of.

Kosiuzsko, Tadeusz, Polish patriot and soldier, b. near Novogrudok, Lithuania, Poland, 12 February, 1752; d. at Solothurn, Switzerland, 18 October, 1817. He was educated at the military schools of Warsaw and Versailles, and attained the rank of captain in the Polish army. When the American Revolution broke out he embarked for the scene of conflict and, joining Washington's army, received a commission as officer of engineers, 18 October, 1776. He was awarded the distinction through the war, was made a brigadier general, and was voted the thanks of Congress. He then returned to Poland and lived for several years in retirement. In 1789, when the Polish army was reorganized, he was appointed a major-general and fought gallantly under Prince Poniatowski against
the Russians. At the second partition of Poland, he resigned his commission and went to live in Leipzig. He had helped to overthrive Poland in 1794, and was wounded and captured by the Russians at the battle of Maciejowice, 10 October. Imprisoned for two years, he was liberated by Emperor Paul on parole and with many marks of esteem. Thereafter his life was passed in retirement. In 1797 he revisited the United States, receiving everywhere great honour and distinction. Congress voted him a grant of land and an addition to his pension. On his return to Europe he took up his residence near Paris, spending his time in agricultural pursuits. In 1806 Napoleon wished him to join in the invasion of Poland, but he felt bound by his parole to Russia and refused. He went to live in Switzerland in 1810, making his home at Solothurn, where he was killed by a fall from a horse. His remains, by direction of the Emperor Alexander, were taken to Krakow, where they were interred with solemn pomp in the cathedral near the tombs of Poniatowski and Sobieski. A mound 150 feet high, made of earth taken from every battle-field in Poland, was piled up in his honour in the outskirts of the city.

HABBAR, Hist. of U. S. (New York, Morrill), Am. Cath. Hist. Researches (Philadelphia, April, 1910); MRR, Pologne et Russie, legs de Kosciusko (Paris, 1851); IDEM, La Pologne morte (1853); FAULKENSTEIN, Kosciusko (Leip- zig, 1857); RYCHLICKI, Kosciuszko and the Partition of Poland (Krzysz, 1872); CHODEOK, Histoire militaire, politique et privée de Kosciusko (Paris, 1837).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

**Kostka, Stanislaus.** See Stan- islaus KOSTKA, SAINT.

**Kotor.** See Cattaro, Diocese of.

**Koudelka, Joseph M.** See Cleveland, Diocese of.

**Kovno.** See Samogitia, Diao- cese of.

**Kozman, Stanislaus and John, two brothers who took part in the Polish insurrection of 1831, and subsequently fled the country. Stanislaus settled in England, studied its institutions, and strove to make both nations, England and Poland, acquainted with each other. John lived in France, was zealous in spreading Catholic ideas, and, when his wife died, became a priest. Later he went to Poland, and, as editor of the "Posen Review", became the centre of religious and political life there; Stanislaus aided him in his work and, returning to Posen, became president of the Society of Friends of Science. Both were ardent Catholics, able reformers of the 'courageous politicians, and had minds of exceptional power.**

**Stanislaus Kozman (b. in 1811; d. in 1883), when a student at Warsaw, had written some poetry, very romantic but only of average worth; later, in England, he set to translating Shakespeare, a work which occupied him for thirty years, and was not complete at his death; he also translated poems by Byron, Moore, Southey, Shelley, Cowper, and especially the splendid passages of Campbell on Poland. He was secretary to the Society of Friends of Poland, and in close relation, with Lord Dudley Stuart. His translations of Shakes- peare, though naturally not perfect, are as good as those in any other language. Of his original work, the poem best known in his days was entitled "The Master of the World", addressed to Mickiewicz, Krasinski, and Zaleski in 1846. He especially worshipped and loved Krasinski, two of whose books ("The Day of To-Day" and "The Last One") first appeared as Kosmian's, as the author would not otherwise have published them. Their success put Kosmian in a very false and painful position, which he described in one of his poems—an imitation of Dante's "Inferno". Several other poems of a patriotic and religious tendency are also de- serving of notice. His prose consists mainly of essays, many of which were published together in two volumes under the title "England and Poland". The first volume contains important information for those interested on that period of Polish history: what the English thought, what they knew of Poland, how far their friendly feeling went, why the ma- jority of the nation were indifferent to what might befall Poland, and so on. The second was interesting for the contemporary Polish reader, giving particulars of English institutions, life, politics, and literature—in the last respect nothing so good has since appeared in Polish. But it is impossible to notice separately all the multitudinous short articles that he wrote; those which deal with literary criticism are especially admiring. He was a practical man of action, a born journalist—unpop- popular indeed, because, being a fervent Catholic, he condemned conspiracies and did not confound revolution with a war for independence. He lived and died comparatively unknown.**

**John Kozioman, b. in 1812; d. in 1877. As priest and author he wrote for upwards of twenty years in the "Posen Review"; his articles have been collected in three volumes (1881). Specially noteworthy are the programme of the Review, "That she may fulfil her mission, Poland must be united to the Church".; "The Two Idolatries", i.e., Revolutionism and Pan-slavism; and his last essay, "Duties are permanent." He also wrote a great deal about Italian affairs and in favour of the Temporal Power. We may also mention a controversial essay with the Jesuit F. Gagarin (a Russian convert), who maintained that the great obstacle to the conversion of the Russians is that they identify Catholicism and Poland. His literary articles are not very numerous. He and his brother were the first secular workers for the revival of Catholic convictions in Poland.**

S. TARNOWSKI.

**Kraft, Adam, sculptor, b. about 1440 at Nurem- berg; d. Jan., 1509, at Schwabach. He carved at**
KRAIN
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Count of Ortenburg, in the fourteenth century, and they preserve their Tyrolean German dialect. Over 99 per cent of the people are Catholics; the remainder includes 319 Schismatics, 509 Protestants, 24 Armenians, 96 Jews, 7 infidels. Ninety-six per cent of the soil is produeed arable, and are now in the Germanic Museum at Nuremberg.

The memorial bronze monument over the Schreyer and Landauer tomb in the church of St. Sebaldis was completed in 1492; three of its reliefs, highly coloured, represent Christ carrying the Cross, His burial and resurrection, with a landscape for background. Later, Kraft undertook, at the request of Imhoff, the famous marble tabernacle in the church of St. Laurence. Decorated with tall slender turrets, a canopy, carved figures, and finely chiseled ornaments, it tapers gradually to its summit. Four bases and three carved figures, of the master and his two apprentices, support the pedestal, above which rises the rectangular tabernacle, richly decorated with delicate reliefs and with the figures of angels and saints in the numerous surrounding niches. It is universally admired as one of the most beautiful creations of Gothic art, and legend records that it was softened at the touch of Kraft's chisel, to harden again in the new form which was imparted to it. Among the master's works are also three handsome sepulchral monuments with statues of the Madonna, besides an "Entombment of Christ," and "Christ on Mount Olivet." Kraft's technical skill is amazing. His scenes from the Passion show deep feeling, his portrayal of saints is noble and full of expression, though his executioners are vulgar and repulsive. Gothic idealism seems to merge into a native realism; not Italian beauty of form, but native German strength, simplicity and pity give value to his art.

WAGNER, Nurnberger Bildhauerwerke des Mittelalters. I. Nurnbergische Künstler nach ihrem Leben und ihren Werken. pt. XI: particularly DARY, Adam Kraft (Berlin, 1897); IDERM. Peter Vicher and Adam Kraft (Bielefeld, 1905).

G. GIESSMANN.

KRAIN or CARNIOLA (SLOV. KRAJSKO), a duchy and crownland in the Austrian Empire, bounded on the north by Karinthia, on the north-east by Styria, on the south-east and south by Croatia, and on the west by Trieste, Gorizza, and Istria; area, 3857 sq. miles; population, 510,000. The Julian and Karavanke Alpes traverse the country. The highest mountain peaks are Triglav, 9090 feet, Stenanzik, 5900 feet; Terglav, 9300 feet, on the top of which Jacob Aljaz, priest and tourist, erected a cylindrical hut of steel, capable of accommodating 4 or 5 persons. The principal rivers are the Save, the Trischa Bistrica, the Korka, the Kamniska Bistrica, the Sora, the Lubiana, the Mura, the Krka, and the Kupa which serves as a boundary with Croatia. The principal lakes are Crno, spreading into seven lakes, of which the highest is over 6000 feet above sea-level; Bohinjko; Blesko, in the middle of which on an island is built a church to the Blessed Virgin, and nine others. The water supply is abundant. Mining is not of much importance, except in the Pb and Zn mining industry. Agriculture here is chiefly raising crops and fruit, and cattle breeding. The main products are rye, wheat, barley, hemp, tobacco, hops, etc. The chief industries are weaving, there are many sawmills and foundries. The capital is Ljubljana, the city of the Emperor箫troj, the seat of the prince-bishop, population, 40,000; it was known to the Romans as Tavenna, and was destroyed by Obri in the sixth century. Ljubljana is divided into Upper Ljubljana or Gorenska, Lower Ljubljana or Donjensko, and Central Ljubljana and Novo Mesto. The chief larger cities and towns are: Kamnik, Kranj, Triglav, Vrhnika, Vipava, Idria (which has the richest quicksilver mine in the world), Tuzjak, Ribnica, Metlika, Novo Mesto, Vače (famous for its prehistoric graves). The mean average temperature in spring is 59°; in summer, 77°; in autumn, 55°; and in winter, 26°. Politically the country is divided into 11 districts consisting of 359 communes; the state capital is the residence of the imperial governor. The districts are: Kamnik, Kranj, Radovljica, the neighbourhood of Ljubljana, Logatec, Postojna, Litija, Krko, Novo Mesto, Ormož, and Goteschi or Kočevje. There are 31 judicial circuits. The duchy was constituted by rescript of 20 December, 1860, and by imperial patent of 26 February, 1861, modified by legislation of 21 December, 1867, granting power to the home parliament to enact all laws not reserved to the imperial diet, at which it is represented by eleven delegates, of whom two are elected by the landowners, three by the cities, towns, commercial and industrial boards, five by the village communes, and one by a fifth curia. The ballot is secret, every duly registered male twenty-four years of age has the right to vote. The home legislature consists of a senate of 14 members, and the lower house, among whom the prince-bishop sits ex officio. The emperor convenes the legislature, and it is presided over by the governor. The landed interests elect ten members, the cities and towns eight, the commercial and industrial boards two, the village communes six, the court. The business of the chamber is restricted to legislating on agriculture, public and charitable institutions, administration of communes, church and school affairs, the transportation and housing of soldiers in war and during manoeuvres, and other local matters. The land budget of 1901 amounted to 373,290 crowns (870,750 dollars)

Ecclesiastical History.—In early Christian times the duchy was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitans of Aquileia, Syrmium, and Salona; but in consequence of the immigration of the pagan Slovenes, this arrangement was not a lasting one. After they had embraced Christianity in the seventh and eighth centuries Charlemagne conferred the major part of KRAIN on the Patriarchate of Aquileia, and the remainder on the Diocese of Trieste. In 1100 that patriarchate was divided into five archdeaconries, of which KRAIN was one. Emperor Frederick III, 8 December, 1461, established the Diocese of KRAIN, a suffragan of Zadar, and under its bishop, directly to the pope, and this was confirmed by a Bull of Pope Pius II, 10 September, 1462. The new diocese consisted of part of Upper KRAIN, two parishes in Lower KRAIN, and a portion of Lower Styria.
and Karinthia; the remaining portion of Krain was attached to Aquileia, later on to Gorizia and Trieste. At the redistribution of dioceses (1787 to 1791) not all the parish churches in Krain were included in the Diocese of Ljubljana, but this was accomplished in 1833, by taking two deaneries from the Diocese of Trieste, one from Gorizia, and one parish from the Diocese of Lavant, so as to include all the territory within the political boundaries of the crownland. The diocese is divided into five archdeaconries, 25 deaneries, two chapters with 17 canons, 236 parishes, 1336 churches, 204 chapels, 722 priests, 572,613 Catholics of the Latin Rite, and 360 of the Oriental Rite. The following congregations of men have houses in Krain: Oeisterian Franciscans 4, Capuchins 2, Brothers of Charity 1, Jesuits 1, Congregati of Minims 1, priests of the German Order 1, Salesians 2. Congregations of Women: Ursulines 3 convents, Carmelites 1, Sisters of Charity 12 houses, including two schools. Krain has a diocesan seminary and one resident college for boys. The patron of the duchy is St. Joseph, and the patrons of the diocese, St. Hermagoras and St. Florinus, Marcellus.

Education.—The school system was founded by state law of 14 May, 1859, and of 2 May, 1883. There are 386 schools, of which 327 are public. Attendance is compulsory, from the age of seven to fourteen. There are two training schools for teachers: one for boys, opened in 1798, and another for girls. The secondary schools are9, the comprehensive public schools 20, the gymnasiums 5, the institutions of higher learning 6, the institutions of technical instruction 5, the schools of music and art 2, and the specialized schools 5. The institutions of technical instruction are also given in singing and on the pipe organ. The Museum Rudolfinum has a famous library. The inspection of the schools is under a school-board. The parochial priests have the right of visiting the schools or of appointing substitutes. The schools are supported from national, regional, and local taxes. The provincial school-board is the highest school authority for all the schools, except those subject directly to the minister of instruction and worship. It consists of twelve members, of whom two are priests. There is a literary society, the "Matica Slovene", and a Catholic daily paper, "Dnevnik.

Slovenes in the United States.—There are in the United States about 100,000 Slovences organized into two great benevolent associations on religious principles. They possess the following churches: St. Joseph's, Joliet, Ill.; St. Stephen's, Chicago, Ill.; St. Michael's, Toledo, Ohio; St. Mary's, Chicago, Ill.; St. John's, Detroit, Mich.; St. Joseph's, Leadville, Col.; St. Mary's, Pittsburgh, Pa.; St. Joseph's, Forest City, Pa.; Holy Family, Kansas City, Kansas. Joliet has one parish school, and one Catholic weekly paper. The saintly bishop, Frederic Baraga, author of the first grammar of the Indian language, Bishops Ignatius Mrak, and John Vertin, Slovences, were pioneers in apostolic work in upper Michigan, as well as Bishops James Trobec and John Starlia, who are still living. Civil History.—Before the coming of the Romans (c. 200 a. c.) the Taurisci dwelt in the north of Krain, the Pannones in the south-east, the Iapodes or Carni, a Celtic tribe, in the south-west. Under Roman rule, the northern part was joined to Noricum, the south-western and south-eastern parts and the city of 'Arsoma to Venice and Istriia. In the time of Augustus all the region from Friuli to Celje belonged to the province of Savia. After the fall of the Western Roman Empire (476), Kra in was incorporated into the Kingdom of Italy, and (493) under Theodoric it formed part of the Ostrogothic kingdom. Between the upper Save and the Sotcha lived the Carni, and towards the end of the sixth century the Slovences peoples that region called by Latin writers Carnia, or Carniola, i. e. part of greater Carnia. Later on with the coming of the Slovences language the name was changed into the Diocese of Ljubljana, in German "Chraimmarcha", "Chrihe", "the boundary". The new inhabitants were subjected to the Avars, but thrust off their yoke, and joined the great Slavic state of Samo. Krain was governed by the Franks about the year 738. When Charlemagne established the new kingdom of Francia, Krain was a part of it. After the division of Friuli, Krain became an independent province, having its own Slovenian margrave residing at Kranj, subject to the governor of Bavaria at first, and after 876 to the Dukes of Karinthia. Henry IV gave it to the Patriarch of Aquileia (971). In the Middle Ages the Church held much property in Krain; thus in Upper and Lower Krain, the Bishop of Friesing became (974) a feudal lord of the city of Skofja Loka, the Bishop of Brixen held Bled and possessions in the valley of Bohinj, and the Bishop of Lavant got Mokronog. Among secular potentiates the Dukes of Meran, Gorizia, Bubenberg, and Zilli held possessions given to them in fief by the patriarchs of Aquileia. The dukes governed the province nearly half a century, and finally Krain was given in fief with the consent of the patriarch to Frederick II, of Austria, who obtained the title of duke, 1218. Frederick was succeeded by his son, Louis III. His nephew, Karin, married a relative of the patriarch, and endowed the churches and monasteries, established the government mint at the city of Kostanjecica, and finally (1268) willed to Otokar II, King of Bohemia, all his possessions and the government of Karinthia and Carniola. Otokar was defeated by Rudolf II of Hapsburg, and at the meeting at Augsburg, 1282, he gave in fief to his sons Albrecht and Rudolf the province of Krain, but it was leased to Count Majnhardt. Duke Henry of Karinthia claimed Krain; and the Dukes of Austria asserted their claim as successors to the Bohemian kingdom. Henry died 1335, Jan, King of Bohemia, renounced his claims, and Albrecht, Duke of Austria, got Krain; it was proclaimed a duchy by Rudolf IV, in 1364. Frederick IV united Upper, Lower, and Central Krain as Metrika and Pivka into one duchy. The union of the dismembered parts was completed by 1607, Tobacco cultivation took place from 1797, and from 1805 to 1806. After the Treaty of Vienna, 1810, Napoleon erected Illyria, with Ljubljana as its capital, and Krain formed a part of the new territory from 1809 to 1813. The defeat of Napoleon restored Krain to Francis I, with larger boundaries, but at the extinction of the Illyrian kingdom, it was confined to the limits outlined at the Congress of Vienna, 1815.

O'Gorman, Church History (New York, 1900); Österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie im Wort und Bild, Karnten und Kra in (Vienna, 1891); Valtonian, Die Ehre des Herzogtumes Kra in (Ljubljana, 1869); Enien, Voyodeste Krajinjsko (Ljubljana, 1883); Czudey, Ceremne namene v XV. stoletju (Ljubljana, 1908); Kutar, Benska Slovinska (Ljubljana, 1899); Droben, Voyodesta Krajinjska (Ljubljana, 1901); Imre, Zemleipsis (Ljubljana, 1907); Pulejnik, Krainsko apostolsko slovenske novice (Ljubljana, 1898).

M. D. Krampončič.

Krimer, John (also called Issittor, the Latin form of his surname), b. about the end of the fourteenth century, he must have died between 1437 and 1440, as a manuscript of the Carthusian monastery of Memmingen speaks of a gift made to it by Krimer in 1437, and the general chapter of the Carthusian Order held in 1440 mentions his death.

Having entered the charterhouse of Buxheim, in the Diocese of Augsburg, Bavaria (whence he is sometimes called John of Buxheim), he there led the life of a pious and obedient religious. There, also, he wrote sundry works, including two treatises published by D. Pez in his "Bibliotheca ascetica". The first of these
is entitled "Breviloquium animi cujuslibet religiosi reformativum"; it consists of two parts. In the first part the author teaches a good religious divers means and practices which he should observe in order to remain a faithful child of the Church, to acquire, on earth, the grace of perfection and, in heaven, lasting happiness. In the second part, by a faint allegory, he puts the religious on his guard against the faults of monastic life which are represented by twenty birds of prey, the eagle, the vulture, the hawk, the owl, etc., whose characteristics and manners he describes. Though written in a rude, uncultured style, the work was much read in the middle ages of the Middle Ages. The subject of Krämer's second book is sufficiently indicated by its title, "Tractatus exhortativus ad evitandum malam iram". In these two books we find the spirituality peculiar to the Carthusians of the fifteenth century: a rigorous asceticism, relieved somewhat (under the influence of Denis the Carthusian) by a few touches of mystical tenderness. An unpublished treatise, "De Objectivo nimbo" has also been sometimes attributed to Krämer, but without sufficient warrant.

Krasinski, Ignatius, in Warsaw, 1801. He took orders in early youth, and soon after became a canon, travelled abroad, preached the coronation sermon for King Stanislaus Poniatowski, by whose favour he shortly got a bishopric in what was soon to become Prussian Poland. Frederick II then made his acquaintance, and it was to amuse this king, they say, that Krasinski wrote his "Monachomachia". In 1775 there appeared a satire, "Hymnus" (The Monachomachia), purporting to be the reply of the monks to the author's "Monachomachia". It is clear enough, but a bishop ought rather to have made an effort to reform the monks than to have laughed at them, and to have written it for a Protestant king's amusement was a greater blunder if the charges were true: as a Catholic, as well as a Pole, he could not be the friend of the Prussian king. Krasinski felt this, and wrote his "Anti-Monachomachia" to destroy the bad impression made. In 1776 he published "Dowiadczynski", a novel written under the influence of contemporary English fiction—partly a clever satirical sketch of character, partly describing an ideal community, and imitating Johnson's "Rasselas". The latter part is so much feebler in its description of an impossible Utopia that it mars the other.

The best part of Krasinski's poetry is his "Satires" (1778) and his "Fables". The former, witty, soberly ironical, without a fall, exagerration, or malice, and perfect in form, remind us of Horace: they are historically important as pictures of the state of Poland, and are very patriotic in tendency. The national faults and aberrations are pointed out wittily always, and sometimes with sorrowful eloquence. "Pan Poldor", though in form a prose novel, has a like aim. The tale diverts us, but its moral is the essential thing, and both are excellent. From the highest duties to the meanest particulars of religious, family, and social life, all is pointed out in the best and noblest way. Surely, if a book could have regenerated Poland, "Pan Poldor" has done it.

The "Fables" (1779) are, like all others at that time in Europe, imitations of Lafontaine's, but none were so like their model as Krasinski's. Like Lafontaine's, Krasinski's are amongst the best ever written, while in colour they are distinctly original, because Polish. The "Martyrs of the Thirty Years' War" (1780), an heroic poem written in order to give an epos to Polish literature, is a failure, though far superior to Voltaire's famous "Henriade". But it is impossible even to name all his works—"Epistles" in verse, comedies, some not without merit, lives of great men, novels, and notes. Let us mention his "Poetic Art", "Gardens", and his "Translation of Ossian". He died in 1801 at Berlin, seven years after his elevation to the Archbishopric of Warsaw, and by a quaint allegory he puts the religious on his guard against the faults of monastic life which are represented by twenty birds of prey, the eagle, the vulture, the hawk, the owl, etc., whose characteristics and manners he describes. Though written in a rude, uncultured style, the work was much read in the middle ages of the Middle Ages. The subject of Krämer's second book is sufficiently indicated by its title, "Tractatus exhortativus ad evitandum malam iram". In these two books we find the spirituality peculiar to the Carthusians of the fifteenth century: a rigorous asceticism, relieved somewhat (under the influence of Denis the Carthusian) by a few touches of mystical tenderness. An unpublished treatise, "De Objectivo nimbo" has also been sometimes attributed to Krämer, but without sufficient warrant.

Krasinski, Stanislaw, Count, son of a Polish general, b. at Paris, 19 Feb, 1812; d. there, 23 Feb., 1859. He lost his mother (Mary, née Princess Radziwill) in early childhood. From boyhood he loved study, and, as a student in Warsaw, distinguished himself as a sympathizer with the Romantic literary movement. But, when—against his will and purely to obey his father—he was forced to return, he presented himself at Nicholas's Court, his health gave way. Permitted to withdraw to Vienna, he brought out his first great work, those which he had written previously being far inferior. "Niebojska Komedia" (The Infernal Comedy, 1833) is the struggle between the old order and the new: each has its champion, both are self-seeking, faithless, and end in despair. This work was paraphrased and expanded by Edward Robert, Lord Lytton, as "Oval, the Fool of Time" (1869). In 1836 "Irydion" appeared. It is distinctly patriotic in tone: a young Greek dreams of delivering his country from the Roman yoke, attempts under Heliogabalus to do so, and, in order to have the Christians on his side, becomes one of them. His vengeance fails, and at the end Christ, his judge, condemns not his patriotism but his evil deeds and want of trust in Providence. After "Irydion" until the appearance of "Precedwit" (Before Dawn) Krasinski passed through a period of little literary activity but much philosophic thinking, during which his works were few and of little importance.

"Before Dawn" is a most beautiful poem, and was intended by Krasinski to be his last. The poet sailing in a boat with Beatrice, his loved one and the source of his inspiration, he assembles some of the heroes of old Poland, which makes him happy, for Czarniecki reveals to him the destiny of Poland, the only nation which preserved the spirit of Christianity: thence its present sufferings and its future greatness. Shortly after the publication of "Before Dawn", Krasinski married Elizabeth Bania. In 1845 he began to write his "Psalms of the Future", poems inspired by the desire to prevent his country from rushing into an abyss, for he had been informed that an armed rising was close at hand. The "Psalms of Faith, Hope, and Love" appeared together, followed (in 1848) by the "Psalms of Sorrow and of Good-will". The last marks what is perhaps the very highest summit of Krasinski's inspiration. Here, as in "Before Dawn", he makes Poland the "Chosen Nation of the Lord". His other works are: "The Day of To-Day", and "The Last One", both published in 1848, but written long before; "Resurrection", a "Glosa de St. Magdalen", which has no name but "The Unfinished Poem", and which as a whole, though he had been working at it before 1840, is much inferior to his best productions. After 1848 Krasinski's health, which had been feeble, gave way completely. He spent some time in Baden and Heidelberg, but ended it in prison. By 1849 found him in a congenial climate; but his last years, saddened by family losses, were spent in a state of great physical suffering.
Krusiński's poetry, possibly the noblest of all contemporary efforts to base politics on the principles of Christianity, has been noticed by all such political questions as touch upon a happier future for the world. The "Infernal Comedy" deals with all Europe as a whole and in general; "Trydyon" enquires how any particular nation is to be regenerated; "Before Dawn" gives the answer, as also do the "Gioia" series of writings, published in the "Rommer Jahrbücher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden" and in the "Serapem", deals with particular features of the history and archaeology of Trier. In this manner Kraus was led on to the study of Christian archaeology in general, and then to Christian art in all its aspects, and man conveys the whole of the history of art as a whole, of antiquity or to contemporaries, whether English, Polish, or German. His defects (redundancy of ornament, exaggeration in thought, turgidity of style), conspicuous only in his feeble works, pass unnoticed in his greatest creations, of which they cannot impair the grandeur. No Polish author writes with greater splendour and majesty. He is representative of the noblest trends of the thought of his time, and eloquently expressive of his nation's sufferings, whilst he warns her not to go astray and point out the way to salvation. He is indeed one of the mightiest minds that Poland ever brought forth.

S. Tarnowski.

Kraus, Franz Xavier, ecclesiastical and art historian, b. at Trier, 18 September, 1840; d. at San Remo, 28 December, 1901. He completed his studies in the Trier gymnasiun, began his theology in 1858-90 in the seminary there, and finished it in 1862-64, having passed in France the time from the autumn of 1860 to the spring of 1862 as tutor in distinguished French families. He was ordained a priest by the suffragan bishop Eberhard of Trier, 23 March, 1864. Even after he became a priest, he continued his studies in theology and philology at the universities of Würzburg, Freiburg—where he had received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1862, and received that of Doctor of Divinity in 1865—and Bonn. In the autumn of 1865 he became beneficiary of Pfazel near Trier, where he developed a zealously literary activity, interrupted by several stays for the progress of his studies in Paris, Belgium, and to Rome in January, 1870. In the spring of 1872 he was attached to the faculty of philosophy at the University of Strasbourg as professor extraordinary of the history of Christian art, and in the autumn of 1878 he succeeded Johann Alxog as professor of church history at Freiburg. In 1880 he was made grand-ducal privy councillor, and held the office of pro-rector of the university for the period 1890-1. He was also curator of religious antiquities in the Grand Duchy of Baden, and from 1883 a member of the Baden Historical Commission.

Kraus was a man of brilliant and versatile talents, a scholar of great learning, a clever and elegant writer, and, in spite of ill-health and the acute bodily sufferings of his closing years, an author of wonderful productivity, who delighted in his work. Although, from an ecclesiastical standpoint, much of his literary work is greatly to be deplored and rejected, and though his political activity—to which we shall refer later—did not always influence favourably his intellectual labours, his achievements of positive and permanent value form a sufficiently imposing array to entitle Kraus to a place among the ablest scholars of the nineteenth century. After his departure from Freiburg (1882) he began his independent literary career with small works on the history of early Christian literature in the first centuries and the Middle Ages, among them: "Egidius von Rom" (in "Oesterreichische Vierteljahresschrift für Kath. Theologie", 1, 1882); "Observationes criticae in Synesi Symposium epistulas" (Salzburg, 1883); "Studien über Synesios von Kyrene" (in "Theologische Quartalschrift", XLVI, 1865); "Der Briefwechsel Papst Pius VI. mit Seneca" ("Veröffentlichungen der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften", XLIX, 1867), and later "Ueber das Martyrium des Ignatius von Antiochien" ("Theol. Quartalschrift", LV, 1873). Of the edition of the "Opera omnia" of Thomas a Kempis, undertaken by Kraus, only the first volume appeared ("Opuscula", Trier, 1868). Kraus reached the end of his days, after reaching the field of research for which he seemed particularly qualified, and in which he was to accomplish his best work. Among other larger or smaller publications we may mention: "Beiträge zur Trierischen Archäologie und Geschichte. I. Der heilige Nagel in der Domkirche zu Trier" (Trier, 18685); "Die Kunst bei den alten Christen" (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); "Die christliche Kunst in ihren frühesten Anfängen. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuesten Resultate der Katakomben-Forschung populär dargestellt" (Leipzig, 1872); "Ueber den gegenwärtigen Stand der Frage nach dem Inhalte und der Bedeutung der römischen Blutampullen" ("Forschungen zur Spurtenenfamil vom Palatin" (Freiburg, 1872); "Roma sotterranea: Die römischen Katakomben. Eine Darstellung der neuesten Forschungen, mit Zugrundelegung des Werkes von J. Spencer Northcote and W. R. Brownlow" (Freiburg, 1873; 2nd ed., 1879); "Ueber das Studium der Kunswissenschaft an den deutschen Hochschulen" (Strasbourg, 1874); "Ueber Begriff, Umfang, Geschichte der christlichen Archäologie und die Bedeutung der monumentalen Studien für die historische Theologie. Akademische Antrittsrede" (Freiburg, 1879); "Synchronistische Tabellen zur christlichen Kunstgeschichte" (Freiburg, 1880).

These were followed by the great works which constitute Kraus's chief claim to an enduring fame: "Kunst und Alterthum in Elsass-Lothringen. Beschreibende Statistik im Auftrage des kaiserlichen Oberpräsidiums von Elsass-Lothringen herausgegeben" (4 vols., Study to Paris, 1876-77), "Die römischen Baupläne der christlichen Alterthümer" (2 vols., Freiburg, 1882-6); "Die Kunstdenkmäler des Grossherzogthums Baden" (vols. I-IV, 1, Freiburg, 1887-1904—is being continued by other authors); "Die christlichen Inschriften der Rheinländen" (2 vols., Freiburg, 1890-95) and lastly his "Die Beziehungen der christlichen Kunst" (vol. I and the first half of volume II, Freiburg, 1896-1900). The second half of volume two, which brings the description of the Italian Renaissance to a close, was published by Joseph Sauer in 1908. This work combined the results of all Kraus's labours in the field of art, and his chief merit lies in the description of the connexion of art with the general and religious culture of the different periods. Other important publications belong to the special history of art: "Die Wandgemälde der St. Georgskirche zu Oberzell auf der Reichenau" (Freiburg, 1854); "Die Miniaturen des Codex Egberti in der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier" (Freiburg, 1884); "Die Miniaturen der Mainzer Liederhandschrift" (Strasbourg, 1887); "Die mittelalterlichen Wandgemälde im Grossherzogthum Baden" (with H. von Oechelhäuser, vol. I, Darmstadt, 1893); "Die Wandgemälde der Sylvesterkirche zu Liernheim" (Munich, 1902).

Kraus's literary leanings were directed towards Italy. After a close study of Dante, covering years of labour, he published the work, which must be ranked among his greatest: "Dante. Sein Leben und sein Werk. Sein Verhältniss zur Kunst und Politik" (Berlin, 1897). Though his opinions may not be in all cases incontestable, this work will always claim a
prominent place in Dante literature. Somewhat earlier he had published "Luca Signorelli's Illustrationen zu Dante's Divina Commedia" (Freiburg, 1892).

His collected "Essays" also belong to Kraus's most brilliant works (part I, Berlin, 1894; part II, Berlin, 1901); they are of a literary, historical, and political character, and the majority appeared originally in the "Deutsche Rundschau"; particularly noteworthy are the essays "Antonio Rosmini"—for whom Kraus had a particular veneration—and "Francesco Petrarca der Theologe" (1911). Compared with the more congenial occupation of literature and art, Kraus's work on church history takes second place. His "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende" (1st ed. in 3 parts, Trier, 1872-5; 4th ed., 1896; French translation: "Histoire de l'Eglise par F. X. Kraus, tr. by B. P. Godet et C. Verschaffel" (4 vols., Paris, 1891-2) contains much that is excellent, but has also serious defects. It is distinguished by clear and perspicuous arrangement, based more or less on that of the well-known manual of the Protestant historian Kurz, and by its elegant and interesting narrative, but its statement of fact is frequently neither sufficiently nor reliably exact. One misses the calm objectivity of the historian, the author showing in many instances the inordinate influence which his liberalizing views exerted over his judgment. This bias naturally aroused enmity, and as it was still more emphatic in the second edition of 1892, Kraus was compelled to withdraw this edition and revise it. The revised edition appeared in 1887 with the ecclesiastical imprimatur. The first edition of the church history was followed by the "Synchronistische Tabellen zur Kirchengeschichte" (Trier, 1876) and "Charakterbilder aus der christlichen Kirchengeschichte" (Trier, 1877), which were designated the fourth and fifth divisions of the ecclesiastical history, but had really the character of separate works. Among his less important ecclesiastico-historical works are "Briefe Benedictus XIV. an den Canonico Francesco Paggi in Bologna 1727-1758" (Freiburg and Tübingen, 1884; 2nd ed., 1888); "Medicean Rome" in "The Cambridge Modern History" II (Cambridge, 1903), 1-35. Mention should also be made of his preparation of the tenth edition of Alzog's "Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte" (2 vols., Mainz, 1832), and his "Gedächtnissrede auf Johannes Alzog Professor an der Universität Freiburg" (Freiburg, 1879). His political rather than his ecclesiastical views are reflected in "Die Erhebung Italiens im 19. Jahrhundert: Cavour" (Mainz, 1902—"Weltgeschichte in Charakterbildern", vol. V).

As a politician Kraus displayed an extensive journalistic activity, which, from the Catholic standpoint, is greatly to be regretted. Personally, he was a man of deep religious feeling and Catholic faith, but, from association with the Liberal Catholics in France, Italy, and Germany, he soon became imbued with their views on ecclesiastical policy. At the time of the Vaticano Council he entered into close connexions with the opposition party, and kept up these relations for some time. He remained in the Church, but the strife had engendered in his mind a certain bitterness. In many anonymous or pseudonymous articles written for the Liberal press, he gave vent to his dissatisfaction with certain ecclesiastical conditions—often with excessive severity and bitterness. The "Kirchenpapstliche Briebe" in the "Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung" (1895-9), written under the pseudonym of "Spectator", created a great sensation. It is to him that we owe the distinction between "religious and political Catholicism", a formula in which he imagined he had found the solution of many difficulties.

The permanent services of Kraus as a scholar are, however, sufficiently great to permit us to draw a veil of oblivion over his political errors and his secret activity on behalf of Liberalism.

BRAND, Zur Einleitungs zu Franz Xaver Kraus (Freiburg, 1903); HAUVELT, F. X. Kraus, ein Lebensbild aus der Zeit des Kompromissbekenntnisses (Colmar, 1892); KOLNIK, Franz Xaver Kraus, ein Leben aus der Freiburger Zeit (Freiburg, 1892), nos. 21, 22, 24; KÖNIGS, Notice biographique et bibliographique sur F. X. Kraus in Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, III (1902), 431-41; SAUER, Kunstchronik, Neues Leben: deutsche Rundschau, (Freiburg, 1902), 432-59; HIRNIN, F. X. Kraus und die Schweiz in Hochland, I, 2 (1904), 650-67; SCHMÖR, in Gesichtspunkte, II, 428-47.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

KRAEL, KARL, Austrian meteorologist and astronomer, b. at Ried, Upper Austria, 4 Nov., 1798; d. at Vienna, 21 Dec., 1862. He received his early education at the Benedictine Abbey of Kremsmünster, under the noted astronomer P. Boniface Schwarzenbrunner. There he joined in the work at the observatory. He studied law for financial reasons, but, in 1825, decided to give it up and to devote himself exclusively to the mathematical and physical sciences. In 1827 he became assistant at the observatory of the Vienna University, then, 1831, adjunct at the observatory of La Brera of Milan. In 1838 he was transferred to the Prague Observatory, of which he became director in 1845. He found this observatory in a very poor condition and was therefore obliged to confine his work more to teaching. He introduced into Austria the study of a new science, that of terrestrial physics. The necessary instruments he obtained by personal privations and persistent efforts. He organized a rational system of magnetic and meteorological observations, which soon placed Prague in the same class with such observatories as that of Göttingen, which was richly endowed and which was directed by the great Gauss.

The emperor conferred upon him the cross of Knight of the Order of Francis Joseph. A member of the Imperial Academy of Vienna since its foundation in 1847, he submitted to it his project of the establishment of a central station for magnetic and meteorological observations in Austria. This was realized at Vienna in 1851. He was made the first director and at the same time became professor of physics at the University of Vienna. His systematic observations, begun at Milan and Prague, soon extended first over Bohemia and later over the entire empire to the shores of the Adriatic, as well as to Turkey and the Black Sea. His religious convictions were very pronounced, and, far from clashing with his scientific occupations, they added a new force to them. He contributed a number of papers and reports on the improved magnetic apparatus, and constructed some self-registering meteorological instruments. The work at Prague was published in eleven volumes, 1839-1850, under the title of "Magnet. und Meteorol. Beob. zu Prag".

Other publications are: "Cenni storici e teoreticoli sulle comete" (Milan, 1832); "Beob. über den grossen Kometen von 1843" (Prague, 1843); "Natur und Bewegung der Kometen" (Prague, 1843); "Mag. und geogr. Ortebestimmungen im Oester. Kaiserthum" (5 vols., Vienna, 1840-1851); "Die Anleitung zu magnet. Beobachtungen" (3 vols., Vienna, 1858); "Horizontale Komponente der magnetischen Erdkraft" (Vienna, 1833). He edited "Astronomisch-meteorologisches Jahrbuch für Prag" (Prague, 1842-1845) and also "Jahrbucher der Centralanstalt für Meteorologie und Erdmagnetismus" (1849-1862).

WILLIAM FOX.

KREITEN, WILLIAM, literary critic and poet, b. 21 June, 1847, at Gangelt near Aachen; d. 6 June, 1902, at Kerkrade (Kirchraith) in Dutch Limburg. At the age of sixteen he entered the Jesuit novitiate of Friedrichsruh at Münster. After receiving his classical
education at Münster and Amiens, he began his philosophical and theological studies at Maria Laach in 1868, but was compelled to interrupt them the following year on account of ill-health. From 1869 to 1871 he pursued literary studies at Münster. When the Jesuit was expelled from Germany, in 1872, Kreitner was one of the sixteen monks of the Bavarian Church. Though continually suffering, he was one of the chief workers on "Stimmen aus Maria Laach," to which he contributed numerous essays on literary subjects and of the reviews of current Catholic literature from 1874 to 1902. His larger works in the field of historical and criticism are "Voltaire, Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungs geschichte der Liberalismus" (Freiburg im Br., 1878; 2nd ed., 1884); "Molieres Leben und Werke" (Freiburg im Br., 1887; 2nd ed., 1897); "Lebrecht Dreyss. Ein Lebensbild" (Freiburg im Br., 1897); a critical edition of the poems of Annette von Droste-Hülshoff with an exhaustive bibliography (1889); a great Westphalian poetess (Münster, 1884–6; 2nd ed., 1900); a series of twenty-one articles in "Stimmen aus Maria Laach" on Blaise Pascal and his works. His poetic works are "Heimatweisen aus der Fremde" (Aachen, 1882), the second edition of which has many additional poems and is entitled "Tier Weg entlang." (Paderborn, 1889; 10th ed., 1904); translations of selections from the modern Provençal Christmas hymns of Louis Simon Lambert, entitled "Bethlehem" (Freiburg im Br., 1882; 2nd ed., 1893). Furthermore, Kreitner completed and published a biography of Klemens Brentano, which had been begun by the friend of his youth, J. B. Diel, S. J., 2 vols. (Freiburg im Br., 1877); edited the other posthumous works of Diet, 2 vols. (Freiburg im Br., 1882), and Brentano's "Die Chronik des tiefen Schülers" (Munich, 1883; 2nd ed., 1888). His last work was a collection of eight hundred aphorisms entitled "Allerlei Weisheit." (Paderborn, 1901).


Michael Ott.

Kremsmünster, Benedictine abbey in Austria, on the little river Krems, about twenty miles south of Lins, on the little river Krems, about twenty miles south of Linz; founded A.D. 777 by Tassilo II Duke of Bavaria, who richly endowed it, as did subsequently Charlemagne and his successors. The first colony of monks came from Lower Bavaria, and Fatericus was the first abbot. The position and reputation of the monastery soon became such that its abbots, in the absence of the bishop of the diocese (Passau), exercised the episcopal jurisdiction. In the tenth century the abbey was destroyed in an invasion of the Hungarians, and its possession restored among the Duke of Bavaria and other nobles and the bishops, but it was restored, and recovered its property, under Emperor Henry II, when the holy and zealous Gottard became abbot. In the following century Kremsmünster shared the general decadence of religious houses, and fell into decay, which was fortunately arrested by the action of the emperors at Aix in 1144, when he completed a community from Gottesau, and introduced the reformed observance of Cluny into the abbey. After this it became known as one of the most flourishing houses in Germany, "excelling all other abbeys," says an anonymous chronicler, "in observance and possession of lands, buildings, books, paintings, and other possessions, and in the number of its members prominent in learning and in art." The monastic library was famous, and drew eminent scholars to study at Kremsmünster, where several important historical works were written, including histories of the bishops of Passau and of the dukes of Bavaria, and the chronicles of the abbey itself. Schrödl (Kirchenlex., VII, 1053) gives a list of writers connected with Kremsmünster from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, and of their books, which comprised 3,000 volumes. One of the most distinguished abbots was Ulrich Schopenhaufer (1454–1484), and it was owing to his attainments and zeal, and those of his disciple and successor Johann Schreiner (1505–1524), that at the critical time when the Reformation errors were beginning to spread in Germany, the Kremsmünster held firmly to the old faith and doctrines.

From the Reformation period onwards nearly every abbot who ruled the monastery proved himself pious and learned, zealous and patriotic, ready to make all needful sacrifices for his country and his emperor. Abbot Lechner, towards the middle of the sixteenth century, constituted the hitherto private monastic school into a public school, and did much to preserve Catholicism in the district, where the Protestant doctrines had become widely prevalent. Abbot Weiner (1558–1565) unfortunately favoured the new teaching, thus introducing trouble and nearly developed into disruption. This was, however, prevented by the zeal of succeeding abbots; and Abbot Wolfredt especially (1813–1839) brought the monastery into so highly flourishing a condition that he was known as its third founder; while its reputation as a house of studies and learning was even increased under his successor, Plegidt Böchler (1644–1669). Among the abbots of the eighteenth century the most prominent and distinguished was Alexander Fiel- millner (1731–1759), who built the great observatory, constructed many roads on the monastic estate, and was a man of most edifying life and good works. Towards the end of this century the drastic and innovating policy of the Emperor Joseph II, especially with regard to the religious houses of his dominions, brought Kremsmünster, like other great foundations, to the verge of suppression; but it happily escaped this fate. The house suffered much during the long Napoleonic wars, and was slow in recovering its position. It was not until the abbacy of Thomas Mitterdorfer (1840–1860) that, with its material position reinforced, and learning and discipline again flourishing within its walls, it regained all its former prestige. One of the most illustrious abbots in recent times was Dom Celestin Gans. Celebrated in 1877 the eleven-hundredth anniversary of the foundation, became Archbishop of Vienna in 1881, and was raised to the cardinalate in 1884 (d. 1889). The present abbot is Dom Leander Caerny, who succeeded Abbot Achatneter in 1905.

The community of the Benedictine Abbey numbers about a hundred members. The abbey has the cure of souls of twenty-six parishes (population over 42,000), and within the precincts are a Gymnastrium, or boys' school (300 pupils), of high reputation, and a school of philosophy. The imposing pile of buildings, as they now stand, are mostly of the sixteenth century. The valuable library contains some 70,000 volumes, 1700 manuscripts, and nearly 2000 incunabula. There is an interesting collection of objects of natural history in the lower part of the observatory, which is eight stories high; and a curious feature is the series of fish tanks devoted to the study of Passau. In the monastery are the works of Benedictine abbots (Linz, 1848); Ritter-Sachens, Annals monast. Cresmoniensis (Paris, 1846); and the works of Benedictine abbots of the Nuremberg (Leipzig, 1729), II, 57.
KIRSHNAGAR

Diocese of (Kishnagrensis).—The boundaries of the Diocese of Kirshnagar are: on the north, the Archdiocese of Calcutta and the Prefecture Apostolic of Assam; on the east, the Diocese of Dacca; on the south, the Bay of Bengal and the Archdiocese of Calcutta; on the west, the Archdiocese of Allahabad. The diocese is divided from north-west to south-east by the Ganges, into two portions nearly equal in extent. Since the last delimitation of territory (1888) it comprises five districts on the western side of the Ganges, viz.: Khulna, Jessore, Nadiya, Faridpur, and Mursidabad; and six districts on the eastern side of the Ganges: Rajshahi, Bogra, Maldah, Krishnagar, Rangpur, and Paiguri, and the native State of Kuch Behar. The first five districts belong to the civil province of Bengal and the other six to the new province called Eastern Bengal and Assam. The population of the whole diocese, according to the latest census (1902), is over eighteen millions. In 1855, six districts of the Vicariate Apostolic of Western Bengal, viz.: Jessore, Nadiya, Mursidabad, Rajshahi, Bogra and Maldah, were provisionally united under the name of Central Bengal Mission; and, at the request of the Vicar Apostolic of Western Bengal, three missionaries from the Seminary of the Archdiocese of Milan were sent out to work for that mission. There were then scarcely a hundred Catholics in the whole mission. In the year 1870 the Central Bengal Mission was definitely separated from the Vicariate of Western Bengal; the provinces of Bhutan and Assam and a few other districts were added to it; and the mission was created a prefecture Apostolic (June, 1870), Father Marietti being the first prefect. On 1 September, 1886, it was constituted a diocese under the hierarchy, and Right Rev. Dr. F. Pozzi was consecrated first bishop, 13 February, 1887. In 1889 the provinces of Bhutan and Assam were detached from the Diocese of Kirshnagar, and the see was restored to its present territory. Bishop Pozzi died in October, 1905, and was succeeded by the present bishop, Dr. S. Taveglia, consecrated 4 November, 1906.

The Catholics of the diocese (August, 1909) number 6247, besides 691 catechumens. With the exception of about four hundred Europeans and Europeans, all the other Catholics are native converta. Working in the diocese at present are: one bishop; eleven missionaries of the Seminary of Foreign Missions of Milan, residing in eight different stations; sixteen Sisters of Charity of Lovere (Italy), distributed in four different houses. There are thirteen churches and fifteen schools and hospitals in the villages, which are used as places of worship, as shelters for the visiting missionary, and sometimes as schoolrooms. There are three orphanages for native boys and three for native girls, with over two hundred children entirely supported by the mission and under the direction of the Sisters of Charity. Scattered in several districts there are twenty-five mission schools attended by over five hundred children, Christian and pagan. The Sisters of Charity are also in charge of a public hospital and three mission free dispensaries; and they also direct two homes for widows and catechumens, and a home for incurables. The Madras Catholic Directory (Madras, 1909); Catholic Calendar (Calcutta, 1910).

F. ROCCA.

KRZYSKII. See CzIBIUM, Diocese of.

Kromer, Martin, a distinguished Polish bishop and historian; b. at Bicz in Galicia in 1512; d. at Heilsberg, Ermland (now East Prussia), on 23 March, 1589. He was the son of a substantial citizen who, desirous of a public career for his son, sent him to the University of Cracow in 1525 and there obtained a degree in philosophy. Afterwards he studied theology at Bologna and at Rome. When he returned to Poland he was appointed secretary to Gamrat, Bishop of Cracow, and shortly afterwards he was made secretary to Prince Sigismund August. The latter was so pleased with him that, when he afterwards ascended the Polish throne, he entrusted Kromer with many high official duties, and in order to enable him to receive promotion to even higher dignities the king elevated him in 1552 to the rank of a nobleman. Kromer was charged with diplomatic missions to the Viennese Papacy, and to the Council of Trent. In Poland he had complete charge of the national archives, arranged the various documents and materials in systematic form, and in doing so devoted himself especially to the history of his country. At the suggestion of the king he compiled the annals of Poland in Latin, entitled De origine et rebus gestis Polonorum" in thirty books, which was published at Basle in 1555, and treated of the history of Poland from the earliest times down to the year 1506. It was translated into German by Heinrich Pantaleon and also published at Basle in 1562, and was likewise translated on two different occasions into Polish and published at Cologne in 1589 and at Cracow in 1611. In this history Kromer showed himself a keen critic, with a graceful style and polished Latinity, and he was particularly successful in setting forth clearly and accurately the intricate political relations of Poland with the neighbouring states. It is to be regretted, however, that his history ended without describing the events of the very epoch which he knew so well from his own participation therein. Following this, he published at Cologne in 1577 his great geographical and descriptive work, "Polonia, sive de situ, populis, moribus, magistratibus et republicis regni Polonicii", in two books, which still remains an important source of information about contemporary Poland. It was translated into Polish by Kondratowicz and published at Wilna in 1583. He had even turned his attention to music, for in 1584 he had published a volume at Cracow entitled "De musica figurata". He took a very active part in opposing the spread of Protestantism in Poland. His various polemical writings, his sermons, and his catechism were all written in Polish and in a simple style devoted to the enlightenment of the people; they formed an energetic protest against the introduction of the new Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines. In 1570 he was appointed by Cardinal (then Bishop) Stanislaus Hosius as coadjutor in the Diocese of Ermland, where together with the latter he wrote popular works in explanation and defense of the Catholic Faith. A year after the death of Hosius in 1579 Kromer was made Bishop of Ermland, and held that see until he died in 1589.

EICHRON. Der ermländische Bischof Martin Kromer (Braunschweig, 1889); WALEWSKI, Martin Kromer (Stettin, 1899); WICHER, Die deutschen Predigten und Katechesen der ermländischen Bischöfe Hosius und Kromer (Cologne, 1885).

ANDREW J. SHIMAN.

Krzynski, Andrew, date of birth uncertain; d. in 1535. A typical humanistic poet, a most supple courtier for whom poetry was to be a source of renown and profit, Krzycki was well-read in Latin poetry and knew the language to perfection, and was a master of epigrams, pointed and spirited in style and diction. His individuality was conspicuous; his talent, though not creative, and confined to imitations of the ancients, was by no means insignificant; his wit, mordant and at times coarse. His verses, whether laudatory or satirical, were mostly written to commemorate notable occasions. In 1512, for instance, he celebrated in verse the marriage of King Sigismund I with Barbara Zapolya; Krzycki subsequently became chancellor to the youthful queen. When the king won the victory of Orsza, he again wrote a poem, and sent verses to the king, complimenting him with his victory and supporting the model of Ovid's "Epistulae Herodii"; these, in a letter to Krzycki, Erasmus praised enthusiastically. After Barbara's death he continued to be chancellor in the household of Bon Stef, Sigis-
Kuhn, Johannes von, theologian, b. at Würzburge in Würtemberg, 19 Feb., 1806; d. at Tübingen, 8 May, 1887. He pursued his classical studies at Gmünd, Ellwangen, and Rottweil, and courses in philosophy and theology from 1825 to 1830 at Tübingen; entered the seminary at Rottweil in the autumn of 1830, and was there ordained on 14 Sept., 1831. In the autumn of 1832, he became professor of New Testament exegesis in the Catholic theological faculty then attached to the University of Giessen. At Easter, 1837, he was called in the same capacity to the University of Tübingen, where, in 1839, he was appointed to the chair of dogmatic theology. He retired in 1842 to clear the way, with remarkable gifts for philosophical and theological speculation, and with Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His first important work was the result of his deep research into the new philosophy, with which he was the first in Germany to make it clear that its basis of conclusions was philosophy. With Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His first important work was the result of his deep research into the new philosophy, with which he was the first in Germany to make it clear that its basis of conclusions was philosophy. With Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His first important work was the result of his deep research into the new philosophy, with which he was the first in Germany to make it clear that its basis of conclusions was philosophy. With Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His first important work was the result of his deep research into the new philosophy, with which he was the first in Germany to make it clear that its basis of conclusions was philosophy. With Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His first important work was the result of his deep research into the new philosophy, with which he was the first in Germany to make it clear that its basis of conclusions was philosophy. With Staudenmaier he occupies the foremost rank among the speculative dogmatists of the Catholic school at Tübingen. His work in this field closed with the important, though unfinished work, "Das Leben Jesu" (1834, 183), in which he opposed the destructive tendencies of Strauss. After he had taken the chair of dogmatic theology at Tübingen, he made the study of speculative dogma life work. His most important work is the "Katholische Dogmatik", an undertaking of wide scope which unfortunately was never completed. The following parts appeared: Vol. I., 1st part: Einleitung in die katholische Dogmatik" (Tübingen, 1846; 2nd ed., 1862); Vol. II.: Die christliche Lehre von der gottlichen Dreieinigkeit "(1857). Kuhn had already outlined his speculative work in the paper "Ueber Princip und Methode der speculativen Theologie" (University programme, Tübingen, 1840). Among his other works which were issued in part independently, and in part in the Tübinger "Theologische Quartalschrift", many bear a polemical character. His treatment of the fundamental questions on the relation of faith and knowledge, of philosophy and theology, brought about a controversy first with the Hermansians, and in later years with the advocates of the neo-Scholastic philosophy (Clemens, Schäzler). In the analysis of the Hermansian anti-Catholicism, Glauben und Wissen, with Rücksicht auf extreme An- sichten und Richtungen der Gegenwart" (Tübingen, 1839), is partly devoted. The "Philosophie und Theologie" (Tübingen, 1860) was directed against the philosopher Franz Jacob Clemens von Bonn, as was also the essay, "Das Verhältniss der Philosophie zu der theologischen Lehre" ("Theologische Quartalschrift", 1862, pp. 541–602; 1863, pp. 3–33). In 1863 and the subsequent years, Kuhn was engaged in a controversy with Constantine von Schäzler, first in regard to a free Catholic University and later on the dogmatic question of the relation of nature and grace, of the natural and the supernatural. On the former question he wrote "Die historisch-politischen Blätter über eine freie katholische Universität Deutschlands und die Freiheit der Wissenschaft" (Tübingen, 1863); on the latter he wrote "Das Natürliche und das Unsinnige (1864). Schäzler then published his important work, "Natur und Übersinnlichkeit. Das Dogma von der Gnade und die theologische Fage der Gegenwart. Eine Kritik der Kuhn'schen Theologie" (Mainz, 1865), and later "Neue Untersuchungen über das Dogma von der Gnade" (Mainz, 1867). It was especially against these two works that Kuhn directed his last important book, "Die christliche Lehre von der göttlichen Gnade. Erster und letzter Theil: Die ursprüngliche Gnade und die damit zusammen- hängenden Untersuchungen über den Begriff und das Wesen der Gnade überhaupt, mit besonderer Berich- tung auf die Scholastik und deren neueste Umdeutung" (Tübingen, 1868). A prospective second volume, in which the grace of Redemption was to be set forth from a positive and theoretical standpoint, never appeared. Of Kuhn's earlier works we may mention a few others, which were published in opposition against the Pantheistic, anti-Christian theories of contemporary philosophy: "Die moderne Spezierung auf dem Gebiet der christlichen Glaubenslehre" ("Theologische Quartalschrift", 1842, pp. 171–225; 1843, pp. 3–75; 179–226; 405–67); "Die Schelling'sche Philosophie und ihr Verhältniss zum christlichen Dogmatismus" ("Theologische Quartalschrift"., 1844, pp. 57–88; 179–221; 1845, pp. 3–39). Kuhn also opposed Hegel's philosophy of religion in the above-mentioned "Ueber Glauben und Wissen" (1839). Schmidt, Zur Erörterung der Johannishvolkent von Kuhn in Theol. Quartalschrift (1867), pp. 331–8; IDM, Geschichtsbriefe auf Groß, ev. v. Kuhn (Rottweil, 1887); IDEM in Kirchen- und Staatsld., s. v. "Kuhn" (Stettin, 1891); Deutsche Biographie, LI, pp. 418–20. Regarding Kuhn's philosophy, see also Schmid, "Wissenschaftliche Richtungen auf dem Gebiet des dogmatischen Theologischen in neuerer Zeit", (1862); Schmid, "Wissenschaftliche Richtungen auf dem Gebiet des dogmatischen Theologischen in neuerer Zeit", (1862); Werner, Gesch. d. kathol. Theologie (Miinchen, 1866), pp. 499 sqq., 637 sqq.; Gumper, "Kuhn und seine Schule in dem Weltall der Philosophie" (Tübingen, 1858); "Ueber Glauben und Wissen in Annalen der philosoph. christie, LXXXVII (1857), pp. 26 sqq., 163 sqq. Friedrich Lauchert.

Kulturkampf, the name given to the political struggle for the rights and self-government of the Catholic Church, carried on chiefly in Prussia and afterwards in Baden, Hesse, and Bavaria. The contest was waged with great vigour from 1871 to 1877; it was renewed at various times in the 1880's and 1890's. On one side stood the government, the Liberals, and the majority of the Conservatives; on the other, the bishops, the priests, and the bulk of the Catholic people. Prussia was the chief centre of the conflict. The Prussian government and Prince Bismarck were the leaders in this memorable struggle.
I. CAUSES OF THE KULTURKAMPF—They are to be sought: (1) in the political party-life of Germany; (2) in the trend of ideas among the German people towards the middle of the nineteenth century; (3) in the general European policy of Bismarck after 1870.

1. Moritz von Blankenburg was the leader of the patriotic faction of the Prussian Conservatives. From 1848 on, he declared himself openly and clearly in Parliament for an anti-Roman policy. The Conservatives represented the orthodox Protestants of Prussia, themselves threatened by the liberal movement at that time opposed to all positive Christianity. Nevertheless the attitude of the party was no more capricious. The Conservatives yet held in principle to the Protestant character of the State of Prussia as formerly constituted (i.e., up to the German Revolution of 1848). After the Constitution of 1848, it is true, this exclusively Protestant character of the State was no longer recognized by law. But the Conservatives jealously saw to it that as a matter of fact no change took place in Prussia. It could not be pleasing to them that the Catholics of the Rhineland and Westphalia should gradually rise to power through the new parliamentary institutions. When the German Empire was formed in 1870, and South Germany, in great majority, chose a Protestant imperial minister. In Prussia, the Conservatives conceived the gravest fears for the supremacy of Protestantism in Prussia.

However, the real instigators of the onslaught on German Catholicism were the German Liberals. Their attitude is thus explained: previous to 1850 the Liberal party had long been composed almost entirely of men belonging to narrow professional circles—professors, lawyers, etc., also prominent business men. They united in opposition to political absolutism, and were eager for a larger constitutional life in Germany. But they had also an intellectual bond. With that bond as a common denominator, the party could develop, as so many other German parties, into an umwelt of dignified and unecclesiastical Christianity, they were all inimically disposed towards the Catholic Church and all positive belief. With the help of legislation and state schools they hoped to secure for “free and independent science” (die freie Wissenschaft) an absolute control over the intellectual life of the whole German nation. Indeed, the original pioneers of the Liberal party were as unanimous in their philosophical views of the world and life as they were in their views of the State. In the beginning, they were reduced to the intense struggle to promote equally both policies. Until 1860, however, they considered themselves too weak to undertake vigorous action in behalf of their Kultur aims, i.e., their intellectual and political ideals as described above. Isolated failures of an earlier date (the Kaiser-Wirren, or economo-political troubles of 1837, and the Deutsch-böhmischen movement of Ronge in Baden, 1844-46) still served as warnings. In both cases vast masses of the people had been deeply troubled. Even the middle-class citizens, usually rather indifferent in matters of faith, were not yet ready to participate in religious conflicts of this nature. Their chief aims at that time were political-economical; a little later, after 1850, the passion of national unity stirred deeply the entire Bürgerthum of Germany. But when the Liberal influence increased after 1850 in the Prussian Parliament (Sprecht) and in the rest of Germany, the Liberal leaders began to change their tactics. The Grand Duke of Baden confided to them the organization of the Ministerium, i.e., the civil administration of the State. Forthwith the Archbishop of Freiburg and the clergy of Baden were subjected to the strictest civil supervision. The Catholic Church was stripped of control of its property and revenues, with which, till then, the Government had not interfered. All ecclesiastical influence was expelled from the schools, and an effort made to introduce the spirit of “free science” even into the education of the clergy. It was a prelude of what was to take place throughout all Germany some ten years later. In the summer of 1866 Bavaria offered the Liberals a pretext for the introduction of the spirit of(answer cut off)
source of Hegelianism, that had accomplished the unity of Germany. Most Liberals, on the other hand, while they rejoiced over the settlement of the "German question" on a flat and constitutional basis, regarded the national unity as incomplete so long as the Germans were divided in religion and in the aforesaid fundamental philosophic views. They maintained that a permanent political unity of Germany depended absolutely on unity of religion, language, and education. On this ground they proclaimed the Catholic minority a foreign element in the new empire; it must be either assimilated or exterminated. The deep-rooted religious differences of Germany, thus brought again to the front in connexion with the nation's future, were freshly aroused, though such new occasion was scarcely necessary. Popular sentiment to evoke them, they had, of themselves as it were, and by their own nature, taken on a new life.

As early as 1848, an important "Catholic Movement" sprang up in Germany. During the eighteenth century the German Catholics had been quite outmanoeuvred by the Protestants, and in the early decades of the nineteenth century found themselves politically powerless. Economically they had fallen into the background, nor could they exercise social an equal influence. In general education they were also backward, in comparison with their rivals. Their Catholic consciousness was therefore much weakened; no other religious question could touch it openly and freely. But about the middle of the nineteenth century a change came over the Catholics of Germany, and they awoke to a fresh sense of the power and beauty of their religion. Simultaneously Catholic life took on a new development throughout the entire church, especially during the pontificate of Pius IX. This pope had a wonderful influence over the Catholic masses, whom he filled with a remarkable confidence and zeal, especially as to their public life. In the Syllabus of 1864 he condemned with gravitas earnestness that Liberalism which was then everywhere proclaimed as the heir expectant of Catholicism. Thereupon, he convened an encyclical council, the first in 300 years. At this turning-point the German Catholics, so long eliminated from the political, economic and educational life of their nation, rallied to the defence of their faith against Liberalism. Under papal blessing and the protection of the House of Hapsburg, Christian teaching and life, violently attacked by a multitude of infidel writers, and undertook to withstand the combined hosts of Protestantism and Liberalism. The Liberals, on the other hand, resented bitterly both Syllabus and Papal Infallibility; in some places (Munich, Berlin) Liberals suffered from the violence of mobs. At the very time when the dogma of Papal Infallibility was being proclaimed, Germany was winning her great victories over France; to the Liberals (some of whom were thus minded in the Prussian war of 1866 against Austria) it seemed as if the time had come for the final conflict between the empire and the popes, the last decisive battle of the Reformation against enslavement of religious thought and subjection to ecclesiastical authority. Gradually and almost unconsciously, under the influence of the aforesaid political and ecclesiastical events, a situation that in the Liberal mind originally contemplated only a more or less comprehensive legislation, both as to the schools and the relations of Church and State, developed into one of the most passionate conflicts of principles ever fought out within the limits of a great nationality. This was the state of affairs when, in the fall of 1870, the Prussian Catholic, now satisfied with the restoration of the system of popular association (Vereinungessen) undertook the creation of a new political party, the Centre (Zentrum); on the other hand, in the Reichstag elections of the Spring of 1871 the Liberals overthrew the Conservatives and took up the reins of power. In April, 1871, the mutilations of the tempest were already heard in the opening debates of the Reichstag, especially in the debate on the Address to the Throne, when the Liberals insisted very pointedly on the need of a firm policy looking towards the restoration of the Temporal Power, characterizing any such steps as an interference with the domestic affairs of a foreign people. As yet, however, no one had the courage to let loose the turbulent passions that filled men's breasts, nor was it possible up to the end of 1871 (Memorials of France Holding that the Liberal leaders were ready to open the campaign. The Centre remained on the defensive, occupied chiefly in outlining its parliamentary status. At this juncture Bismarck appeared on the scene.

(3) He was then under strong nervous tension, owing to the extra stress the Liberals were applying to their "high stakes" policy of his previous eight years. He was dominated by the fear that new and more exhaustive wars would soon be necessary in order to defend the unity of Germany then barely won. In this temper he was deeply concerned lest within the empire itself the foreign enemy should find aid and succour from particularists (Prussianists and Poles), an importance he easily over-estimated. At this stage of his diplomacy he was bent on preventing the recurrence of any situation similar to that of 1863-66, when he found himself helpless in the presence of a powerful parliamentary opposition. He was at all times naturally inclined to punishment as an unjustifiable, any kind of parliamentary opposition. Quite indifferent to theories of home government and the division of political authority within the State, he was equally eager for a solid centralization and thorough reinforcement of all national resources, in view always of the foreign enemy. In this spirit he had once fought the Liberals, and compelled his former opponents to become the ardent supporters of his foreign policy. Now, on his return from France, he found before him a party, on the one hand more powerful in a parliamentary sense than the Liberal opposition of the sixties, while on the other it seemed to him gravely perilous in case of a foreign war. He was suspicious of one deputy, Ludwig Windthorst, in whom he at once recognized the real leader of the Centre. While Bismarck was fully aware of the high abilities of Windthorst, he knew also that he was a former subordinate of the House of Habsburg, a Catholic, and had had touch with that dynasty, that he had never approved the exclusion of Austria from the German unity as accomplished by Bismarck, and that he vigorously disapproved the excessive favour shown by Bismarck to the Liberals, both in Prussian and in imperial affaires. He had already suffered a notable defeat at Windthorst's hands in the Tariff Parliament of 1866, on which occasion Bismarck tried in vain to obtain from the assembly anything more than the politico-economical services for which it had been called (i.e. he failed then to secure the peaceful union of the South German States with the North German Confederation). Windthorst at that time had no strong parliamentary following, yet his political strategy had proved successful. But now a strong party was at his back, and, as its acknowledged leader, he lost no occasion to increase its influence. On the one hand he appealed to certain Conservatives, superior to Protestant prejudices, and unalterably opposed to the National Liberals as enemies of Christianity and the traditional German views of the State; on the other he was always ready to combine with those Liberals who had not yet gone unconditionally to Bismarck. This welcoming of caitiff Liberals was a blow to Bismarck's chief cause of complaint. He had also perceived that the Centre from the beginning that the Centre entertained foreign relations inimical to the new German Empire. After the Franco-Prussian War the chancellor seems to have feared a conflict with Russia as champion of the new Panasalism. He had in large measure the
KULTurKAMPF

habitant distrust of Prussia for its Polish subjects, and was persuaded that in case of war they would be on the side of Panalism—that, whether in war or diplomacy, they would always prove a thorn in the side of Germany. He had watched them closely for several years and noted with deep suspicion the alliance of their deputies with the German Catholics. He laid great store by the Holy See, but there was no question as to the Roman Catholic clergy at large for the growth of the Centre, while, under Windthorst’s direction, the party was standing out not only for the rights of the Catholic Church, but also for a definite political programme. This zeal of the German clergy was at this juncture especially odious to Bismarck; despite his clear-headed political realism, his imagination was deeply affected by the idea that Protestant Prussia had restored to Germany its former imperial grandeur precisely when Papal Infallibility was being proclaimed at Rome. In his eyes the empire once more stood over against the papacy; only the Holy See could protect the German individual freedom against submission to ecclesiastical authority. He persuaded himself that Rome was less friendly to the new empire than any other European power, and that it meant to unite against the new Protestant Empire all the Catholic nations of Europe and its own priesthood everywhere. To obtain definite information as to the relations of Rome and the Centre he demanded, in the spring of 1871, through the Bavarian ambassador at the Vatican, that Rome should censure the Centre party for its antagonistic attitude in the Parliament. A friendly answer was given him by the Holy See, but the censure of prominent members of the Centre, notably of Bishop Ketteler, Rome refused to further influence the Catholic party, whereat the indignation of the chancellor was boundless. In the meantime the South German Liberals, foremost among them Prince Heinrich zu und b. zu Hohenlohe-Ingelfingen, had lost all confidence in the Centre, the Catholic clergy, and Rome. Though for a while slow to act, he became daily more convinced that a grave peril for the empire existed in the activity of a powerful parliamentary party of German Catholics under the leadership of a man like Windthorst, and his Reichstag in need of a conservative reform of the Church, and Rome had no intention of abandoning Windthorst, but threatened, in case of refusal, to pillory the party before all Germany as an enemy of the Empire. Shortly afterwards he caused the house of a Polish canon in Posen to be searched by the police, in the hope of finding there correspondence that would enable him to justify his original mistrust of the Centre, the Catholic clergy, and Rome. Now the Catholic Movement, as he knew it since 1850, was for Bismarck something entirely hostile and had been friendly to Austria, and its adherents were numerous in Southern Germany and Westphalia. Moreover, its enthusiasm for Rome and for the independence of the Catholic Church was odious to him. As a Prussian official he believed in a State Church; the Church should not only be under the supervision of the State, but should positively serve the purposes of the State. It seemed, therefore, that the psychological moment had come for the arrest of this Catholic Movement. All Germany was enthusiastic over the new-born imperial unity. To judge by various occurrences within the ranks of Catholicism, it seemed as if Rome had gone too far in its claim of freedom of German Catholics in matters of faith. The Old-Catholic organization then taking shape seemed a likely nucleus for a German National Church, a State Church for Catholics; it would welcome all seceders from Rome and guarantee them a new ecclesiastical life. Old-Catholicism, he argued, must be supported; the Roman Catholic clergy forced to submit; the measures behind the Catholic Movement must be intimidated; the immediate pressure of Roman authority removed from them, and the Centre stigmatized before its constituents as an enemy of the German Empire.

II. Course of the Conflict.—It may be divided roughly into three periods: 1871–72; 1872–78; 1878–91.

A. 1871–72.—The afore-mentioned views of Bismarck concerning the danger of the Centre party were not without fruits. The measures by which Rome was forced to yield were by no means so clearly worked out in the summer of 1871 that he was ready then to begin a systematic onslaught on German Catholicism. For a year and a half his policy was manifested only in individual cases, though in all such cases a unity of attitude toward the Catholic Church was manifest. As early as July, 1871, he abolished the Catholic Section of the Prussian Ministry of Worship and gave over henceforth to officials in great majority Protestant the conduct of all governmental matters pertaining to Catholic churches and schools. His excuse was that the members of the aforesaid Catholic Section of the Department of Worship were guilty of too close relations with the Poles. Towards the end of 1871 he proceeded, on similar grounds, against the Catholic clergy of the eastern provinces of Prussia; he introduced at that time in the Reichstag a law concerning the supervision of instruction and education. This act contemplated the extension of the Jesuit instructions, and at the same time the abolition of ecclesiastical supervision of the primary-school system hitherto exercised conjointly with the civil authorities. Henceforth, whenever the schools of a district were entrusted to ecclesiastical superintendents, their authority was to be derived solely from the State; in large measure, moreover, the Catholic clergy were excluded from any supervision of the schools.

During the discussion of this School Supervision Law, Bismarck made an extremely violent attack (2 Feb., 1872) on Windthorst’s leadership of the Centre, held out to the left the new branch of a political party with the object of abandoning Windthorst, but threatened, in case of refusal, to pillory the party before all Germany as an enemy of the Empire. Shortly afterwards he caused the house of a Polish canon in Posen to be searched by the police, in the hope of finding there correspondence that would enable him to justify his original mistrust of the Centre, the Catholic clergy, and Rome. In this he was unsuccessful. On 4 July, 1872, the Reichstag passed the law against the Jesuits (Jesuitenbesetzung), on the plea that they were the emissaries of Rome in Germany (pretending at the same time to free the bishops from the Jesuit obedience); moreover, the influence of the Vatican over this party. In his eyes the Centre was an outcome of the German Catholic Movement (die katholische Bewegung); deprived of the support of the latter it would collapse. Now the Catholic Movement, as he knew it since 1850, was for Bismarck something entirely hostile and had been friendly to Austria, and its adherents were numerous in Southern Germany and Westphalia. Moreover, its enthusiasm for Rome and for the independence of the Catholic Church was odious to him. As a Prussian official he believed in a State Church; the Church should not only be under the supervision of the State, but should positively serve the purposes of the State. It seemed, therefore, that the psychological moment had come for the arrest of this Catholic Movement. All Germany was enthusiastic over the new-born imperial unity. To judge by various occurrences within the ranks of Catholicism, it seemed as if Rome had gone too far in its claim of freedom of German Catholics in matters of faith. The Old-Catholic organization then taking shape seemed a likely nucleus for a German National Church, a State Church for Catholics; it would welcome all seceders from Rome and guarantee them a new ecclesiastical life. Old-Catholicism, he argued, must be supported; the Roman Catholic clergy forced to submit; the measures
tion to the effect that "in the future he would obey in their entirety the laws of the State." He refused to make the declaration, whereupon his salary was witheld. A similar attitude was expressed by his foreign policy, which was soon shown in his famous papal election dispatch (14 May, 1872), in which he invited the European governments to agree on the conditions under which they would recognize the next papal election. The dispatch was ineffective, equally so Bismarck's attempt to compel the pope to accept, as the German Empire's first ambassador to the Vatican, Cardinal Hohenlohe, brother of the above-mentioned Prince Chlodwig Hohenlohe whose close relations to both National Liberals and Old Catholics were well-known. On this occasion Bismarck uttered the celebrated words: "Nach Cæsar den Cæsaren, nach Papst den Papst!" (We have a Caesar, i.e., he foretold the real issue of the conflict before it had yet fairly begun. Nevertheless he was now fully determined to carry it on to the end. He found a ready instrument in the person of Herr Falk, appointed Minister of Worship in January, 1872, a clever and personally well-meaning man, but a jurist of a very formalistic type and an extreme partisan. The chancellor had already, 7 Feb., 1872, urged the Min-
ister of the Interior to undertake the solution of the Polish question "on a basis of principle, actively, and aggressively"; he now engaged Falk to walk in the same course. He was "to make known with all due cleverness and in every sense the relations of the State to the various religious societies". On the side of the Church her defenders began now to seek the open. The Prussian hierarchy, assembled at Fulda for its an-
nual meeting, issued (20 Sept., 1872) a memorial to all the German States in which the recent anti-eclesiastic.

al laws were restated in the form of a judgment of public opinion, and proof supplied that rights of the Church hitherto acknowledged both by international and national law had been seriously violated. Pius IX, moreover, lifted his voice twice in protest. On the first occasion (24 June, 1872) he said to the German bishops in Rome that Bismarck had placed himself at the head of the persecutors of the Church. "Who knows, however, that but soon the little stone will fall from the mountain and strike the feet of the colossus and shatter it?" Another time (Christmas Consistory, 1872) he spoke reprovingly of "men who not only do not belong to our holy religion, but do not even know it, yet arrogate to themselves authority to decide concerning the doctrines and the rights of the Catholic Church." The popular agitation grew from day to day. The Association of Ger-
man Catholics (Mainzer Verein), founded under the presidency of Baron Felix von Loes, soon counted 200,000 members, and took a much bolder attitude than the Centre, whose leader, Windthorst, observed at all times much moderation.

In the meantime Falk aimed to make the Catholic bishops independent of Rome, the clergy independent of the bishops, and both dependent on the State. They were to be trained in courses designed to accomplish these aims. The education of the clergy was to depend entirely, or nearly so, on the State, and to be carried out in the spirit of the average German Liberalistic education. Next, all ecclesiastical offices were to be filled only after approval by the highest civil authority in each province. In the future all ecclesiastical courts outside Germany should no longer exercise any disciplinary power over the Prussian clergy. From all official Catholic bodies was to lie, in the future, an appeal not only on the part of the accused, but also of the Chief President (on grounds of public interest), to a court composed of civil officials and to be known as the "Royal Court of Justice for Ecclesiastical Affairs". Falk sought also to restrict con-
cerning bishop and clergy on one side, and the bishop and Rome on the other, were intimately bound to one another. He erred most grievously, however, when he made it a criminal offence for any priest to exercise his ministry without due authorization from the civil power, and "silenced" every bishop who refused to comply with the new legislation. In case the German clergy remained loyal to the Church these measures meant the withdrawal of the sacraments from the Catholic people, i.e., the most grievous spiritual suffering. The plans of Falk were formulated in four bills. The first was laid before the Landtag in No-

vember, 1872. (The Catholic Party, i.e., the Centre, although the royal consent was obtained with difficulty and only after insistence on the severity of the afo-

said papal allocution at Christmas of 1872. It was during the discussion of these Falk Bills that the word Kulturkampf was first used. The Landtag (Prus-

sian Assembly) Commission to which the Falk Bills were referred expressed grave doubts as to their constitu-
tional validity, seeing that the Prussian Constitution guaranteed to the Catholic Church an independent ad-
ministration of her own affairs. The Commission did not, therefore, advise the rejection of the Falk Bills, but rather proposed an amendment to the Constitu-
tion to the effect that in all her administration the Church was subject to the laws of the State and the jurisprudential authorized supervision of the same. B. 1875-78. This amendment and the four bills were adopted in May, 1873, hence the term May Laws (Maiengesetz). To hasten their execution the Prussian Ministry at once called the Old Catholics to establish themselves as a Church, and contributed large sums for that purpose. It also encouraged the public adhesion of so-called State Catholics, i.e., Roman Catholics who protested formally their willingness to obey the new laws. Nevertheless, both Old Catho-

lics and State Catholics raised a storm in Rome. On the other hand the unexpected happened in the shape of a remarkable development of ecclesiastical loyalty on the part of the Catholics. The bishops of Prussia had protested beforehand (30 January, 1873) against the forthcoming legislation. On 2 May they issued a common pastoral letter in which they made known to the faithful the reasons why all must offer to these laws a passive but unanimous resistance. On 26 May they declared to the Prussian Ministry that they would not co-operate for the execution of the Falk Laws. Almost without exception the clergy obeyed the mandate of the bishops. Thereupon the punish-
ments prescribed by the laws for their violation were at once applicable; in hundreds of cases fines were soon imposed on the clergy for the execution of their ecclesiastical ministry. As none of the condemned ecclesiastics would voluntarily pay the imposed fines, these were forcibly collected, to the great irritation and suffering of the condemned. Some of the principales began to open, and Falk declared (24 Oct., 1873) that still greater severity would be used. The Ministry of War declared Catholic theological students subject to military service; the Marian congregations were forbidden to exist; the Catholic popular associa-
tions and the political activity of the Centre (public meetings, Catholic press) was subjected to close and
inimical supervision, in every way hindered, and the Catholic population persecuted for their fidelity to
the party. In December, 1873, changes were made in the
organization of the party by the bishops. Reference
to their oath to the pope was stricken out, and an
unconditional observance of the laws of the
State prescribed. These measures, however, did not
produce the desired results. In the November elec-
tions (1873) the Centre returned to the Landtag 90
members instead of its former 56, and to the Reichstag
91 instead of its former 63. The number of its votes
was doubled, and reached about 1,500,000. The num-
ber of Catholic papers increased in 1873 to about 120.
Falk sought to overcome all this Catholic opposi-
tion by fresh ravages on the pastoral ministry. New
laws of the Landtag (May, 1874) supplemented his
authority and put at his disposal new means of
expulsion. It was provided that when a bishop was de-
posed a representative agreeable to the Government
should be appointed; if none such were to be had, ap-
pointments to vacant parishes should lie in the hands
of the "patron" in each parish, or should be taken
by the bishops in consultation with the bishop of the
province. The Reichstag aided by passing a Priests-Expulsion Law (Priester-
ausweisungsgesetz) by which all priests deprived of
their offices for violation of the May Laws were turned
over to the discretion of the police authorities.
During the debates on this law the Archbishops of Posen
and Cologne and the Bishop of Trier were condemned
to imprisonment; later, the Archbishop of Posen
(Count Ledochowski) was deposed. Shortly after
the promulgation of the new May Laws the Ministry saw
it to that all the Prussian sees were vacated. A very
great number of parishes were also deprived of their
pastors. The ecclesiastical educational institutions
were closed. These renewed efforts were no more suc-
cessful than the former measures. No cathedral chap-
ter chose an administrator, and no parish elected a
parish priest. The exiled bishops governed their sees
from abroad through secretly delegated priests. The
faithful everywhere made it possible to hold Divine
Service. The pope declared, 5 Feb., 1875, the May
Laws invalid (irrītās). On all sides exasperation was
well-nigh boundless.

Under these circumstances Bismarck himself took
charge of the situation. His main hope still lay in
proposing the Centre party to his Germany. This empire,
and this stigma he endeavoured by all possible
means to fasten upon it; could he do so, the party
would be isolated in the Reichstag, and soon helpless.
At Kissingen, 13 July, 1874, the Catholic cooperator,
Kullmann, attempted to assassinate him. Though the
chancellor had no evidence to justify his assertion,
he declared in a public session of the Reichstag
that the murderer "held to the coat-tails of the
Centre", and refused to consider any denial of the
charge by that party. Bismarck now called to his
aid two allies which in the past he had always found
serviceable in face of great popular opposition, i. e.
his assistant of the Centre party. The new influence
offered considerably from those of Falk. The latter
saw in the religious life of the Catholic people their
chief fortress, and so attacked it with all earnestness,
hoping to meet with victory in the tumultuary reac-
tion likely to follow any interference with the spiritual
necessities of the people. In this there was for Bismarck
too much idealism; he chose rather to appeal to the
material needs of his opponents. On 22 April,
1875, he obtained from the Landtag the so-called
Sperrgesetz, by which all state payments to the
Catholic bishops were withheld until they or their
representatives complied with the new laws. Another
law of the Landtag (31 May, 1875) closed all
monasteries in Prussia, and expelled from Prussian
territory all members of religious orders, with the ex-
ception of those who cared for the sick—and they were
variously restricted. Finally (20 June, 1875), he dealt
the Catholic Church what seemed to him a crushing
blow; on that date was passed in the Landtag a law
which confiscated all the property of the Church, and
at the same time sanctioned the election of the bishops
by the members of each parish. To accom-
plish this he had previously to commit another act of
supreme violence, i. e. the abolition of those para-
graphs of the Prussian Constitution which concerned
the Church. The aforesaid Kanadeparagraf, or "pulpit-
law", was added by the Reichstag (6 Feb., 1876)
so as to enable the Government to prosecute before
the criminal courts any priest who should criticise
in the pulpit the laws or the administration of the
Prussian State. In the following years sixteen mil-
ion marks (83,250,000) were withheld by the Govern-
ment from the Church, by virtue of the Sperrgesetz;
two hundred and ninety-six monastic institutions
were closed. By the end of 1880, 1125 parish priests
and 645 assistants had fallen victims to the new
laws (out of 4627 and 3812, respectively).
In the circle of their operation 646,000 souls were ent-
tirely deprived of spiritual assistance. With this ad-
dition the Falk Ordinance of 18 Feb., 1876, issued
with Bismarck's consent, by which in the future reli-
gious instruction in the primary schools was to be
given only by teachers appointed or accepted by the
State, i. e., all Catholic ecclesiastical control was
suppressed.

The debates on all these measures were the most
violent ever heard in the German Parliament; it was
apparent that on both sides the leadership would soon
fall to the extremists. On the Catholic side, there-
fore, evidences of moderation were soon forthcoming,
and tended to prevent further extreme measures on
the part of the Government. The bishops felt that
the gravest perils had been successfully met and
averted. The earliest relief was the result of legisla-
tion originally intended to do great damage to the
Catholic cause. The Prussian Civil Marriage Law of
March, 1874 (extended to the German Empire, 6 Feb.,
1875), withdrew from the clergy their former right of
keeping the civil registers, and made civil marriage
obligatory. It was hoped that in this way the laity at
least would be freed from ecclesiastical control, since
neither bishops nor clergy were willing to separate
from Rome. Under the circumstances, however, the
introduction of the compulsory state marriage Law of
the Church. Had marriages remained possible only in
the presence of civilly recognized priests, the Catholic
population, in the end, given the absolute necessity
of marriages, would have had to accept one of two issues:
either they would tolerate the state clergy, or they
would bring pressure to bear on the Catholic clergy
in the sense of obedience to the new laws. On the other
hand the bishops met successfully Bismarck's securali-
ation of the Church property. They declared that in
this respect it was material interests which were chiefly
at stake, and in such cases the Church was always in-
clined to the most conciliatory measures; confiding
therefore, in the ecclesiastical loyalty of the Catholics
they directed them to obey these laws. In the mean-
time by the laws of 7 June, 1876, and 13 Feb., 1878,
Bismarck undertook to sequestrate all Church prop-
erty; he had already failed, however, in his original
purpose. Windthorst, on the other hand, strove earn-
estly to keep as much as possible of the Catholic
Church and to incline them to peace with the Gov-
ernment as soon as the ecclesiastical situation would
permit. In this temper a reconciliation was evidently
no longer remote, much less impossible. It was now
clear to Bismarck that the popular agitation had
reached a height that no material force could control,
and that the civil authority itself was endan-
gered. The chief motive that had originally led him
to enter on this grave conflict with German Catholi-
stem had long since disappeared; since 1875 he no longer feared an anti-German coalition of Catholic powers or a war with Russia. In the meantime those closer relations with Austria had begun; which in 1879 terminated in the actual Triple Alliance. His new foreign policy brought with it a frequent rapprochement with the Catholics. In the Reichstag he could no longer act quite independently of them, and this was another factor in the future reconciliation. The National Liberals in the Reichstag had ceased to be his unconditional supporters in the grave questions of internal reform (politico-economic, social, and financial) that the Catholics and the National Liberals had continued to press. The continued opposition of so large a party as the Centre was henceforth an element of grave danger for all his plans. Conservative Protestants, meanwhile, rebelled against the Liberalism of Falk, which under the circumstances was far more offensive to them than to Catholics. Moreover, Emperor Wilhelm inclined daily more in their direction. Indeed, the position of Falk had become practically untenable.

C. 1878-91.—The death of Pius IX and the election of Leo XIII (Feb., 1878) made possible the restoration of peace in the much troubled Fatherland. At once, and for the first time, in a conciliatory way to Kaiser Wilhelm urging the abolition of the May Laws. His request was refused; at the same time Berlin expressed a desire for reconciliation. In July, 1878, Bismarck had a personal interview with the papal nuncio, Maesia, at Kissingen in Bavaria. However, a full decade was yet to intervene before the May Laws quite disappeared. The proposed basis of negotiations was not calculated at this juncture to bring about the much desired peace. Bismarck insisted that the May Laws should not be abolished by any formal act; he was willing, however, to modify their application, obtain gradually from the Landtag termination of the class struggle, greater freedom of laws, remove certain odious points, etc., all on this condition of a yielding attitude on the side of the Catholics. The latter, indeed, were in this respect praise-worthy. Bismarck further desired that in all measures of relief the Government should appear to take the initiative—of course after proper diplomatic negotiations with Rome. In return he demanded from the Curia an assurance that the Centre party would support the policies of the Government; otherwise the latter could have no interest in a reconciliation.

As a proof of good will he dismissed Herr Falk in 1878; by the law claiming all May Laws. The retiring Herr Puttkamer, whose ecclesiastico-political attitude was more conciliatory than that of his predecessor. Under him the Church began to regain its former influence over the schools. He obtained from the Landtag on three occasions (1880-83) discretionary authority to modify the May Laws; thereby he provided for a restoration of orderly diocesan administration, and the filling of the vacant sees. The vacant parishes, it is true, remained yet without pastors; it was allowed however, to administer them from neighbouring parishes. After 1883 the Sperregezez, or suspension of clerical offices, was not enforced. In 1884 Prussia established an embassy at the Vatican. Bismarck in the meantime held firmly to one point: the obligation of the bishop to make known to the Government all ecclesiastical appointments, and the Government’s right of veto. This much Rome was not disinclined to allow, but demanded a previous formal abolition of the May Laws. It was of no account. Leopold XIII was very anxious to re-establish peace and harmony with Germany, and for that reason chose for his secretary of state, in 1881, Lodovico Jacobini, who had been nuncio at Vienna since 1879, and had conducted the preliminary negotiations. During the negotiations of the papal diplomacy consisted in the excessive stress it laid on the purely politico-ecclesiastical elements of the problem (those which affected the general European situation of the Church), not sufficiently taking into account the fundamental source of the conflict, i.e., the violation of the constitutional law at Prussia. From this point of view it did not seek to co-operate with the tactics of the Centre in that party’s dealings with Bismarck: but it resolved to give permanency to the exertions of his party, to again anchor the rights of the Church in the Prussian Constitution, and to make the latter document guarantee once again the independence of the Church. During these years of more or less fruitful negotiations between Rome and Berlin, the political power of the Centre in the Reichstag grew notoriously; the Government was no longer able to count on a majority against it. By this time the Conservatives had again obtained the upper hand in the Landtag, and soon made evident their intention to abolish completely the Falk system of interference with the disciplinary affairs of the Catholics. The Centre party, however, after all these years, had established a sort of protection, or obligation of making known to the Government all ecclesiastical appointments, with the corresponding civil right of veto. He believed, apparently, that the Kulturkampf agitation would gradually die out, and that the Catholic people grew weary of “a struggle for the constitution and freedom of the independence of the Church”, now that the most burdensome of the May Laws had been withdrawn and a somewhat orderly ecclesiastical life was again possible.

In the meantime the Centre party and its press kept alive a strong Catholic feeling. On the other hand, the foreign situation soon brought up the question of the final abolition of the May Laws. Bismarck was again anxious in regard to Russia, and this time feared an alliance of that nation with France; the recent awakening of Panasium added to his solicitude on this point. He was concerned lest the Vatican should favour the French attacks on Russia. On the other hand he now sought to rally all forces at the disposal of the Government for the suppression of the Polish movement that had by this time taken on large proportions; owing to his Kulturkampf policy, all classes of the Polish people had been deeply stirred during the previous decade, and their attitude now caused the chancellor great anxiety. He hoped, also, that a decisive ending of the ecclesiastical conflict would seriously affect the hitherto intact solidarity of the Centre and weaken notably the popular attachment to the party, whereby its influence, even yet the source of his great political difficulties, would finally diminish. Leo XIII saw clearly that Bismarck was now earnestly desirous of peace; Rome, therefore, it seemed, need no longer be over-timid in the matter of concessions based on suitable guarantees. The pope also hoped that Bismarck would in turn be helpful to him in respect of the German imperial policy towards Italy. Important in this matter was the juncture the most statesmanlike member of the Prussian hierarchy, Bishop Kopp of Hildesheim (now Cardinal, and Prince-Bishop of Breslau), was made a member of the Prussian House of Lords (Herrenkammer). Bismarck still held with tenacity to the former government claims of the Kingdom of Prussia, and as the nominations of parish priests at least should not take place without the Government’s approval. Nor
would be listen to the restoration of the former recognition of the Church by the Prussian Constitution. Finally, he held in its entirety to the state control of the schools. In reality he was able to maintain these three points; on the other hand he yielded to the Church, practically, the control of ecclesiastical education, permitted the re-assertion of the papal disciplinarity of the clergy, allowed the restoration of public worship and the administration of the sacraments, the application of ecclesiastical disciplinary measures (censures, etc.), and held out to the religious orders the hope of returning. This is substantially the content of the two comprehensive laws (21 March, 1885, and 29 April, 1887), that modified the ecclesiastical Laws in an acceptable way and thereby ended formally the long conflict since known as the Kulturkampf.

During the negotiations for the first law the pope had allowed the bishops (25 April, 1886) to lay before the Government for approval the appointment of parish priests. While the second law was under discussion the pope declared that it showed the way to peace, while Bismarck termed it the restoration of a modus vivendi between State and Church. The Centre was deeply suspicious of both laws because the pope did not insist on constitutional guarantees; the interval between these laws, in view of them, the chancellor made a last attempt to obtain through Rome the support of the Centre for his military policy and the foreign aims it implied. He wished the Centre to vote in the Reichstag for the so-called Septennate. A correspondence ensued between Cardinal Jacobini and the President of the Centre Party; Windthorst was not to be moved from his position. It may be said that the hopes of Leo XIII in Bismarck's help respecting Italy were deceived. In the following years the last remnants of the May Laws disappeared. The law prescribing the expulsion of all priests from the government agencies was withdrawn in 1890, and in 1891 the Sitzverbot (i.e. the ecclesiastical salaries, etc., withheld since April, 1875) were distributed to the various German dioceses. For a while it seemed as if another grave conflict would follow, this time apropos of the schools. However, since the early nineties there has prevailed the present quiescent attitude in all matters ecclesiastical and educational. It may be added that the anti-Jesuit legislation was so modified in 1903 as to offer no longer its former exceptional character; the Redemptorists had been previously allowed to return. One important consequence of the Kulturkampf was the earnest endeavor by which Catholics strove in common with the Protestant denominations, so weak they formerly were in both respects was clear to them only after the great conflict had begun. These efforts took the name of the Paritätsschweigungen, i.e. a struggle for equality of civil recognition. In turn the discussions awakened and fed by this movement soon led to a vigorous self-questioning among the Catholic masses as to the fact of, and the reasons for, their backwardness in academic, literary, and artistic life, also in the large field of economic activities (industry, commerce, etc.). On the other hand the reconciliation between Church and State made it possible for the Catholics of Germany to participate more earnestly than hitherto in the public life of the Fatherland, in illustration of which we may point to the notable contributions of the Centre Party (1896–1904) to the solution of the great imperial problems of that period. At present it seems possible that it may be said that the Kulturkampf rightly appears as only the first phase of the vast movement of antagonism in which Catholicism stands over against Protestantism and Liberalism, on the broad field of Prussia, henceforth one of the great powers of Europe, and within that German nation now coexistent in the political unity of the Empire.

Kulturkampf, Kulturkampf und Maienvergebung in Staatstextikon

Gerrnegengleichheit, 2. Aufl. (Freiburg, 1902). III: SIEGFRIED, Alttestamentliche betreffend den preussischen Kulturkampf (1882); F. X. SCHULZE, Geschichte des Kulturkampfes in Preussen (1882), and Geschichte der ersten sieben Jahre des Volksbundes mit dem Reich, I: Der Schulkauf, 2d. ed. (1879); MAJUNKE, Geschichte des Kulturkampfes in Preussen (1881); Gisbert, Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert, I, ed. KIRBLING (1807); HAHN, Geschichte des Kulturkampfes in Preussen (1881); HUBER, Ludwig Windthorst (1907); SPÄH, Ernest Lippe (1906), and Das deutsche Christentum (1897); HERMAN, Bismarck’s Conviction with the York Church, in Am. Cath. Quart. Rev. (1884), 322 sqq.; O’BREY, Bismarck’s Decisions and Fall, etc. (1911); The Imperialist Fortress, Prince Bismarck and the Centre, ibid. (1880), 390 sqq.; IDEM, Windthorst, ibid. (1891), 515 sqq.

Martin Späh.

Kulturkampf, Dioecese of (Kumbakonensis).—Kumbakonam, signifying in English the “Jug’s Corner,” is a town of 60,000 inhabitants, and is situated in the fertile plain of the Tanjore District about halfway on the railroad which connects Madras with Tuticorin. Although of no great importance to the British Raj (dominion), still, as a religious centre, it enjoys a wide popularity among the Hindus as the seat of one of their holiest shrines in the south of the peninsula. Nothing positive is known of the origin of this shrine, but a mythological legend says that, some time before the Deluge, the mighty god Shiva, desiring to preserve against the coming cataclysm, directed Brahma to get ready an earthen pitcher wherein he could place in safety on a layer of ambrosia, the spark of creative power, the Vedas, and a supply of corn-seed. Brahma having done this, Siva closed the jug and set it on Mount Meru. When the waters prevailed upon the earth, the precious vessel was lifted up by the flood and tossed about upon the waves, until, at last, it rested on the very spot where is now the “sacred” tank of Kumbakom, called the Maghamagham. From time immemorial a solemn festival has been celebrated once in every twelve years to commemorate this event. It begins on the day of February when Jupiter is in conjunction with the full moon in the lunar constellation called Magham. The Hindus believe that, on this occasion, the waters of the “sacred” tank are fecundated by those of the “divine” Ganges, and that whoever bathes in them on the first day of the month is pardoned of all his sins, but also opens the gates of salvation to every one of his ancestors up to the one hundred and eightieth generation. This duodenal solemnity took place recently (1909). It began at the temple of Kumbeshwur, the “Lord of the Jug,” and lasted ten days, during which a greater number of pilgrims and ablations in the Maghamagham. Kumbakonam, seen through European glasses, is a rather dirty and dusty town with vulgar, tortuous streets, where, with the exception of several pagodas, very few buildings are worthy of attention. However, one of these treasures possesses several ancient sculptures and a very valuable library of Sanskrit books. Though not properly speaking an industrial or commercial town, its silk-dyeing, silk-weaving, chintz-stamping, and especially metal industries have won a good repute for its artisans in the South of India. The glory of Kumbakonam is found in the number of learned people who live in it, and in the comparatively high percentage of the young who receive a liberal education in its schools. The college, conducted on distinctly English lines, is under the management of a European gentleman, who is seconded by an efficient body of native teachers. The institution is a national institution for girls. The “big school,” which numbers about 250 students, is placed under the tuition of native Catholic nuns, paid by the municipality. The diocese, which was created in 1899, is entirely on British territory, although it is suffragan to Pondicherry (the capital of French India). It is bounded on the north by the River Vellar, on the west and
south by the Caavy (which divides it from the Dioceses of Madura and Coimbatore), on the east by the Bay of Bengal and the French territory of Karikal. It includes part of the British civil districts of Tanjore, Trichinopoly, South Arcot, and Sale. The first and perhaps the most important is Ormoe's Society of Foreign Missions (Paria), author of the first Catholic version of the Bible in Tamil, and editor of several classical and devotional books in both this and the Bengali languages. The diocesan numbers 85,000 native Catholics (out of a population of about 3,000,000), evangelized by 50 priests, 65 brother-priests, 111 catechists, and 1,000 laymen. In the mission there are 76 schools, with 3,400 children in attendance, 5 orphanages, 4 dispensaries and a hospital under care of the French nuns. A native Catholic gentleman has built at Perumpannuyur a monument church at a cost of about 135,000 dollars (four lacs of rupees), and has also richly endowed it.

H. M. Bottero.

Kumigonde, Blessed. See Cunkundes, Blessed.

Kutenai Indians, an important tribe of southeastern British Columbia and the adjacent portions of Montana and Idaho, occupying chiefly the present Kootenay County, B. C., but formerly also the Selkirk Range, from about 52° southwards, including the basins of the Kootenay and Lower Columbia rivers, and extending to Lake Pend d'Oreille in Idaho. They constitute a distinct linguistic stock, designated as the Kitunahan, from the proper name, Kitunag. The meaning of this name is unknown, but it occurs in the form of Cattanahowes on the Mackenzie map of 1801. To their Salishan neighbours they are known as Kalzi, "lake, or water, people", and to the French as Arcas-à-plats, anglicized Flat-bows. They have a distinct tradition of having formerly lived in the plains east of the Rockies, whence they were probably driven by the Blackfeet, their hereditary enemies. Up to a recent period they were in the habit of making annual descents into the Plains, in company with the Flatheads, Kalispel, and Nez Perces, for the purpose of hunting the buffalo. They are commonly differentiated as Upper and Lower (or Flatbow proper), approximately in British Columbia and the United States respectively, with several minor subdivisions and two main dialects. Physically the Kutenai rank as the tallest and best built Indians of British Columbia, being also almost entirely free from blood diseases. They are noted for the ready manner with which they have adopted the European mode of dissipation so prevalent among other tribes of the region. Intellectually they are more stable and capable of continuous mental exertion, while concurrent testimony of traders, travellers, and missionaries places them in the first rank for morality, honesty, reliability, and manly qualities. In their primitive condition the Kutenai lived in small skin or mat-covered tipis, of which the universal sweat lodge (see Indians) was always an important adjunct. They subsisted by hunting, fishing, and the gathering of wild berries and roots, particularly camas (Camassia: see Flatbows for above) upon which the Kutenai are dependent in times of fish for winter. They made no pottery, but were expert basket-weavers, boiling their food in water-tight baskets by means of heated stones. They dressed in buckskin, painted their faces in bright colours, and wore their hair full length, either braided or flowing. Their social organization was extremely stable, and in no trace of the clans or subclans or secret societies common to most other tribes of the region. Each band had its own chief, hereditary in a certain family, who was assisted by a council. Both slavery and polygamy existed, the slaves being captives taken in war. Slaves when free were punished by cutting off one or both ears, and this was inflicted on the adult members of the tribe as a penalty. Orphan children were adopted by their relatives, while near relatives were not allowed to marry. Murder was compounded by a fine or punished with death by the family of the victim. The dead were buried in the ground with all their worldly goods, and the debts of the deceased were paid by the surviving relatives. The religion was the usual Indian Animism, with the Sun, personified as a woman, being the highest and most Bountiful in the world, and to whose homage the spirits of the dead journeyed, to rejoin their friends later in this world at a place of sacred pilgrimage on the shore of Lake Pend d'Oreille. Tabus, fasting, and sacrifice were a part of the system, and the shaman doctors exercised great influence. Among their greatest ceremonies was the feast following the death of a chief, held at a large camp on Kutenai River, U. S., De Smet himself celebrated "the first Mass ever offered in their land" and set up the cross of a mission, which he named in honour of the day "The Assumption". The mission of the Sacred Heart of Mary was founded on the Tobacco Plains, B. C., within the next year, a whole tribe, with the exception of a portion of the Lower Kutenai, accepted almost at once the new faith, in which they have remained steadfast and exemplary ever since. Those within the United States are chiefly gathered upon the Flathead reservation, Montana, by treaty of 1863, where they are still under Jesuit teaching, while some few in Idaho probably retain their old beliefs. Those in British Columbia are under the ministry of the Oblate Fathers, who, assisted by the Sisters of Charity, conduct a successful mission school at Saint-Eugene, near Fort Steele. The school was established in 1874 by Father Leon Fouquet, the first of the Oblates to enter the Kutenai field. The great majority have long since adopted the ways of civilisation, and subside by farming, stockraising, and labouring in the lumber camps and for the white ranchers. The official Canadian report (1908) describes them as "enlightened" in "labor, law and order, and law abiding", "temperate and moral", and "progressing", while the mission work "deserves the greatest praise". In spite of several great epidemic visitations in years past, notably smallpox, the Kutenai have held their own well, thanks to their innate manliness and to their strict observance of the precepts inculcated by their religious teachers. They probably number now nearly as many as at any period in their history and even seem to have largely increased within the past twenty years. Official reports for 1908 give them about 1120 souls, viz: British Columbia, Kootenay Agency, 613; Montana Agency, 406.

Our principal authorities on the Kutenai are: CHAMBERLAIN, De Smet, and the official reports. Consult: CHAMBERLAIN, "Indians in Kootenay Indians in Report" (London, 1892); IDEN, Kootenay Indians in Ontario Archaeological Report (Toronto, 1905); IDEN, Some Kutenai Linguistic Material (London, 1891); IDEN, Anthropologists (London, 1887); BROWN, Indian and European Travels (London, 1845); MONICHE, Catholic Church in Western Canada (Toronto, 1910); SIBA, Catholic Missions (New York); De Smet, Our Mission Saints (Toronto, 1904); TRAVELS of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs (U. S.), and of Department of Indian Affairs (Canada) (Ottawa).

James Mooney.

Kwango, Prefecture Apostolic of.—Kwango is the name of a river which flows into the Kassai, which itself is a tributary of the River Congo. The Mission (missione Kwangenses) formed part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Belgian Congo till 8 April, 1892, when a decree was issued, entrusting this new mission to the
Jesuit Fathers of the Belgian province. The late Father Emile van Henhoutzen (1852-1908) was its first superior. He left Belgium 6 March, 1893, with two fathers, one scholastic and two lay brothers, and reached the mission towards the end of May. Unfortunately, owing to the hardships of the voyage, one of the Fathers died on the way. By decree of 30 January, 1903, the Kwango mission was made a prefecture Apostolic (Prefectura Apostolica Kwangensi), the first prefect Apostolic being Father Julian Banckaert, S.J., whose residence is at Kisantu, the chief mission station. The prefecture comprises the civil districts of Eastern Kwango and that of Stanley Pool. It is situated on the Kwango River 25° 30' to 27° E. longitude. Its boundaries are to the north the Kwango River, to the east the range of hills between Rivers Loange and Jumua; to the south Portuguese territory; to the west the River Inkisi and the railway to Leopoldville. The Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur have two important institutions at Kisantu and at Ntemfu, where they provide for more than one thousand native girls. Julian Banckaert, S.J., was born at Bruges in 1847, entered the diocesan seminary, and was ordained in 1871. He joined the Society of the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart at the age of 25. There he was successively a missionary, superior of the mission, and military chaplain, till in 1901, he was sent to the Kwango mission.

**Kwango.**

**J. Banckaert.**

**Kwango, prefecture Apostolic of.**—The mission of Kwango comprises the entire province of that name. As a country, it is very mountainous and extremely poor. The province has a population of about ten million souls divided among several distinct races, the most remarkable of whom are the settlers from Canton, the Hakka, and the wild Yao-tse and Misao-tse. The first missionary to Kwango was the Jesuit Father Ruggieri, who in 1583 endeavoured without success to establish himself at the capital, Kwei-lin. Fifty years later, the Franciscan, Francesco d'Eccalonne, arrived at Wu-chou. About the middle of the seventeenth century, Father Koffer built a church at Kwei-lin and baptized at Nan-ning, under the name of Constantine, a son of the Emperor Yung-il, a pretender to the throne who was still combated in the southern part of the empire the advancing Manchu conquerors. Father Boyum laboured in company with Father Koffer. In 1692 Father Jacques Vital endeavoured to give further impulse to the work of his predecessors, and then came Fathers Chamaya and Lopez. At the same time the Spanish Augustinians established themselves at Kwei-lin and Wu-chou, and the Franciscans at Ping-fo fu. All were expelled in 1724 by the Emperor Yung Cheng, and Kwango thenceforward remained without missionaries for a hundred and thirty years. In 1848 Kwango, united to the mission of Kwang-tung, was confided to the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. In 1854 Blessed Auguste Chapdelaine first entered the province from Kwei-lin, but was arrested and thrown into the prison of Si-lin-hien ten days after his arrival. Liberated after sixteen or eighteen days of captivity, he ministered under this date but baptized several hundred catechumens, but he was again arrested, taken to Si-lin, condemned to death, and executed on 29 February of the same year, with Blessed Lawrence Pe-mu and Agnes Tsau-kong. In 1866 several missionaries again penetrated Kwang-si, but were unable to return to Europe. In 1868 Father Mileur was appointed superior to the mission of Kwei-lin. Under his direction several missionaries were able to enter the province. Among them was Father Foucard, who evangelized Shang-sze, while labouring in the disguise of a wood-cutter to avoid arousing the suspicions of the mandarins.

On 6 August, 1875, Pius IX made Kwango a prefecture Apostolic, and placed it under the authority of Father Jolly, previously missionary in Kwang-tung. At this same period were founded the districts of Kwei-hien and of the “hundred thousand mountains” among the wild Yao-tse. Father Jolly died in 1878, and Mgr Foucard was named bishop of Zela and Prefect Apostolic of Kwang-si. The Chinese authorities placed many obstacles in the way of the free spread of the Gospel. Mgr Foucard was obliged to proceed personally to Pekin and demand justice, but he obtained no satisfaction. The Franco-Chinese War in 1884 served to increase the difficulties of this mission. Fathers afterwards entrusted to the care of Father Fathers with cruel treatment and several Christian communities were uprooted. Only the communities established among the savages and at Si-lin enjoyed relative tranquillity. Mgr Foucard died in 1889, and was succeeded by Mgr Chopuy. Under the direction of the new prefect, other communities were established, and finally a certain measure of liberty was accorded to the missionaries. Often, however, sudden revolts seriously interfered with their labours. Two missionaries, Fathers Mazel and Bertholet, were massacred in different districts. In 1899 Mgr Chopuy died, and in the following year Mgr Lavestenigal was appointed prefect. During the Boxer troubles but three residences and a few other houses belonging to Christians were pillaged. Mgr Lavest subsequently moved his residence from Kwei-hien to Nan-ning, intending to erect a cathedral at the latter place. Two French schools have been established, one at Nan-ning and one at Kwei-lin, by the Little Brothers of Mary. Nuns of St. Paul of Chartres have established themselves at Nan-ning and Long-chau. During 1908 they have relieved 4000 sufferers at their dispensary in Nan-ning and 4000 at that in Long-chau.

The following figures give the condition of the mission at the various periods named: In 1889, 1 bishop, 11 missionaries, 1 seminary, 21 schools with 211 pupils, 16 churches and chapels, 1249 Catholics. In 1900, 1 bishop, 17 missionaries, 1 seminary with 16 students, 24 schools with 310 scholars, 32 churches and chapels, 110 baptisms of native adults and 61 baptisms of native children, 1536 Catholics. In 1908, 1 bishop, 27 missionaries, 4 native priests, 2 seminaries with 16 students, 34 schools with 379 pupils, 311 baptisms of adults, and 113 baptisms of native children, 4214 Catholics.

**Kwang, Prefecture Apostolic of.**—This prefecture comprises the whole province of that name except the civil prefecture of Shing-hing, the three districts of Heung-shan, Yan-ping, and Yeung-taun, which belong to the Diocese of Macao, and the three districts of San-on, Kwai-shin, and Hoi-fung, which belong to the Vicariate Apostolic of Hong-Kong.

St. Francis Xavier was the first missionary who attempted to penetrate the province of Kwang-tung (1552), but he died in the Island of Shang-ch'wan (St. John's Island), south-west of Macao, before he was able to preach Christianity there. In 1556 Father Melchior Barreto penetrated as far as Canton, where he was discussed with the mandarins; other priests followed, and in 1571 Father Ruggieri secured authorization to open a chapel. In 1582 the real founder of Christianity in China, Father Matteo Ricci, arrived at Canton. From Canton Father Ricci went to Shing-hing, then the capital of the province, and afterwards to Shing-chou, where he died for the first time in the celebration of the Mass of Kiang-nan. He then travelled towards Kwang-si and Nanking, establishing on the way Christian settlements, which have persevered to the present time. Until 1658 Kwang-tung was dependent on the Diocese of Macao. In that year it was confided to Mgr de la
Motte Lambert. The priests of the Missions Etrangères then preached there together with the Jesuits, the Franciscans, and the Dominicans. From 1682 to 1710, Mgr de Guéméné and Fathers de Céde and Duppaq established themselves at Shen-chou. The tomb of Mgr de Guéméné (d. 1704) is at Shin-chou, as is also that of Père Lirot (d. 1720). When the persecution of Emperor Yong-ching broke out in 1732 there were 30,000 Christians in the province of Kwang-tung, but all the missionaries were then expelled.

From that time until 1844, when Mgr de Lagrenée obtained the proclamation of religious liberty, the missionaries did not enter Kwang-tung except in disguise. The bishops of Macao had meanwhile regained jurisdiction over the province, but the number of Christians tended by native priests had fallen to 7000 or 8000. On 30 September, 1848, the Congregation of the Propaganda confided this mission to the Société des Missions Étrangères de Paris without removing all jurisdiction from the Bishop of Macao. Father Libois, procurator of the Société de Hong-Kong, was named prefect Apostolic, and Father Guillemin having a mission in Siam, was sent to supervise the province. The progress was slow at first: there were 115 baptisms of adults in 1851, 214 in 1854. In 1853 Father Guillemin was named prefect Apostolic instead of Father Libois. A persecution broke out, and seven missionaries were arrested and thrown in prison. Mgr Guillemin, having a mission in Siam, was sent to end them on 8 Aug., 1856, by nominating Father Guillemin Bishop of Cybistra in partibus infidelium, and by giving him on 17 September, 1858, complete jurisdiction over Kwang-tung, Kwang-si, and Hainan. In 1856 Blessed Auguste Chapdelaine was martyred in Kwang-si with two companions, Blessed Laurence Pe-nu and Blessed Agnes Chow-kong.

As the result of the Anglo-French expedition which ended in the taking of Peking, a treaty was signed on 25 October, 1800. This was the signal for wider liberty for the missionaries. In compensation for the churches which had been destroyed and the property which had been taken from the mission, the bishop obtained the site of the ancient palace of the viceroy, on which were built the seminary and orphanages. With the assistance of Napoleon Il and the Catholics of France was also built the fine cathedral of Canton, on the island of Taishang, a faithful replica of the Par Diast. A chapel in honour of St. Francis Xavier was built at Shang-ch'wan, and this island became a place of pilgrimage for the faithful of Hong-Kong, Macao, and Canton. Baptisms became more numerous, amounting to 740 in 1862 and to 922 in 1867. There were some 300,000 Catholics in 1869. In 1875 the Province of Kwang-si was separated from the Mission of Kwang-tung, while the island of Hai-nan and the district of Heung-shan were ceded to the Diocese of Macao. Three districts were given to the priests of the Missions Etrangères, the Cantonese, which was ministered to 15,000 Catholics; in 1880 it had 23,730 under its care. In 1881, Mgr Guillemin, worn out with labour, left Mgr Chausse, titular Bishop of Capasa, in charge of the mission. In 1884, at the time of the war of Tongking, the missionaries were ordered to discontinue the mission, and had to stay at Hong-Kong for nearly a year. The Christian establishments of Canton were destroyed. The districts of Shun-tak, Sha-tan, Shin-hing, Tong-kun were laid waste, but it is worthy of remark that the districts nearest Tongking suffered the least. In some of these the missionaries were able to continue throughout the hostilities. On the restoration of peace the missionaries and the Christians who had followed them returned to the country. No indemnity was granted either to the missionaries or the Christians, on the pretext that the French would not restore the vessels sunk at Fu-chau.

The report for 1889 gives 1 bishop, 43 missionaries, 7 native priests, 150 churches or chapels, 1 seminary with 125 students, 156 schools, 13,350 pupils, 20,670 catechumens. In 1894 and 1895, during the war between China and Japan, there were some disorders. A missionary was besieged for nine days in a Christian village by a band of soldiers returning from Formosa, and the mandarin of the place had to pay several thousand dollars to induce the soldiers to raise the siege. After the war there was a great conversion movement which lasted several years, especially at K'it-yeung and Tong-kun. In 1898 Father Chanez was slain with eight Christians in his district of Pok-lo. In 1900, during the Boxer uprisings, several missionaries were ordered by the viceroy, then the famous Li Hung Chang, to leave the province, but they all remained at their post. However, in September, when the troops of the allies had been in Peking a month, the chief Christian settlements of Shun-tak, Sha-tan, and Tong-kun were destroyed and the chapels burned by the populace. Mgr Chausse, who was ill, could save the sacred vessels of the district of Chi-hing on the frontiers of Kiang-si. In 1905 five American Presbyterians were massacred at Lin-chou, on the borders of Hu-nan, by an infuriated populace. Since then peace has lasted. The inhabitants of Kwang-tung seem to have decided leaning towards the things of Europe and America. Numerous students go to be educated in Japan, the United States, and Europe. Mgr Méré has founded the College of the Sacred Heart, to teach English and French to the Chinese without distinction of religion. The number of students exceeds 250.

In 1908 the mission of Kwang-tung ceded to the Diocese of Macao the civil prefecture of Shin-hing and the two districts of Yang-ping and Yeung-tsung, belonging to Shin-hing at the time of the fulmination of the decree by the Holy See, instead of which the Island of Hai-nan was given to the Prefecture Apostolic of Kwang-tung. But, as Shin-hing possesses more than 300,000 Catholics, it would be unfair to count them as 300 or 400, it will be readily understood why the reports of the Mission of Kwang-tung number less Catholics in 1908 than in 1907. The statistics for the two years are as follows: 1907, 65 missionaries, 20 native priests, 66 seminarians, 455 churches and chapels, 210 schools, 2050 pupils, 1,137 baptisms of adults, 7002 baptisms of pagan children, 60,000 Catholics; 1908, 73 missionaries, 24 native priests, 70 seminarians, 454 churches and chapels, 250 schools, 3500 pupils, 2214 baptisms of adults, 9586 baptisms of children of pagans, 58,917 Catholics to about 30,000,000 pagans.

KWEI-CHOU, VICARIAT APOSTOLIC OF.—The mission of Kwei-chou embraces the entire province of that name. The country is very mountainous and is principally inhabited by Chinese emigrants from other provinces and the race of aborigines known under the generic term of Miao-tze, who are subdivided into numerous tribes. The Faith was carried for the first time into Kwei-chou by a Portuguese Jesuit towards the end of the sixteenth century. The first vicar Apostolic of the Paris Society of Foreign Missions, Mgr Pallu, was created administrator of Kwei-chou in 1658. In 1708 Father Claude Viallou was made
vicar Apostolic of this province by Cardinal de Tournon, but never entered upon his mission. The Holy See finally joined the mission of Kwei-chou to that of Sze-ch’wan under the direction of the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. From 1769 onwards Mgr Pottier, Vicar Apostolic of Sze-ch’wan, Yun-nan, and Kwei-chou, made a practice of sending a native priest every two years. In 1832 an English missionary was established in Kwei-chou by Christian families migrated thither from Sze-ch’wan. The Venerable Moye visited these settlements in 1774. He was arrested, imprisoned, and eventually expelled from Kwei-chou. In 1815 Blessed Joseph Chang Ta-pong was beheaded at Ta-tung. There were others. In 1846, another was that of Joachim Ho. In 1846 Kwei-chou was detached from Sze-ch’wan and made an independent vicariate Apostolic. Father Stephen Albrand, missionary in Siam, was placed in charge. He found twelve hundred of the faithful in the entire province. He established himself at the capital, Kwei-yang. In 1849 he was created vicar Apostolic and consecrated titular Bishop of Sura. On 28 January, 1858, the blessed martyrs, Jerome Lu Pin-mei, Laurent Wang, and Agatha Lin were decapitated at Mau-keou. In 1850 Mgr Faurie succeeded Mgr Albrand. This same year there were the victories of the Britich and French, the Treaty of Peking guaranteeing religious liberty was signed.

The province, however, ravaged for several years afterwards owing to feuds between the Chinese and Mohammedans. During this period Christians were imprisoned, their parishes pillaged, and their missionaries massacred. On 29 July, 1861, four native Christians were beheaded at Tsin-gai. These were Blessed Joseph Chang, Paul Chen, J. B. Lo, and Martha Wang. In 1862 Blessed John Peter Neel, a French missionary, Martin Wu, John Chang, John Chen, and Lucy I were beheaded at K’ai-chou. In 1867 there were nine missionaries, four native Christians. Notwithstanding the persecution, it was possible in 1866 to record 408 baptisms of adults, and 13,178 infant baptisms among the natives. In 1867 the number baptized included 601 adults and 11,023 infant baptisms; in 1868, 902 adults and 9,322 infant baptisms. Mgr Faurie died in 1872 on his return from Rome, where he had taken part in the Vatican Council. He was succeeded by Mgr Lions, who was consecrated titular Bishop of Basilia in 1872. Peace reigned during several years, and the missionaries were able to greatly augment the number of Christian converts. In 1884, after the Franco-Prussian War, the persecutions were renewed. They were particularly violent in Kwei-chou. The Christians of the capital alone escaped. Hardly had this initial persecution terminated than a second, which was still more terrible, broke out, beginning with the destruction of the Catholic establishments at Chung-king (Sze-ch’wan). The Chinese priest, Father Lin, was massacred, together with his catechist and a neophyte. Many Christians were thrown into prison, and the missionaries were only able to obtain justice by application to Peking. In 1884 Mgr Guehard had been made assistant to Mgr Lions. Upon the death of the latter in 1893, Mgr Guichard took the entire direction of the mission in hand. During the following period peace was secure in the Kwei-chou mission, and the missionaries were able to augment rapidly the number of their converts. In 1900 Kwei-chou again escaped the troubles which were overthrowing the other Catholic missions in China. In 1907 Mgr Seguin was made coadjutor to Mgr Guichard, and consecrated titular Bishop of Pillana.

In 1899 the Catholic community numbered 2 bishop, 29 missionaries, 6 native priests, 66 churches and chapels, 1 seminary with 18 students, 120 schools and orphan asylums ministering to 2031 pupils, 15,000 Catholics. In 1900: 1 bishop, 38 missionaries, 8 native priests, 86 churches and chapels, 2 seminaries with 36 students, 150 schools and asylums with 2844 scholars, 998 native adult and 4634 native infant baptisms, 10,128 Catholics. In 1908: 2 bishops, 51 missionaries, 17 native priests, 3 seminaries with 62 students, 196 schools with 2388 pupils, 13 orphan asylums with 855 children, 1420 native adult and 4713 native infant baptisms or 15,729. 


V. H. MONTANAR.

Kyriz Eleison (Kőpε Θέλω, Lord have mercy: the Latin translation supposes a pronunciation as in Modern Greeks, and is the ejaculation used constantly in all Christian liturgies. Arrian quotes it in the second century: “Invoking God we say Kőpε Θέλω” (Diatribē Epicteti, II, 7). A more obvious precedent for Christian use was the occurrence of the same formula in the Old Testament (Ps. iv, 2; vi, 3; ix, 14; xxv, 11; exxii, 3; lxx, xxxiii, 2; Tob., viii, 10, etc., in the Sept.). In these places it seems already to be a quasi-liturgical exclamation. So also in the New Testament the form occurs repeatedly (Matt., ix, 27; xx, 30; xxv, 22; Mark, x, 47; Luke, xvi, 24; xvii, 13). The only difference is that in these cases it has an accusative after the verb: Kőpε Θέλω με, or Θέλω μεια. The liturgical formula is shortened from this.

History.—It is not mentioned by the Apostolic Fathers or the Apologists. The first certain example of its use in the liturgy is in that of the eighth book of the “Apostolic Constitutions”. Here it is the answer of the people to the various Synagōga (Litanies) chanted by the deacon (Brightman, “Eastern Liturgies”, pp. 4 and 5; cf. “Ap. Const.”, VIII, vi, 4). That is still its normal use in the Eastern rites. The deacon sings various clauses of a litany, to each of which the people answer, Kyrie Eleison. Of the Greek Fathers of the fourth century, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the two Gregorys do not mention it. But it occurs often in St. John Chrysostom. Its introduction into the Roman Mass has been much discussed. It is certain that the liturgy at Rome was at one time said in Greek (to the end of the second century at least). It is tempting to look upon our Kyrie Eleison as a surviving fragment from that time. Such, however, does not seem to be the case. Rather the form was borrowed from the East and introduced into the Latin Mass later. The older Latin Fathers, Tertullian, Cyprian, etc., do not mention it. Ether, the Franco-Prussian War, is evidently a strange thing to her, and she translates it: “As the deacon says the names of various people (the Intercession) a number of boys stand and answer always, Kyrie Eleison, as we should say, Misere Domine” (ed. Hen eus, Heidel berg, 1908, X, 6, p. 209). The first evidence of its use in the West is the third Canon of the Second Council of Vaison (Vasio in the province of Arles), in 529. From this canon it appears that the form was recently introduced at Rome and in Italy (Milan?): “Since both in the Apostolic See as also in all the provinces of the East and in Italy a sweet and most pious custom has been introduced that Kyrie Eleison be said with great insistence and compunction, it seems good to us too that this holy custom be introduced at Matins and Mass and Vespers” (cf. Hefele- Leclercq, “Histoires des Conciles”, Paris, 1908, pp. 1113-1114; Duchesne, “Origines”, p. 183). The council says nothing of Africa or Spain, or even of Africa in other canons about liturgical practices (Can. v). It appears to mean that Kyrie Eleison should be sung by the people cum grandio affectu. E. Bishop (in the “Downside Review”, 1889) notes that this council represents a Romanizing movement in Gaul.

The next famous witness to its use in the West is St. Gregory I (590-604). He writes to John of Syracuse
to defend the Roman Church from imitating Constantineople by the use of this form, and is at pains to point out the difference between its use at Rome and in the East: "We neither said nor say Kyrie Eleison as it is said by the Greeks. Among the Greeks all say it together, with us it is said by the clerks and answered by the people, and we say Christe Eleison as many times, with more frequent instance in this mass than in others. Many Masses and in daily Masses some things usually said are left out by us; we say only Kyrie Eleison and Christe Eleison, that we may dwell longer on these words of prayer" (Ep. ix in P. L., LXXVII, 956). The last words appear to mean that sometimes other prayers are left out that there may be more time for singing the Kyrie Eleison. We are of course in St. Gregory's time the special Roman use of the alternative form Christe Eleison (unknown in the Gallican and Eastern rites) existed. It seems inevitable to connect the Kyrie Eleison in the Roman Mass with an original litany. Its place corresponds exactly to where it occurs as part of a litany in the Syrian-Byzantine Liturgy; it is still always sung at the beginning of litanies in the Roman Rite too, and St. Gregory refers to "some things usually said" in connexion with it. What can these things be but clauses of a litany, sung, as in the East, by a deacon? Moreover there are still certain canons about it, obviously archaic, where a litany occurs at the place of the Kyrie. Thus on Easter Eve the Mass begins with a litany of which the last clause (Kyrie Eleison, repeated three times; Christe Eleison, repeated three times; Kyrie Eleison, repeated three times) is sung as the celebrant says the first prayers of the Mass, and correspond in every way to our usual Kyrie. So also at ordinations the Litany is sung towards the beginning of the Mass. In this connexion it may be noted that down to the late Middle Ages the Kyrie of the Mass was left out when it had just been sung in a Litany before Mass, as, e.g., in the Rota Rossa of 1378. We may suppose, then, that at one time the Roman Mass began (after the Introit) with a litany of general petitions very much of the nature of the third part of our Litany of the Saints. This would correspond exactly to our great Synapte in the Syrian Rite. Only, from what has been said, we conclude that the answer of the people was in Latin—the "Miserere Domine" of Etherea, or "Te rogamus, audi nos", or some such form. About the fifth century the Greek Kyrie Eleison was adopted by the West, and at Rome with the alternative form Christe Eleison. This was then sung, not as in the East only, but by the people, with the cantors and people. It displaced the older Latin exclamations at this place and eventually remained alone as the only remnant of the old litany.

The first Roman Ordo (sixth-seventh cent.) describes a not yet fixed number of Kyries sung at what is still their place in the Mass. "The school [schola] having finished the Antiphon [the Introit] begins Kyrie Eleison. But the leader of the school watches the Pontiff that he should give him a sign if he wants to change the number of the litany" ("Ordo Rom. primus", ed. Atchley, London, 1905, p. 130). In the "Ordo of Saint Amand", written in the eighth century and published by Duchenne in his "Origines du culte" (p. 442), we have already our number of invocations: "When the school has finished the Antiphon the Pontiff makes a sign that Kyrie Eleison should be said. And the school says it [dicit always corresponds to the liturgical Latin: dicere present Missal: "dicit cantando vel legendo" before the Pater Noster], and the Regionarii who stand below the ambo repeat it. When they have repeated it the third time the Pontiff signs again that Christe [sic] Eleison be said. This having been said the third time he sends that the people say it. And when they have completed it nine times he signs that they should stop." So we have, at least from the eighth century, our present practice of singing immediately after the Introit three times Kyrie Eleison, three times Christe Eleison, three times Kyrie Eleison, making nine invocations altogether. Obviously the first group is addressed to God the Father, the second to God the Son, the third to God the Holy Ghost. The medieval commentators are fond of connecting the nine-fold invocation with other words to fill up the long neumes. The names of the various Kyries in the Vatican Gradual (for instance, Kyrie Cunctipotens genitor Deus of the tenth century, Kyrie magnae Dei potentiae of the thirteenth century, etc.) are still traces of this. As an example of these innumerable and often very long farcings, this comparatively short one from the Sarum Missal may serve:

Kyrie, rex genitor ingenite, vera essentia, eleison.

Kyrie, luminius fons rerumque conditor, eleison.

Kyrie, qui nos tue imaginis signasti specie, eleison.

Christe, Dei forma humana particeps, eleison.

Christe, lux orienis per quem sunt omnia, eleison.

Christe, qui perfecta es sapientia, eleison.

Kyrie, spiritus vivitice, vitis vies, eleison.

Kyrie, utrisque vapor in quo cuncta, eleison.

Kyrie, expurgator secutorum et largitor gratiae; quassumus propter nostras offensiones noli nos relinquere, O consolator doloris animae, eleison (ed. Burntisland, 929).

[Lord, King and Father unbegotten, True Essence of the Godhead, have mercy on us.

Lord, Fount of light and Creator of all things, have mercy on us.

Lord, Thou who hast signed us with the seal of Thine image, have mercy on us.

Christ, True God and True Man, have mercy on us.

Christ, Rising Sun, through whom are all things, have mercy on us.

Christ, Perfection of Wisdom, have mercy on us.

Lord, vivifying Spirit and power of life, have mercy on us.

Lord, Bestower of the Father and the Son, in Whom are all things, have mercy on us.

Lord, Purger of sin and Almoner of grace, we beseech Thee abandon us not because of our Sins, O Consoler of the sorrowing soul, have mercy on us.]

Not to exaggerate the length of the last farcing to fit the neumes of the last Kyrie, which are always longer. Sometimes the essential words are mixed up with the farcing in a very curious mixture of Latin and Greek: "Onditor Kyrie omnium ymas creaturum eleison" (Ib., 932°). The reformed Missal of Pius V happily abolished these and all other farcings of the liturgical text.

In the Roman Rite.—In the Mass, the three groups of invocations are sung by the choir immediately after the Introit. They form the beginning of the choir's part of the Ordinary. A number of plainsong Masses are provided in the Gradual, each characterized and named after the Kyrie that begins it. Although each Mass is appointed for a certain occasion (e. g., for solemn feasts, doubles, Masses of the B. V. M., etc.) there is no law against using them without regard to this arrangement. Moreover, except on feasts, which keep their very simple chants, the various parts (Kyrie, Gloria, etc.) of different Masses may be combined (see rubric after the fourth Creed in the
Vatican "Gradual"). The new Vatican edition also provides a series of other chants, including eleven Kyries, ad Rituem. The Kyrie Eleison (as all the Ordinary and proper of the choir) may also be sung to figured music that does not offend against the rules of Pius X's "Motu proprio" on church music (22 Nov., 1903). Meanwhile the celebrant, having incensed the altar and read the Introit at the Epistle side, says the Kyrie there with joined hands alternately with the deacon, sub-deacon, and surrounding servers. At low Mass the celebrant after the Introit comes to the middle of the altar and there says the Kyrie alternately with the server ("Ritus celebr.") in the Missal, iv, 2, 7). The Kyrie is said in this way at every Mass with the exception of Holy Saturday and also of the Mass on Whitenum Eve at which the prophecies and litany are chanted. On these occasions the cantors finish the litany by singing the nine invocations of the Kyrie. After the prayers at the foot of the altar the celebrant goes up, incenses the altar, and then at once intones the Gloria. But he should say the Kyrie in a low voice himself first. Besides in the Mass, the Kyrie occurs repeatedly in other offices of the Roman Rite, always in the form Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison (each invocation once only). It begins the process ferialis at Lauds, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers; it begins the process at Prime and Compline. It is sung after the Reponsorium at funerals, said at marriages and on many other occasions for blessings and consecrations. In these cases it generally precedes the Pater Noster. It also begins and ends the Litany of the Saints. As an imitation of this, it is always placed at the beginning of the various other private litanies which are imitations of the official one.

In other Rites.—In the first place, the invocation Christe Eleison is purely Roman. With one exception, obviously a Roman interpolation in the Mozarabic Rite, it does not occur in any other use. Local medieval uses had it, of course; but they are only slight local modifications of the Roman Rite, not really different rites at all. In the Gallican Mass, as described by Germanus of Paris, three boys sing Kyrie Eleison three times after the Trisagion which follows the Antiphon at the entrance, then follows the Benedictus. These chants represent the beginning of the Mass (Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", pp. 182, 183). After the Gospel and Homily comes a litany sung by the deacon like the Syrian and Byzantine synapta. The people answer in Latin: Precamur te Domine, misercere; but at the end come three Kyrie Eleissons.

The Milanese rite shows its Gallican origin by its use of the Kyrie. Here, too, the form is always Kyrie Eleison three times (never Christe Eleison). It occurs after the Gloria, which has replaced the older Trisagion, after the Gospel, where the Gallican litany was, and after the Post-communion, always said by the celebrant alone. It also occurs throughout the Milanese offices, more or less as at Rome, but always in the form of Kyrie Eleison three times. The Mozarabic Liturgy does not know the form at all, except in one isolated case. In the Mass for the Dead, after the singing of the chant called Sacrificium (corresponding to the Roman Offertory) the celebrant says Kyrie Eleison, and the choir answers Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison ("Missale mixtum" in P.L., LXXXV, 1014, 1015, 1021, 1024, etc.—the various Masses for the Dead). This is obviously a Roman interpolation.

All the Eastern rites use the form Kyrie Eleison constantly. It is the usual answer of the people or choir to each clause of the various litanies sung by the deacon throughout the service (varied, however, by some Coptic, Egyptian and one or two other similar ejaculations). It also occurs many other times, for instance in the Antiochene Rite it is sung twice, at Alexandria three times just before the Communion. In the Byzantine Rite it comes over and over again, nearly always in a triple form, among the Troparia and other prayers said by various people throughout the Office and not as in the Liturgy. A conspicuous place in this rite is at the dismissal (Brightman, 307). In general it may be said to occur most frequently in the Syrian-Byzantine family of Liturgies. In the Syriac liturgies it is said in Greek, spelled in Syriac letters Kūrēllīsōn, also in the Coptic liturgies (in Greek letters of course—nearly all the Coptic alphabet is Greek); in the Abyssinian Rite it is spelled out: Kirilaγos. The Nestorians translate it into Syriac and the Armenians into Armenian. All the versions of the Byzantine Rite used by the various Orthodox and Uniate Churches (Old Slavonic, Arabic, Rumanian, etc.) also translate Kīsē Śēphōn.


ADRIAN FORTECUE.
Labadista, a pietist sect of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries founded by Jean de Labadie, who was born at Bourg, near Besançon, 11 October 1610, and died at Altona, 13 February, 1674. He was educated by the Jesuits at Bordeaux, joined their order in 1625, and was ordained ten years later. Having left the Society of Jesus in 1639 he preached successfully at Bordeaux, Paris, and Amiens, where in 1640 he was appointed professor of theology. In 1657 he resigned his priestly functions at Abbeville also, and in 1649 withdrew to the Carmelite monastery of Graaf- ville, near Havre, to avoid a conflict with the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. In 1650 he joined the Reformed Church at Montauban, where he was appointed professor of theology in 1657, after the pastoral work at Orange on the Rhône, became extraordinary preacher at Geneva in 1659, and seven years later accepted a call to the French-speaking congregation at Middelburg, Holland, where he refused to subscribe to the Belgian Confession or to recognize the authority of the Reformed Church and founded a separate sect, whereupon he was expelled from the city. He then endeavoured to organize a community first in the neighbouring town of Veere, then at Amsterdam, where he permanently won over to his cause the learned Anna Maria van Schurman. On the invitation of the princess-abbess, Elizabeth, he removed in 1670 with some fifty-five followers to Herford in Westphalia. Having been banished also from this place in 1672, the congregation settled at Altona where De Labadie died. Shortly after his death, his followers, to the number of one hundred and sixty-two finally migrated from Altona to Wiewert in West Friesland. Here they reached the highest point of their prosperity, but even then did not number more than about four hundred. In 1680 they accepted an invitation from the governor of the Dutch colony of Surinam to establish a missionary settlement in his dominions. But the colony of "Providence" which they founded disappeared in 1688. A similar attempt at New Bohemia on the Hudson in the State of New York also ended in failure. The congregation of Wiewert itself dispersed in 1732. In their doctrinal teaching, the Labadists laid great stress on the necessity of interior illumination by the Holy Ghost for the understanding of the Bible. The Church for them was a congregation of holy persons who have been born again from sin. These alone are entitled to the reception of the sacraments. Hence they frowned upon infant baptism, seldom celebrated the Lord's Supper, and declared that marriage with an unregenerated person is not binding. They held property in common, and supported themselves by manual labour and held very lax views regarding the observance of Sunday.

Van Berkum, De Labadische en de Labadisten (Thee., 1851); Hepper, Geschichte des Pietismus der reformierten Kirche (Leiden, 1879), 241-374; Goebel-Frank in Realencyk., für prot. Theol., s. v. Labadie, Birchen ann van Schurman (London 1869). N. A. Weber.

Laban (Lb3", An546), son of Bathuel, the Syrian (Gen. xxviii, 5; cf. xxv, 20); grandson of Nachor, Abraham's brother (xxii, 20, 23; cf. xxix, 5, where he is called "son of Nachor"), brother of Rebecca (xxvii, 29, 55; xxv, 20; xxvii, 43; xxviii, 5), uncle of Jacob (xxviii, 2, xix, 10) and also his father-in-law (xxix, 25; xxx, 25; xxxi, 20; cf. xxxix, 12, 15; xiii, 8, where he is called his "brother"); the father of Lia and Rachel (xxix, 16) and of several sons (xxx, 35; xxxi, 1). Laban's home was in Haran (xxviii, 43; xxix, 4), the city of Nachor (xxv, 10), in Mesopotamia of Syria (xxviii, 2, 5) where Nachor, his grandfather, remained when Abraham and Lot migrated to Chanaan (xi, 31; xii, 4). Hence Laban is also called "the Syrian" or "Aramean" (xxv, 20; xxxi, 20; 24; Heb.). It was here in Mesopotamia that Laban met Abraham's servant and consented to Rebecca's departure to become the wife of Isaac (xxiv, 29, sqq.) (see Abraham). The incident in the subsequent history of the Jewish nation is interesting because of its connection with that of Jacob, his sister's son (Gen., xxix, 10—xxxii, 55) (see Jacob). The latter having arrived in Haran was met by Rachel who notified her father Laban of his brother's (sic) arrival. Laban goes forth to meet Jacob and offers him the hospitality of his home (xxx, 10, 15). Laban invites his nephew to remain permanently with him, even allowing him to fix his own wages. Jacob agrees to work seven years for his uncle, and his wages were to be the hand of Rachel, Laban's younger daughter (xxix, 14—18). These terms appeared satisfactory to Laban, who, at the end of seven years entered into a marriage feast, but, instead of giving his younger daughter Rachel to Jacob, he gave him his elder daughter Lia whom Jacob, however, failed to recognize until after the marriage (xxix, 18—24). When Jacob reproached him with his uncle, Laban agreed to give him his younger daughter on the sole condition that Jacob serve him seven more years. Jacob agreed to this, and at the end of seven years Laban gives his younger daughter Rachel to Jacob (xxx, 24—29).

Having received the wife whom he sought, Jacob resolved to return to his own home, but, Laban, wishing to retain the profitable services of his nephew, once more prevailed upon Jacob to remain with him (xxx, 25—28). The terms stipulated by Jacob this time appeared most advantageous to Laban, but he and his sons soon discovered that Jacob had outwitted them in this last agreement, which procured for Jacob a large increase of flocks (xxx, 29—42). Laban and his sons then began to despise Jacob, who, noticing their change of attitude towards him, and dissatisfied with the treatment accorded him by his uncle, who had changed his wages ten times, secretly departed together with his wives and possessions (xxx, 1—20). Three days later Laban, upon learning of Jacob's departure, remarked the loss of his idols, which Rachel had taken with her, goes in pursuit of the fugitives. After seven days Laban overtakes Jacob near the mount of Galaad, but during the night he is warned in a dream not to inflict any harm on Jacob (xxx, 21—25). The next day Laban meets Jacob on the mountain of Galaad and makes an agreement whereby Jacob is not to harm Laban's daughters, and neither party is to pass with hostile intent the limits set by a heap of stones called "the witness heap". Laban then takes leave of his sons and daughters and returns home, never to be heard of again in history (xxx, 25—31). Laban is then invited by Jacob to search for his idols, and when he fails to find them, thanks to Rachel's shrewdness, he is vigorously upbraided by Jacob (xxxii, 31—42). Laban then demands an agreement whereby Jacob is not to harm Laban's daughters, and neither party is to pass with hostile intent the limits set by a heap of stones called "the witness heap". Laban then takes leave of his sons and daughters and returns home, never to be heard of again in history (xxx, 25—31).

Francis X. E. Albert.

Labarum, the name by which the military standard adopted by Constantine the Great after his celebrated vision (Laetantius, De mortibus persecutorum, c. xiv), was known in antiquity. The original labarum,
designed under the emperor's direction on the day subsequent to the appearance of the "cross of light", is described by Eusebius (Vita Constant., I, 26) as "a long spear, overlaid with gold," which with a transverse bar formed the figure of a cross. "On the top of the whole was fixed a wreath of gold and precious stones, and within this the symbol of the Saviour's name, two letters indicating the name of Christ by means of the initial letters, the letter X intersecting P at the centre." These two letters formed what is known as the monogram of Constantine, so-called—not because it was the invention of this emperor, for it had been used as a Christian symbol prior to his conversion, but—because of the great popularity it enjoyed from the date of its appearance on the imperial standards. From the cross-bar of the spear was sus-

pected a purple banner with the Greek inscription: TO TOTTO NIKA—i.e. conquer by this (sign), usually rendered in Latin "In hoc signo vinces" (in this sign thou shalt conquer). This banner, square in form, covered with a rich embroidery of precious stones, and "being also richly interfaced with gold, presented an indescribable degree of beauty to the beholder." The part of the staff immediately above the embroidered banner was adorned with medallions of the emperor and his children. Fifty soldiers of the imperial guard, distinguished for bravery and piety, were entrusted with the care and defence of the new sacred standard (Vita Constant., II, 8). Standards, similar to the original labarum in its essential features, were supplied to all the legions, and the monogram was also engraved on the soldiers' shields. An idea of some of the deviations in form of the standards furnished to different divisions of the army may be obtained from several coins of Constantine's reign still preserved. On one coin, for instance, the portraits of the emperor and his sons are represented on the banner instead of on the staff; on a second the banner is inscribed with the monogram and surmounted by the equal-armed cross, while the royal portraits, though on the shaft, are below instead of above the banner. In form, the labarum of Constantine was an adaptation of the already existing cavalry standard of the Roman army (Dict. of Christ. Antiq. s. v.); the pagan emblems were merely replaced by Christian symbols. The term labarum, which is of uncertain derivation, was probably familiar in the Roman army from the reign of Hadrian. 

Eusebius, Life of Constantine, iv. (New York, 1904); Venable, in Dict. Christ. Antiq., s. v.; Lowrie, Monuments of the Early Church (New York, 1901); Kraack, Relig. Umg. der christl. Alterthümer (Freiburg, 1882-83), s. v.; Bucker, Kirchliches Handlexikon (Munich, 1907—), s. v.; Bahnsen, Das Monogramm Christi auf dem Labarum (1891); Demoches, La Peinture (Paris, 1868); Ravel-Chapuis, Dix ans sur le labarum (Frogue, 1899); Knoepfler in Hdb. pol. Blatter, Pt. I (1906).

MAURICE M. HAMBETT.

Labat, Jean-Baptiste, Dominican missionary, b. at Paris, 1664; d. there, 1738. He entered the Order of Preachers in his native city at the age of twenty years and was professed on 11 April, 1685. After the completion of his philosophical and theological studies he was ordained and for several years taught philosophy publicly to the secular students of Nancy. Abandoning this work he devoted himself to missionary activity and for many years preached in the various churches of France. The missionary fields of America were proving a strong attraction to the zealous clergy of his day, and Labat became filled with a burning desire to assist in the evangelization of the Indians. Accordingly, in 1695, he obtained permission from the general of the order to depart for those colonies of the West Indies which were then under French domination, and laboured among the Indians for thirteen years, until 1706, when he sailed for Italy in the interests of his mission. After attending a meeting of the order at Bologna, and presenting to the general a report of his work, he prepared to return to America, but was denied permission and detained in Rome for several years. During this period he commenced a long contemplated history of the West Indies. The work was finally published in six volumes at Paris, in 1722, with copious illustrations made by himself ("Nouveaux Voyages aux îles Françaises de l'Amérique", Paris, 1722). Labat had a wide reputation as a mathematician and won recognition both as a naturalist and as a scientist. He embodied in the history his scientific observations and treated comprehensively and accurately of the soil, trees, plants, fruits, and herbs of the islands. He also explained the manufactures then in existence and pointed out means for the development of commercial relations. He published similar works on other countries, drawing information from the notes of other missionaries. His two works on Africa have become well known: "Nouvelle relation de l'Afrique occidentale", Paris, 1728, and "Relation historique de l'Ethiopie occidentale" (Congo, Angola, Matamba), after the Italian of Father Cavazzi, Cap. (Paris, 1732). The latter treatise is supplemented with notes and statistics drawn from Portuguese sources.

ECHEARD et QUESIT, Script. O. P., II, 806; REICHELMANN in Kirchenlex., s. v.

IGNATIUS SMITH.

Labbe, Philippe, b. at Bourges, 10 July, 1607; d. at Paris, at the College of Clermont, 17 (16) March, 1667, a distinguished Jesuit writer on historical, geographical, and philosophical questions. He entered the Society of Jesus, 28 Sept. 1623. After literary, philosophical, and theological studies, he successively taught the classes of rhetoric and philosophy; then he held for five years the chair of theology. His memory was quick and retentive, his erudition most extensive and accurate; every year witnessed the production of one or more of his works, so that in the
field of history Labbe and Petauvius have been considered as the most remarkable of all French Jesuits. After his death it was found that his notes and annotations on all kinds of authors were so numerous and extensive as to exceed in bulk what an ordinary scribe in his time or in his lifetime, it was taken up answering the doubts or questions of others; he was constantly consulted on points of history, on questions of literature, on difficulties in moral and scholastic theology. However, he found time to express his devotion to Christ and His Blessed Mother in each of the Latin verse. His biographers emphasize his tender devotion to the Holy Eucharist and the Blessed Virgin.

Sommervogel enumerates more than eighty works left by Labbe, but we have to be satisfied with the titles of only the more important ones. (1) Among the works on philological subjects, we may mention: "Tirocinium Lingue Grecie, etc." (Paris, 1648). The work went through some thirteen or fourteen editions. Labbe had the annoying habit of modifying the titles of his works in their various editions, so that a list of their complete titles is quite impossible here. (2) "La Grecque royale" appeared in Paris, 1640. (3) "De Byzantinis historiae scriptoribus, etc." (Paris, 1648), was valued as a most useful work at the time of its publication. (4) "Concordia sacrae profanae chronologie annorum 5691 ab orbe condito ad hunc Christi annum 1538" (Paris, 1638); the author published several other harmonies of historical dates, which contained a number of dissertations on special questions. (5) "Bibliotheca antijacensiana" (Paris, 1654), is a catalogue of all writings directed against the Jansenists, and gives a brief history of the origin of Jansenism. (6) "Bibliotheca bibliothecarum" (Paris, 1654), a bibliography for the handy use of librarians. The second edition contains an additional part entitled "Bibliotheca nummariia", and describes old medals, coins, weights, measures, and other antiquarian objects. (7) "Sacrosancti Ecclesiae Tridentini Concilii... canones et decreta" (Paris, 1667), is a work containing a great number of documents referring to secular princes and their representatives in the council, and giving also some of the conciliar transactions. (8) But the chief work is the collection of councils entitled "Sacrosanctae concilia ad regiam editionem exacta", published by the joint labour of Labbe and Cossart, and printed in Paris at the expense of the Typographical Society for Ecclesiastical Books. When Labbe died, the vols. I-VIII and XII-XV had been printed; vols. IX and X were in press; Cossart finished these two volumes and also vol. XI. In the sixteenth volume (or the seventeenth, for XI is a double volume) the "apparatus" of the collection has been added by Cossart. A second "apparatus" has been added in vol. XVIII, which contains the treatise "De concilii" by Jacobitus; but this volume is extremely rare and extensive, the price being as high as that of the rest of the collection.

Labour and Labour Legislation.—Labour is work done by mind or body either partly or wholly for the purpose of producing utilities. This definition is broad enough to include the work of the actor, the physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, and the domestic servant, as well as that of the business man, the mechanic, the factory operative, and the farmer. When used without qualification to-day, the word labour usually designates hired labour, and frequently hired manual labour. This usage is only true when the term is used to describe the persons who labour rather than the work or effort. The explanation of this narrower usage is that in most occupations hired labourers are more numerous than self-employing workers, and that among wage-earners manual labourers exceed in numbers those whose activity is predominantly mental. In this article labour always means the labouring classes. When used of the ages preceding and in the industry dealt with in this work, the term is used to describe the persons who labour, but all who got their living mainly through their own labour, and only in a slight degree by employing others. Hence it takes in the master artisans of the Middle Ages, and the agricultural tenants who worked partly on their own account and partly for the feudal lord; for the former this work that is now performed by hired labour, and the latter possessed even less economic independence than do the wage-workers of to-day. Moreover, usage justifies this extension of the terms, labour and labouring class.

Passing over the nomadic and pastoral stages of economic life, because there was then no distinct labouring class, we shall touch briefly upon the condition of labour among some of the great nations of antiquity that were engaged in agriculture, commerce, or industry. A few years ago the majority of scholars held that the earliest form of land-tenure everywhere was joint ownership, and that joint ownership was by all the members of the community. According to the weight of present opinion, if such a condition existed, it has not been proved by positive and convincing evidence. Perhaps the nearest approach to this arrangement in historical times is the clan system, by which the clan, or tribe, or sept, owned the land in common, but allotted definite portions of it for individual cultivation by each member. So far as we know, this system has not played a great part in agrarian history. In ancient Egypt the Pharaoh owned the greater part of the land, and the tenant cultivators, though not in the strict sense slaves, were compelled to live and labour in conditions that differed but little from the most oppressive slavery. Their labour it was that built the Pyramids, the public works at Lake Mosis, and the Labyrinth; there, too, they were exploited to the limit of physical endurance, just as were the Hebrews by the Egyptian taskmasters of a later period. There were some large private estates which were cultivated by a servile population. Indeed, the history of labour down to a little more than one thousand years ago, is for the most part the history of slavery. Judea had few manufactures, and very little commerce; but its working class consisted to a great extent of slaves and compulsory labourers. On the other hand, in many parts of the world, slaves have been better treated than workers of the same condition in Gentile countries. However, the division of Solomon's empire into two kingdoms was caused in large part by the contributions of labour and produce which that monarch exacted from his own people. In later times a large proportion of the independent Hebrew cultivators were deprived of their lands by rich capitalists, and compelled to become slaves or forced labourers. Some of the strongest denunciations of the Prophets were uttered against this form of exploitation. The great trading and manufacturing nation of antiquity was the Phoenician, and most of their activities and achievements in this field seem to have been based upon the labour of slaves.

The industrial and commercial supremacy of the world passed, in the fifth and fourth centuries before Christ to the Greeks, but slave labour continued to be its main support. Although a considerable proportion of the tillers of the soil seem to have been freeholders at the beginning of Greek history, the majority were slaves in classical and post-classical times. During the latter period the slaves considerably outnumbered the free population as a whole; consequently, they must have formed a large majority of the laboring class. Their curious increase, especially at Athens, was not nearly so wretched as that of the Roman slaves during the classical period of that country. They had some protection from the law against inju-
ries, and considerable opportunities of emancipation. In fact, labour seems to have been less disdained in Greece in the fifth and fourth centuries than in any other country at that time, except Judea, and it was certainly held in higher esteem than in Rome. A great deal is said concerning the organizations that existed among the Greek artisans, but they do not appear to have exercised much influence over the conditions of the more prevalent. Many of the artisans were not free in the modern sense of that term. They were members of associations which they were forbidden by law to abandon, and they were not allowed to leave their occupations. The State took this measure on the theory that these labourers were engaged in an industry necessary to the welfare of society. It was, therefore, the duty of the law to provide that this function should be properly discharged. Although this particular restriction of the freedom of labour seems very unreasonable to the modern mind, the fact is that some form of minute regulation of industry has been the rule rather than the exception in Christian times. In the latter days of the empire the slave labourers were chiefly domestic servants, the employees of the large landholders, and the workers in the imperial mines and manufactures. At the beginning of the fourth century the emperor DIOCLETIAN issued an edict fixing the wages of artisans. According to this, and the other edicts of remuneration prescribed in this edict were about the same as those that prevailed in France at the end of the eighteenth century, and a little more than half as high as the wages in that country at the end of the nineteenth century. It was not, however, the purpose of this rescript to benefit the labourer. The rates of wages laid down were maximum rates, and the object was to prevent the price of labour as well as of goods from rising above the point which the emperor regarded as sufficient.

Despite the teaching and influence of Christianity, the laws and institutions, the ruling classes and public opinion, the intellectual classes, and, indeed, the bulk of the people were still pagan. A few years later, CONSTANTINE made Christianity the official religion of the empire, but he did not thereby make the people Christian. The majority were still dominated by selfishness, dislike and contempt for labour, instead of the desire to exploit their fellows, especially through usurious practices. The language employed by Ambrose, Augustine, Basil, Chrysostom, and Jerome against the rich of their time, is at once a proof that the powerful classes were not imbued with the Christian spirit, that they were alienated and that the Christian teachers were the true friends of the poor and the toilers. The doctrine laid down by these Fathers, sometimes in very radical terms, that the earth was intended by God for all the children of men, and that the surplus goods of the rich belonged to right to the needy, has been the most fruitful principle of human rights, and the most effective protection for labour that ever fell from the lips of men. It is, in fact, although not always so recognized, the historical and ethical basis of the now universally accepted conviction among Christian peoples that the labourer has a right to a living wage, and that the work of the poor may not do all that he likes with his own. During this period (the fourth century), likewise, large numbers of men and women who found it impossible to live a life of Christian perfection in the still semipagan society of the time, founded monasteries and convents, and there gave to the world its first effective labor movement in the chrestian state. The number of the clergy was growing, and the work of these foundations gradually became centres of industry and peace, and later on developed into those medieval towns in which labour became for the first time fully self-supporting and free.

By the time of the barbarian invasions in the sixth century, the majority of rural slaves had become either
free tenants or serfs. The latter were soon reduced to their former condition, and all the legislation and customs which, under the influence of Christianity, had been introduced for the protection of the serf were ruthlessly set aside by the new masters of the Roman Empire, the Burgundians. The barbarian tribes generally restored to the landlord the power of removing the serf from the land, and to the master the power of life and death over his slave. Speaking generally, this continued to be the situation down to the time of Charlemagne. From the beginning of his reign the lot of the slaves rapidly improved and their number rapidly decreased, so that by the middle of the tenth century they had almost all been transformed into serfs throughout the Holy Roman Empire. One hundred years later, about seven per cent of the inhabitants of England were slaves, but the institution had practically disappeared in that country by the middle of the twelfth century. In the year 1170 the last remnant of it in Ireland was abolished by St. Lawrence O'Toole.

At the end of Charlemagne's reign practically all the land within his dominions was held by the great warriors, the clergy, and the monasteries. The majority of the peasants were serfs, and the proprietors were feudal lords. Politically, the latter were not only the military defenders of their territory, but to a great extent legislators, administrators, and judges; economically, they had the right to receive from the cultivators of the soil a rent, either in money or in money's worth, according as they chose; in many places, but not always, the serf, while not owned as a slave, became a vassal, in custom, and his tenure of the soil was dependent on the will of his lord. In the course of time the serf was relieved of some of these regular burdens, his labour services were definitely fixed by custom, and his tenure of the land that he cultivated on his own account was made secure by custom, if not by law. Between the eighth and the twelfth century serfdom was the condition of the majority of the labouring class, not only throughout the Holy Roman Empire, but, with the exception of Ireland, all over Europe. Ireland had the clan system. During the period of the discussion we are dealing with the clan was a very considerable measure of progress. With the exception of ordinances mitigating and abolishing slavery, there was no important labour legislation during this period.

Between the twelfth and the end of the fifteenth century, the great majority of the serfs of England became free tenants, that is, they were gradually relieved from the fines and petty exactions imposed upon them by the lord, and from other disabilities, economic and civil; they were permitted to pay their rent in money instead of in labour or produce; they were enabled to sell the soil, and their possession of their holdings was secured by law, or by custom which had the force of law. In France emancipation was not quite so rapid. nor was it so thorough in the individual case; still it had been extended to the great majority of the serfs by the time of the Reformation. It was effected much more slowly in Germany. At the beginning of the Reformation the condition of the majority of the tenants there was that of serfdom, and there existed, in many districts, a considerable number. As a consequence of their revolt and its bloody suppression, their emancipation was set back for at least a century. The majority of the German peasants were still serfs at the end of the eighteenth century. Serfdom lasted in Russia until 1861.

The emancipation of the serfs during the later Middle Ages was due in great measure to the growth of towns and town industries. Attention has already been called to the fact that many of the towns owed their origin to the settlements made and the industries built up by the monks. The latter not only exercised handicrafts themselves, but taught their neighbours to do likewise. In the course of time groups consisting of several hundred, and sometimes of several thousand, persons were centered about the monastery, many of whom were artisans more or less independent of any lord, and having a fairly good realization of their freedom and their rights. And there were very many of the medieval towns arose in this manner. In the twelfth century the towns in England began to purchase charters from the king, the lord, or the monastery, according as each happened to control the land upon which the town was situated. In this manner they obtained or secured a considerable measure of self-government. About the same time the merchants and the artisans began to combine in associations called, respectively, merchant guilds and craft guilds (see GUILDS). The latter, which were much the more important, comprised master-workmen, journeymen, and apprentices. They had generally speaking, a monopoly of their respective trades or crafts, and regulated not only the general conditions in which work was performed, but even the wages of the journeymen and the prices of the product. Their ordinances had for a long time a semi-legal character and all the practical force of a civil law. Thus the towns became the abode of populations that were not subject to the lord, and that were a standing check upon his power, not only because they were free themselves, but owing to the contagion of their example. Moreover, the serf who escaped from the lord and maintained a residence in the town for one year and a day was considered a freeman. The development of the towns and guilds in England was typical, with some differences of time and detail, of Europe generally. In most places the guilds reached their highest degree of efficiency in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The condition of the labouring classes both in town and country during these two centuries was much better than it had ever been before. In the first place, the worker enjoyed considerable security of position, either on the land that he tilled or in the craft that he pursued. According to the theories of the time, the members of every class performed a social function which gave them a social claim to the protection of their lord, in conformity with their needs and customs. Hence the feudal lord and the monastery were charged with the care of all the inhabitants of their estates, while the guilds were required to find work or relief for their members. Although the workers enjoyed as a whole less individual freedom than they do to-day, their economic position was more secure, and their future less uncertain. There was no proletariat in the modern sense, that is, no considerable number of persons for whose welfare no person or agency was held socially responsible. As to the content of the livelihood obtained by the average labourer of that period, any attempt at a precise statement would be misleading. Nor is it possible to institute any general comparison that would be of value between the welfare of the la-
bourger then and now. This much, however, may be asserted with confidence: the poorest one-tenth of the population were probably better fed and better clothed, if not better housed, than is the poorest one-tenth to-day; for “the grinding and hopeless poverty, just above the verge of actual starvation, so often prevalent in the present time, did not belong to medieval life” (Gibbon’s, “Industry in England”, 177); the labouring class (meaning all persons who got their living as wage-earners or through self-employment, and not by employing others) received a larger share per capita of the wealth then created than our wage-earners obtain from the wealth produced in our time; and, finally, the guild system which governed town industry “did for a time, and in large part, until the end of the eighteenth century, the consumers and producers” (Ashley’s, “English Economic History”, II, 168).

Legislation pertaining to labour during the three centuries immediately preceding the Reformacion was mostly enacted by the towns, the feudal lords, and the guilds. Its main results were the emancipation of the serfs and the privileges by which the guilds were enabled to become the real, if not the nominal, lawmakers in all things affecting the economic welfare of their members. The towns frequently, and the national governments occasionally, regulated the prices of products but little care was taken to satisfy the industrial principle of the time was regulation, not competition. In 1349 the English Parliament enacted the first of the many statutes of labourers that have been passed in that country. It prohibited higher wages than those that had prevailed in 1347, the year before the Black Death. A similar law was enacted at the same time in France. Both ordinances aimed at keeping down the remuneration of the labourer, but neither was very successful.

From the Reformacion until the industrial revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, the history of labour for the most part records a decline from the conditions of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The confiscation of the monastic and guild lands in England under Henry VIII and Edward VI, the evic- tion of large numbers of the tenants from their holdings, the enclosures of these lands and a large part of the common pastures into great estates, and the substitu- tion of large proprietors for custumers, in- creased hardships to the agricultural population. In Germany much the same process of spoliation and impoverishment occurred, although it had begun in that country before the time of Luther. Owing to the Hundred Years’ War and other causes, the rural popula- tion suffered. The small guilds suffered to a greater extent, the net result of which seems to have been unfavourable. As a result of the great increase of capital, and the immense expansion of commerce and industry during this period, the labouring population in the towns and cities increased greatly in numbers and importance. Their condition was as a whole less happy than in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This is particularly true of England, where, in the first half of the sixteenth century, the guild lands were confiscated, and the guilds themselves all but disappeared. Although they continued in France until the Revolution, and in Germany somewhat later, their control over industry in those countries was not as thorough as it had been before the Reformacion. It must be remembered, however, that the power of the guilds would have been checked even if there had been no Reformacion; for they were becoming too exclusive in their membership and too great a barrier to the welfare of the consumer. In fact, these tendencies had already caused a gradual decline in the English guilds before the end of the fif- teenth century. Nevertheless, it remains true that both in England and Germany the Reformacion inflicted great injury on the guilds, and on them upon the whole labouring class. There was no legis-

lation during this period that was of any marked benefit to the labourer. In France and Germany laws were passed restricting the activities of the guilds. In England the Statute of Labourers 1524 was enacted and amended at least ten times in the course of two centuries, was supplanted in 1563 by the famous statute of Elizabeth. It embraced all the most stringent provisions of the preceding laws, with some clauses that were intended for the protection of the worker. But its principal fault lay in the stipulation that wages should be fixed and the law administered by the justices of the peace. The latter generally were keenly interested in keeping wages down, and in exploiting the labourer. So thoroughly did they enforce the law for their own benefit that by the beginning of the eighteenth century wages, famine wages, traditional, and these wages, insufficient by themselves, were supplemented from the poor rate” (Rogers, “The Economic Interpretation of History”, 43). This reference to the poor rate calls to mind the Elizabthan Poor Law, which had been rendered necessary through the confiscation of the guild and monastic lands, and the destruction of the monastic system of poor relief.

The modern industrial era, the factory system, the age of machine production, began, properly speaking, with the industrial revolution. The latter phrase describes the changes that came to pass from the steam engine, spinning machinery, and the power-loom, during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Among their most important immediate results were: the grouping of workingmen into factories where they tended machines instead of working in their homes with the old and simple tools; the ownership of the factories and machinery by capitalist employers, instead of by the labourers themselves; a great increase in the dependence of the labourer upon the employer; and congestion of the working population in the cities which grew up close to the factories and communal establishments. Hereafter, labour in this article is to be understood of wage-earners only. Simultaneously with the revolution in industrial processes and relations, there occurred a revolution, as thorough if not as sudden, in economic theory and legislation. The teaching of the physiocrats and the eighteenth-century philosophers was in France, the economic-political theories of Smith and Ricardo in England, and the self-interest of the English capitalists, all combined to inaugurate a regime of complete freedom of contract, complete freedom of competition, and almost complete non-intervention of Government in industrial matters. The fixing wages, and requiring a seven-years’ period of apprenticeship, was abolished in 1813 and 1814, and nothing was substituted for the protection of the labourer. While every law that in any way restricted the freedom of the employer or regulated the conditions of employment was abolished, the old Combination Acts, which made labour organizations criminal, were re-enacted in 1799. This act prohibited even the contribution of money in furtherance of a strike. In fact, the prevailing theory of industrial liberty seemed to require that the individual employer should always deal with the individual worker, and to assume that this would be for the best interests of all. Undoubtedly, many of the old regulations, such as the law of apprenticeship, had outlived their usefulness and ought to have been repealed, but some of them were still valuable or could have been made so by amendment. What was needed was not an appropriate series of changes to be effected by all regulations. As a result of the policy of non-intervention, the working classes of England experienced during the first half of the nineteenth century a depth of misery and degradation which has obtained the name of “English wage slavery”.

Long before these conditions had reached their lowest
level, however, some steps had been taken to protect the labouring class by legislation. In 1802 a law was passed which aimed at giving some relief to the pauper children in the cotton factories, and in 1824 the prohibitions of most of the ordinances were abolished. Between 1833 and 1878, the famous English Factory Acts were enacted, amended, and re-enacted, until they provided for safety and sanitation in all workshops, and regulated the hours of labour of women and children, and the age at which the latter were permitted to work. In both countries, the slow transition from the system of handwork to the factory system came somewhat later and somewhat more slowly than in England, and consequently caused less hardship to the weaker members of the labouring class. Moreover, the theory of legislative non-intervention was not so fully developed, except in France and Belgium, where the political philosophy of the Revolution had obtained a strong foothold. The guilds were abolished in France in 1789, and labour unions, strikes, and lock-outs were prohibited during substantially the whole period between that date and the year 1866. The most effective factory legislation was enacted in 1841, but it was not seriously enforced for thirty years. In Belgium the guilds were abolished in 1785, and there was no very important labour legislation until 1856. Most of the laws for the protection of labour in Switzerland came into existence during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Effective labour laws were not enforced in Italy until 1866. In Prussia the complete abolition of the monopolistic privileges in certain trades enjoyed by certain towns, classes, and organizations took place in 1845, while a general code providing for industrial freedom was adopted in 1869 by the North German States, and after and extended to the whole of the German Empire. In 1881, however, a law was passed which gave to the volunteer guilds a certain privileged position, and the tendency since then has been to confirm that position. Austria likewise retained the guilds and the old industrial regulations longer than England or France, and enacted new legislation during the first half of the nineteenth century. At no time did Austria attempt to carry out the disasterous policy of "complete industrial freedom".

At the present time laws regulating the hours of labour exist in all the countries of Europe. Except in Belgium and Switzerland, the tendency is to apply such legislation to the labour of all adult males, as well as to that of women and children. As yet, however, this regulation has not been applied to adult males generally, but only to those in certain arduous and dangerous occupations. The hours for women and children in mines, factories, and workshops, and frequently in some other occupations, are restricted by most European states to ten per day, while the age at which children may be employed varies from eleven to thirteen in most employments. Regulations providing, with varied degrees of efficacy, for compulsory accident insurance, for sanitation in factories, workshops, and mercantile establishments are practically universal. Many of the countries have compulsory state insurance against sickness and accidents; Germany and Italy have in addition a system of old-age insurance. England requires employers to compensate their employees for industrial accidents, and has a system of old-age pensions. Switzerland and Belgium insure against unemployment. In most of the European countries there are laws providing for the arbitration of industrial disputes, but in none of them is the arbitration compulsory, and in no country do they give special privileges to, labour unions or guilds. In Germany and Austria membership in a guild is indispensable for certain trades. Generally speaking, peaceful strikes and boycotts are everywhere lawful. Boycott was made legal in Great Britain in 1906.

The theory of non-intervention has exercised a stronger influence in the United States than even in England, owing to the fact that it was incorporated into the National Constitution, and in the Constitutions of the States. The prohibitions of class legislation and of interference with freedom of contract have caused American labour laws to be for the most part, "a collection of exceptions to these general provisions" (Adams, "Labor Problems", 464). Between 1840 and 1850, laws were enacted in some of the states limiting the hours of labour for women and children, and in 1877 Massachusetts enacted a code of factory legislation. Since then more than half the states have followed the example set by Massachusetts, and the general tendency points constantly toward more and better regulations for the protection of children. In no state, however, is there a general law limiting the hours of labour for adult males. Such legislation would undoubtedly be construed as contrary to the constitutional guarantee of freedom of contract. The few states that have enacted provisions of this sort have limited their application to occupations involving personal danger to health, safety, or the public welfare. In the federal states the working day of women is restricted, usually to ten hours, on the theory that this is a legitimate exercise of the police power in the interest of private health, or on behalf of a peculiarly weak section of the population. The hours of labour of all children have been set in all states at ten per day, in the majority of cases to ten per day, but in a few instances to eight, nine, eleven, or twelve. Almost all the states set a minimum age at which children may be employed, at least in certain places, such as factories and stores. In the majority of the cases the limit is fourteen years, although it is sometimes one or two years less, and sometimes one or two years higher for certain occupations. Laws governing the safety and sanitation of factories exist in more than half the states. As yet, there is no legislation providing for insurance against disabilities of any sort nor for old-age pensions. The only legal regulations of this nature are based on the common law concerning the employer's liability for accidents occurring to his employees while at work. In many of the states tribunals have been created for the voluntary arbitration of industrial disputes, but none of these boards has been a national characteristic, which applies only to railroads, has been more successful. Labour unions are given no special privileges, except that in some states they are encouraged to incorporate. Strikes are not prohibited, but occasionally the sympathetic strike and frequently the boycott have been forbidden by the courts through the process of injunction.

This brief review of the history of labour looks seems to make a few conclusions tolerably safe. If the labouring class of to-day be taken in the wider sense which we have given it in discussing the ages before the industrial revolution, it is not a nation of nations, which one or two years ever been since the world began. If we use the phrase in the narrower sense of wage-earners, we can still say that the majority of these are now in a better position, materially, socially, and politically, than the labouring class, whether widely or narrowly interpreted, has ever been before. While it is very probably true that the poorest section of the manual workers of the later Middle Ages was in a happier condition materially than the poorest workers of to-day, it is also true that the latter have the advantage socially and politically. And when we recall the sufferings that the toilers have endured through it, and some of them give special privileges to, labour unions or guilds. In Germany and Austria membership in a guild is indispensable for certain trades. Generally speaking, peaceful strikes and boycotts are everywhere lawful. Boycott was made legal in Great Britain in 1906.
the workers were either slaves or serfs, we realise that, in spite of set-backs, there has been great and encouraging progress. When we compare the condition and status of the labourers in medieval days with that of the last century, we cannot doubt that the improvement is mostly due to Christianity, and that continued progress will be in proportion to the influence of Christian ideals in the social order. Some of these ideals are stronger to-day than ever before. In the whole of Europe of the last century, there is an element of justice in the labour contract, and when either party deliberately ignores this factor, its aim is to that extent immoral. This is as true of an organization as of an individual. Though good in its constitution and end, the union might possibly be immoral on account of the disproportionate amount of evil to which it leads. It is doubtful whether any intelligent and unbiased observer would contend that this hypothesis is verified to-day. Although the evil effects of the union are frequent, and sometimes very serious, they seem to be, on the whole, outweighed by its good effects. “An overwhelming preponderance of evidence before the Industrial Commission indicates that the organisation of labour has resulted in a marked improvement in the economic condition of the workers.” (Final Report of the Industrial Commission, p. 802.) And the good results obtained by organization are considerably enhanced by the fact that they could not have been secured in any other way. As Walker, a very conservative writer, says, “Nothing, economically speaking, can save economic society from progressive degradation except the spirit and power of the working class.” (Elementary Course in Political Economy, 266.) A careful survey of the history of labour during the last one hundred years will show with abundant clearness that no entire grade or class of labourers has secured any important economic advantage except by its own organized resistance and aggressiveness. And practically every union has at some time protected the working conditions of its members against deterioration. These facts are merely a result of the system of unlimited competition, not a condemnation of the employing class. If anyone doubt that the evils resulting from the unions are less important morally, economically, and politically, than the benefits that they have produced, let him calmly survey the conditions that would exist in England to-day if the unions were still prohibited by law, as they were during the period of English “wage slavery”, in the early decades of the nineteenth century. If the individual unions are sometimes immoral, and as such forbidden to conscientious working-men, because the organization does more harm than good. This was probably true of the Western Federation of Miners in Colorado a few years ago. The moral judgment to be passed upon unionism from the side of its results applies for the most part to the past. It cannot with certainty be applied to the future in order to determine whether a union or all unions are worthy of condemnation or of approval, except in so far as the past conduct of an organization may create a presumption for the time to come. If the judgment expressed in the last paragraph is sound, the presumption, therefore, is that the labour union in general will in the future be justified from the view-point of its results, and that it may claim the allegiance of conscientious men. And we have already seen that it is lawful in its general constitution and general aims.

I. The Aims and Results of the Labour Union.

—The two general aims, ends, or objects of the union are mutual insurance and better conditions of employment. In the opinion and procedure of the unionists, the second is much the more important. Conditions of employment include wages, hours, sanitation, and safety, and several other circumstances that affect the welfare of the workers. Better conditions mean, in the consciousness of the unionist, not only better conditions than those now enjoyed, but better than he would have if the union did not exist. In other words, the union aims at safeguarding and increasing present benefits. Inasmuch as these benefits rarely exceed, and probably in the majority of instances still fall below, the amount to which labour is entitled in justice, this aim is, in the consciousness of the unionist, the more justified.

The morality of the insurance feature is obvious.

So much for the union in general with regard to its general aims. In any specific instance a union is justified in seeking advantages, whether of wages, hours, or other conditions, only when these are in accord with the law of right. If its members are already re-ceiving all that they are morally entitled to, they of course do wrong when they use the power of their organization to extort more. For, contrary to the prevailing code of morality, the union is not the property of the last days of Greece and Rome with its condition and status to-day, we cannot doubt that the improvement is mostly due to Christianity, and that continued progress will be in proportion to the influence of Christian ideals in the social order. Some of these ideals are stronger to-day than ever before. In the whole of Europe of the last century, there is an element of justice in the labour contract, and when either party deliberately ignores this factor, its aim is to that extent immoral. This is as true of an organization as of an individual. Though good in its constitution and end, the union might possibly be immoral on account of the disproportionate amount of evil to which it leads. It is doubtful whether any intelligent and unbiased observer would contend that this hypothesis is verified to-day. Although the evil effects of the union are frequent, and sometimes very serious, they seem to be, on the whole, outweighed by its good effects. “An overwhelming preponderance of evidence before the Industrial Commission indicates that the organisation of labour has resulted in a marked improvement in the economic condition of the workers.” (Final Report of the Industrial Commission, p. 802.) And the good results obtained by organization are considerably enhanced by the fact that they could not have been secured in any other way. As Walker, a very conservative writer, says, “Nothing, economically speaking, can save economic society from progressive degradation except the spirit and power of the working class.” (Elementary Course in Political Economy, 266.) A careful survey of the history of labour during the last one hundred years will show with abundant clearness that no entire grade or class of labourers has secured any important economic advantage except by its own organized resistance and aggressiveness. And practically every union has at some time protected the working conditions of its members against deterioration. These facts are merely a result of the system of unlimited competition, not a condemnation of the employing class. If anyone doubt that the evils resulting from the unions are less important morally, economically, and politically, than the benefits that they have produced, let him calmly survey the conditions that would exist in England to-day if the unions were still prohibited by law, as they were during the period of English “wage slavery”, in the early decades of the nineteenth century. If the individual unions are sometimes immoral, and as such forbidden to conscientious working-men, because the organization does more harm than good. This was probably true of the Western Federation of Miners in Colorado a few years ago. The moral judgment to be passed upon unionism from the side of its results applies for the most part to the past. It cannot with certainty be applied to the future in order to determine whether a union or all unions are worthy of condemnation or of approval, except in so far as the past conduct of an organization may create a presumption for the time to come. If the judgment expressed in the last paragraph is sound, the presumption, therefore, is that the labour union in general will in the future be justified from the view-point of its results, and that it may claim the allegiance of conscientious men. And we have already seen that it is lawful in its general constitution and general aims.

I. The Aims and Results of the Labour Union.

—The two general aims, ends, or objects of the union are mutual insurance and better conditions of employment. In the opinion and procedure of the unionists, the second is much the more important. Conditions of employment include wages, hours, sanitation, and safety, and several other circumstances that affect the welfare of the workers. Better conditions mean, in the consciousness of the unionist, not only better conditions than those now enjoyed, but better than he would have if the union did not exist. In other words, the union aims at safeguarding and increasing present benefits. Inasmuch as these benefits rarely exceed, and probably in the majority of instances still fall below, the amount to which labour is entitled in justice, this aim is, in the consciousness of the unionist, the more justified.

The morality of the insurance feature is obvious.

So much for the union in general with regard to its general aims. In any specific instance a union is justified in seeking advantages, whether of wages, hours, or other conditions, only when these are in accord with the law of right. If its members are already re-
A. The Strike.—This is probably the most important of the methods, from the side of morals. It cannot be denied absolutely that there is an extreme moral and ought not to be employed unless certain grave conditions are verified. Whether they are all present in a given case, is rarely easy, and sometimes impossible, to determine with certainty. At any rate, the following seem to be the general conditions that ought to be fulfilled before a strike can be justified. First, the workers must be one to which they have a lawful or equitable claim; a peaceful solution of the difficulty must have been tried and found ineffectual; the grievance must outweigh the evil results that are likely to follow from the strike; and there must be good grounds for hoping that the strike will be successful. One of the good effects of well-established unions has been to lessen the number of strikes, and to moderate their excesses and abuses. Violence and the sympathetic strike are less frequent than formerly in connexion with the strike proper, but they are still so prominent as to deserve discussion. In so far as any attempt is made to justify the former, it is usually based on the claim that the labourer has a right to his job, and that he has at least the right to decent conditions of employment, and consequently that he may use force to protect this right against the unjust aggression of the man who employs him. For example, the employer may go out of business, and thus abolish the job, without doing the labourer any injustice. At most, the right to a job is merely the right to continue economic relations with a particular employer. It is, consequently akin to the right of a merchant to the patronage of his customers, or to the right of a man to pursue a lawful good by lawful means. Hence it is a right to a social relation, which leads to a material good, rather than a right to the material good itself. In a general way it is a right to liberty rather than to property; a right to pursue rather than a right to possess. Consequently, it may be deposed as truly as the right to patronage is violated by an unjust boycott; an obtained promise is violated through slander which prevents the would-be giver from carrying out his intention. The nature of the right to patronage will be discussed presently in connexion with the boycott.

Now it would seem that a right to his job in this sense of the phrase does inhere in the labourer who would suffer grave inconvenience if compelled to seek some other occupation; for example, a man with a family who owns a home where he works, and who would be unable to get employment at his trade from another employer in the same city. There is good reason to maintain that the employer who should discharge such an employee without grave reason would sin against not merely charity but justice. Conversely, cases can occur in which the labourers who quit their employer without a sufficiently grave reason will be guilty of injustice toward the latter. If these propositions are not sound, no boycott, however unreasonable, will be unjust merely because of the damage inflicted through the withdrawal of patronage. The labourers that take the places of the striking workers, who are assumed to have this right to their jobs, will by implication take also a sufficiently grave reason for the act. The right of the strikers to the jobs is not valid against other workers who are in grave need. For example, if the latter cannot without great difficulty find employment elsewhere, they will offend neither against charity nor justice when they take the places of the former; for they, no less than the strikers, have a right to seek and obtain a livelihood on reasonable terms. Both classes of workers are counting on advantages that both have a right to pursue and the latter must be interpreted and determined by reference to their respective conditions and needs. Hence it may happen that the prior right of the old employees to their jobs will give way before the sufficiently grave needs of the new-comers. Thus far we have assumed that the employer is attempting to compel his old employees to accept unjust conditions, and if they consent to work for less than living wages, they commit an illicit action, and consequently use immoral means to prevent the old employees from obtaining an advantage that the latter have a right to seek. And yet, the needs of the new men may be sufficiently grave to justify them in submitting to these harsh terms for themselves, and in depriving the older men of their jobs. Suppose, however, that the action of the new-comers finally results in the old employees, or some of them, returning to work on the old, unjust conditions. This is what usually happens when a strike is in the very heart of its progress. If the new men undoubtedly co-operate in producing an unjust effect, that is, in causing injustice to the old employees. The latter are unjustly treated, yet the instrumental agents of such injustice, namely, the new men, will be justified if their needs are such as to compel them to work under unsatisfactory terms. They sometimes lack such justification, particularly when they are professional "strike breakers", and when they would better their condition by holding off, and assisting the striking workers to obtain the just terms that are sought.

In view of the foregoing outline of the equities of the situation, the question concerning the morality of violent methods of supporting a strike may be answered somewhat as follows: As against the employer, the strikers have no right to destroy his property; for this is lawful only as one of the extreme measures of war, and a strike, no matter how just, has not the moral weight of a violating of a just war requirement. Even if the places of the strikers, no violence is lawful when the action of the former is justified by their own needs. Will it be lawful when there is no such justification? May not the strikers forcefully repel unjust assaults upon their rights to decent conditions of employment, just as a man may repel an attack of a burglar? Potter hesitates about giving a categorical answer, contenting himself with the statement that force will certainly not be justifiable when less objectionable means would be effective, or when the good effects to be expected are not great and certain in proportion to the evil effects (De Jure et Justitia, pp. 228, 229). Now, it is certain that the good effects to be obtained through the use of violence are practically never sufficient to outweigh the evil effects; for the benefits that labour would thus secure are insignificant compared with the social disorder and anarchy through which they would be obtained. The interests and rights of a class must yield before the interest and rights of the community. The sympathetic strike occurs when labourers who have no personal grievance quit work in order to aid their fellows. It can be directed either against the employer of the latter, or against some other employer who is not concerned in the original dispute. We have an example of the first kind when the brakemen on a railway strike out of sympathy with the trackmen who have left work because they have been refused an increase in wages. If the cause of the trackmen is just, the brakemen will not be wrong in
thus acting; for the employer's right to the continued services of the brakesmen is valid only so long as he treats them reasonably, and does not use the advantages which he derives from their services for unreasonable ends. When the employer is under an obligation to continue at work cease when a reasonable cause arises. Such a reasonable cause may well be at hand when their continuation at work becomes a means of assisting the employer in his unjust course towards the trackmen, while their withdrawal from his service will be effective in compelling him to do what is right. Their obligation towards their employer gives way before their right morally to coerce him to grant justice to their fellows. If, indeed, they should quit work without any reasonable cause whatever, they would be guilty of unreasonable interference with the employer's right to pursue the advantages to be derived from the railroad industry, but the cause of the unjustly treated trackmen may be sufficient to render the interference reasonable. It is on this principle that a strong nation or a strong man is justified in coming to the assistance of a weak nation or a weak man who is oppressed by a nation or man with whom the assisting nation or man has no business in which it is at personal profit. A sympathetic strike is against another employer than the one concerned in the original dispute, when, for example, bricklayers quit work because their employer continues to furnish material to a builder whose employees are on a strike, it will ordinarily be considered more charitable and just to the employer than if there are extreme cases in which the unconcerned employer would be under an obligation of charity to assist the labourers who are involved in the first strike, by ceasing to have business intercourse with the offending employer, but such cases would be rare, and the result would be the sympathetic strike against employers generally would be morally permissible. For the great body of employers and the general public are not reasonably treated when they are compelled to suffer so great inconvenience in order that an offending employer may be coerced into reasonable treatment of a small section of the community. While we cannot be certain that a general strike is never justified, we can safely say that there is against it an overwhelming presumption.

B. The Boycott.—In general the boycott is a concerted refusal to engage or continue in business or social intercourse with a person or corporation. Like the sympathetic strike, it is of two kinds, primary and secondary, or simple and compound. The primary boycott is carried on against a person with whom the boycotters have had a dispute; the secondary against some person who refuses to join in the primary boycott. The morality of the primary boycott depends upon the grievance that the boycotters have against the boycotted, and the extent to which, and the means by which it is prosecuted. If the labourers have not been unfairly treated by the person with whom they are at variance, they would be the injustices which they are not justified in carrying out. The basis of this right is the same far-reaching principle that we noticed in connection with the right of a man to his job, and of an unconcerned employer to the services of his employees who threaten to make him the victim of a secondary sympathetic strike. It is the principle that every man has a right to seek and obtain material advantages and opportunities on reasonable terms, and without unreasonable interference. Indeed, this is the real basis of even property rights, and the sole final justification of all the recognized property titles. Hence it is a violation of justice to deprive a man of the benefits of social or business intercourse without some sufficient reason. But there can be a sufficient reason. It will be present when the injustice inflicted by the employer is grave enough to justify an injunction against him. Boycott is a reasonable method. After all, the boycott does not differ essentially from the strike, which is also a concerted refusal of intercourse. But the boycott must be kept within the limits of justice and charity in its process and extent. It must be free from violence and other immoral device, and it must be carried so far as to deny to its object the necessities of life, or any of those acts of social intercourse which are demanded by the fundamental human relations,—what the theologians call the "communis signa charitatis". For the sake of clearness and simplicity, the foregoing observations refer only to the boycott against employers; they are not intended to apply to employees unfairly; but it is obvious that lawful boycotts have a much wider application. When the cause and the need are sufficiently grave, the boycott may be employed with due moderation against any unreasonable conduct that injures, harms, or wrongs any person, or any part of the community. The boycotters are encouraged to boycott the perversity of newspapers and theatres. The secondary boycott is directed, as already noted, against "innocent third persons", that is, those persons who refuse to assist in the primary boycott. For example, the labourers refuse to buy from a merchant who employs the boycotters. This is analogous to a manufacturer against whom they have a grievance. In principle it is the same as the secondary sympathetic strike, and in practice it is as well. It is commonly immoral except in extreme cases. It is commonly immoral because it is an unreasonable interference with the right of the unconcerned person to pursue and possess the advantages of social or business intercourse with his fellows, that is, with the person who is originally boycotted and the boycotters themselves. It is an unreasonable interference because it subjects him to what is in most cases an unreasonable inconvenience, that is, the deprivation of intercourse with the boycotted, and with the boycotters. This inconvenience is unreasonable because it is excessive as compared with the moral claims of the boycotters to the co-operation of the man who is compelled to suffer the inconvenience. That is, the former have a right to bestow their patronage where they please, in the name of a general proposition, but the proposition is too general to reflect adequately the equities of the situation. Undoubtedly the labourers, or any other class of persons, are within their rights and exempt from moral censure when they transfer their patronage to someone whom they wish to chastise, in the conviction that he is the agent of a manufacturer in the primary as well—the desire to help a friend is only incidental, while the intention to injure the boycotted person is direct and primary. This is not morally lawful unless the thing that they seek to compel him to do can be reasonably required of him. For example, when labourers withdraw their trade from a manufacturer because he refuses to refrain, at great financial loss, from patronizing a manufacturer who, we will suppose, is justly boycotted by the labourers and their friends, he is compelled to undergo a loss that is out of proportion to his duty of assisting the latter. His right to business intercourse on reasonable terms is violated.

On the other hand, cases do occur in which an unconcerned person may reasonably be required to give up the advantages of business relations with the man against whom the primary boycott is directed; if he
refuses, he may rightfully be made the object of a secondary boycott until he is ready to act reasonably. A clothing merchant who obstinately continues to buy his supplies from a boycotted manufacturer of "sweat-shop" goods would seem to be a case in point. For this reason, no good business has any reason to do otherwise than to refuse dealing with him, and the secondary boycott will not only tend to induce the merchant to assist the original boycott, but will directly and in itself increase the scope of the latter. Consequently, here, secondary boycott is not only lawful and always right. Lawyers, and occasionally judges, condemn it on the ground that it involves threats, or that it causes injury to a man's business, or that it implies a conspiracy, but every one of these features is contained in a strike. Whatever may be the legal aspect of the matter, a threat is not morally wrong per se. Its morality depends upon what is threatened, and how, and why. Injuries indirectly caused, which is the case in strikes and boycotts, are justified whenever all the conditions are present which render morally lawful the performance of an act not bad in itself, but which produces both good and bad effects. The morality of a strike is determined by its purpose. Although the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission denounced the secondary boycott unreservedly, the particularly immoral and cruel instances cited show that the commission had in mind the abuses of the practice rather than the practice itself. Nevertheless, the abuses seem to be so frequent in actual life that we cannot wonder at the attitude of those who wish to have the practice forbidden by positive law.

C. The Closed Shop, or the Union Shop. These phrases point to that method or policy of the unions by which their members refuse to work with non-unionists in the same establishment or employment. Now, if, as sometimes happens, the unions refuse to admit non-unionists to membership on reasonable terms, in order to monopolize the trade or employment, their action will, generally speaking, be uncharitable, if not unjust. But if the union is willing to admit all capable workers, and if it has a sufficient reason for pursuing the closed-shop policy, the latter will be neither unjust nor uncharitable. Among the considerations advanced in justification of the policy are the following: The non-unionist ought to help to defray the expenses of organization, from which he derives so much benefit; the presence of non-unionists at an establishment often prevents that peace and discipline which is one of the aims and results of an agreement between the union and the employer, and provokes constant bickering between the two classes of workers, and, most important of all, the average employer strives to suppress gradually the unionist employees or to reduce their wages to the lower level accepted by the non-unionists. In a word, the general defence of the closed-shop policy is that it is indispensable to effective organization. The employment inevitably tends to become all union, or no union. This defence is both justifiable, and on justified, but in the sense that, if it does give a true account of the situation, the closed-shop policy is justifiable; for, as a general rule, organization is necessary to obtain just conditions for labour. Of course there are exceptions to this rule. We speak here only of what generally happens, without inquiring into the frequency of the exceptions. In so far as the closed shop is necessary as a means to reasonable conditions of employment, it will not be immoral, as against either the non-unionist or the employer. Neither is deprived of his right to enter economic relations and pursue his livelihood on reasonable conditions. It would not merit much consideration if it said would comply with that condition which alone makes justice possible for the mass of his fellow-workers, and it is unreasonable that he should desire to work as a non-unionist when such action tends to produce unjust circumstances for all. There are, indeed, cases in which the inconvenience of joining the union is great, as compared with the harm that would be done to the class through the opposite course. Membership in the union would then be an unreasonable employment. The closed-shop policy is often objected to, on the ground that it deprives the non-unionist of his natural right to work. In this assertion the right to work, which no one denies, and which cannot possibly be violated except by physical restraint, is confused with the right to work in certain conditions of social relations. The specific demand of the non-unionist is that he shall be permitted to work beside members of the union. If this were an unconditional right it would contradict and annul a similar right of the unionist, namely, the right not to work beside the former. One of these rights is no better than the other. In point of fact neither is genuine, for there can be no such prerogative as an unconditional right to a social relation. The right of a non-unionist to work in the same shop with a unionist is no more unconditional than the right to strike, to boycott, or to enter any social relation which requires the consent of the other party. A condition of employment is a special condition, and it is valid only when these are reasonable. In the hypothesis that we are considering, membership in the union is such a reasonable condition, while refusal to enter is unreasonable. Hence, if the closed-shop policy is necessary in order to obtain proper conditions of employment for the body of the labourers, it will not violate the right of the non-unionist, even if it prevents him from obtaining any employment; for the right in question is dependent upon the contingency that it be exercised within reasonable limits. To deny this is implicitly to assert that the unionists are obliged to work in conditions that are unreasonable. Finally, the policy under discussion may properly be opposed by an employer who otherwise treats his employees fairly. Contrary to the impression that seems to be prevalent, the closed shop is not an innovation. It was enforced for centuries by the guilds, and for a long time in many places it was sanctioned and prescribed by civil legislation (Cf. Ashley, "English Economic History", I, 82). Practically speaking, the law forbade a man to work at his trade unless he belonged to the guild. What the civil law could then command, individuals can now with reason seek to obtain by persuasion, bargaining, and contract.

The methods and policies discussed in the foregoing pages exhibit all the more important moral aspects of the labour union. All these practices involve economic relations which are a means of obtaining material goods. If the relations were not necessary to this end, they could not become the basis of rights. Since they are necessary, they give rise to a right, which, like all other rights, is limited by the end to which it is a means, and is sufficiently realized when it can be exercised on reasonable terms. On this principle only; that is, in the only kind of right, whether to life, property, or liberty. And all that has been said in connexion with the strike, the boycott, and the closed shop, was merely an attempt to apply this general and far-reaching principle. To forestall misunderstanding, it may be well to note that every violation of justice through labour-union methods is also a violation of charity, and that charity may sometimes be offended without any breach of strict justice.

D. Limitation of Output and of Apprentices.—The practice of restricting the amount of work to be performed by the non-union on a given day, or to refuse to allow a given number of his union members to be employed, is generally willing to admit. But it is probably less frequent than the opponents of the union assert. In itself this method is not wrong, and it may even be
L Auberge. Competent authorities maintain that the exceptional workman is often constituted the pacemaker for all the others, and that the intensity of exertion demanded by many forms of high-speed machinery has considerably reduced the working-life of the workers. "The Social Unemployment of the 19th Century," p. 733). In such cases the union does well to endeavour to keep the output of the average man down to an average reasonable limit. When the restriction goes beyond this, and is motivated by indolence or by the desire of making a job last longer, it is clearly unjustifiable and dishonest. To the complaint of the employer that in many of the skilled trades the union will not permit the training of a sufficient number of apprentices, the unionist replies with a simple denial. The explanation of the difference between them is largely in their different standards of sufficiency. Both recognize that a scarcity of apprentices tends to make wages high, but they do not agree as to the point at which wages are sufficiently high. Since the employer is generally able to pass the extra cost of labour on to the consumer, he is not seriously in any danger of becoming under-capitalized. In other words, the supply of skilled workers is kept so low that their wages are unreasonably high. The workers who are able and willing to qualify for the trade are also injured, inasmuch as they are compelled to enter a lower and less remunerative occupation. At what precise point in the wage scale a real injustice is done to the consumer, it is practically impossible to say; but, since such a point can be reached, since the men in those trades where limitation of apprentices is enforced are, as a rule, sufficiently organized to defend their just interests, and since a considerable injury is done to those who are excluded from the trade, the practice would seem to be of doubtful moral correctness. After all, a labour union can become a real monopoly, capable of practising extortion upon the community as truly, though not as extensively, as a monopoly of products.

While the unions are a necessity of our present industrial system, they are nevertheless, both in spirit and in many of their methods, a necessary evil. They are too often established and maintained on the theory or conviction that the competition between employer and employee is a veritable war, in which the object is to secure for all that is possible to secure, and in which the victory is always to the stronger force. If competition were restrained by law or by some other species of social control within the limits of reason and morality, if the taking of exorbitant profits and the reduction of wages below the level of decent living were alike rendered impos-

sible, the union would still be desirable, indeed, just as organization is desirable for every class of men whose interests are common; but a far greater proportion of its activities could be devoted to mutual help, especially in the form of insurance, and a much smaller proportion to the struggle for the abolition of unfair terms, and to economic warfare generally. In that better, though still remote, day, most of the extreme methods of the union, such as the strike, the boycott, and the closed shop, could be discarded in favour of milder practices, such as collective bargaining, insurance, and education.

ADAMS and RUMER, Labor Problems (New York, 1905); Commons, Trade Unions and Labor Problems (New York, 1904); the "Report of the Commission on Trade Unions" (London, 1904); IDEM, Industrial Democracy (London, 1902); BLAIR, The New Dictionary of Socialism, ed. (New York, 1905); Macdonald and others in Irish Theological Quarterly (1906, 1907), articles on Boycotting: See also (Paris, 1890): LEHM, "Droit et Justice," in (Paris, 1890); LASER, "La Sociale d'Espagne," in (Paris, 1890); LEHM, "La Sociale d'Espagne," in (Paris, 1890). See also (Paris, 1890). See also (Paris, 1890). See also (Paris, 1890). See also (Paris, 1890).

John A. Ryan.
century, and the centre stone (which is octagonal and was formerly inlaid with brass imagery) is still preserved in the museum of that city. These labyrinths are supposed to have originated in a symbolic allusion to the Holy City, and certain prayers and deviations doubtless accompanied the perambulation of their intricate maze.—In modern times, gnomes are fantastic arrangements of lofty and interlaced box hedges in a garden as at Hampton Court, where it is difficult to find one's way to the centre.


THOMAS H. POOLE.

Laç, Stanielas du, Jesuit educationist and social worker, b. at Paris, 21 November, 1835; d. there, 30 August, 1909. His father, Louis Paul Albert du Lac de Fugères, was descended from a noble family, noted in history as early as 1206, and his mother was Camille de Rouvroy de Lamairie. Entering the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Issenheim, in Alsace, October 28, 1853, he studied theology at Laval till 1869, when he was ordained priest by Mgr. Wicart, 19 September. The following summer (1870) he was made rector of the new College of Sainte-Croix, at Mans, where, during the Franco-Prussian war, he organized an efficient hospital service. During the ten months of his rectorship at Mans, twenty-two thousand soldiers sojourned successively in his college. In October, 1871, he succeeded the martyred Father Léon Douroudray as Rector of the Ecole Sainte-Geneviève, generally called "La Rue des Postes," an institution which prepared candidates for the great military and scientific schools of France. During his rectorship, from 1872 to 1881, 213 of his pupils were admitted to the Ecole Centrale, 279 to the Ecole Polytechnique, and 830 to Saint-Cyr.

With a rare combination of firmness and gentleness he trained his students to be such fearless Catholics that they gradually infused a Catholic spirit into the military school of Saint-Cyr. This, together with their unparalleled success at the entrance examinations, was the real cause of the closing of the Jesuit colleges in 1880 and of the subsequent persecution of the Church in France. In 1880 he founded a new French college, St. Mary's, at Canterbury, England, where he remained as rector nine years, venerated and loved by all who met him, Protestants as well as Catholics. The last ten years of his life were spent in Paris, Versailles, as preacher, director of souls, and founder of the "Syndicat de l'Aigüille," a collection of loan and benefit societies for needlewomen, dressmakers, seamstresses, especially those young sewing girls who are called midinettes. As early as 1901 this syndicate, which has spread all over France, counted more than two thousand members and two hundred lady patronesses in Paris alone, where its two restaurants, reserved exclusively for members, had served more than a million meals, and where its preventive zeal had saved and consoled thousands of young women. Father du Lac had been for many years, in the eyes of the ignorant anti-Catholic multitude, the personification of the scheme of Jesuit, while the Catholics who knew him best thought him only too frank, too apt to waste his kindness on men whose hatred of the Church is immeasurable. He wrote two books: "France" (Paris, 1889), which dwells particularly on the relation between the Rector of St. Mary's, Canterbury, and his French boys; and "Jésuites" (Paris, 1901), a defence of the Society of Jesus, containing many autobiographical reminiscences. In the last long months of illness God took him away from the strife of tongues into the solitude of a religious house which was not his own, a hospital where he died in poverty and perfect trust.

YVINDOLIUT in L'Univers (Paris, September 2 and 5, 1909); IDROM in L'Action Sociale (Quebec, 9 October, 1909); AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY (New York, 18 September, 1909); ÉTUDES (Paris, 20 September, 1909).

LEWIS DRUMMOND.

La Calzada. See CALAHORRA and LA CALZADA, Diocese of.

Lace.—(Lat. laqueus; It. laccio, trine, merletto; Sp. lazo, encaje, pasamanos; Fr. lacis, dentelle; Ger. Spitze).—I. HAND-MADE LACE.—(1) Classification.—(a) Needle-made lace, or needlepoint (trine ad ago), which has three divisions:—(i) Lacies, lace made by working various needlepoint stitches on a specially prepared knotted netting (modano) or twisted netting (buratto). (ii) Lace made by the needle on a foundation of woven linen—the pattern sometimes made by drawing threads together by the needle, sometimes by cutting portions of the linen away and sewing over the remaining threads. This linen lace is called drawn-work (tela tirata) and reticello or cut-work (tela tagliata). A Venetian chalice-cover of the seventeenth century has a background of cut-work, the figures being worked in punto in aria. (iii) Needle lace made without any foundation at all, and hence called punto in aria. This includes every variety of needle-made or point lace made entirely without foundation, such as Venice and Spanish flat point and raised point, point de France, Alençon point, point de gaze, etc. However widely dissimilar these laces may be in their designs and styles of execution, they all come under the head of needlepoint lace.

(b) Bobbin-point lace, which is made with bobbins on a pillow (trine a fusellì) or by crochet, tatting or simply twisting and knotting threads by hand into fringe as in macramè (Sp. meropec). There are three chief ways of making bobbin-lace. (i) Early or peasant lace.—A tape, sometimes plain, sometimes ornamented, is made on the pillow, and joined up as required, but is not cut or finished off until the pattern is completed. (ii) Genoese, Milanese lace, etc. (Figs. 1 and 2).—Complete sprays or patterns are made and finished on the pillow and afterwards placed as required and joined by brides or by a réseau. (iii) Mechlin, binche, valenciennes, etc.—The same bobbins which were first filled and placed on the pillow continue throughout the process, and complete both pattern and ground of the lace.

(2) History.—Among the Egyptian antiquities discovered in 1809 by Professor F. Petrie, at Aurneh, it is interesting to recognize the square knotted mesh netting, similar to the laces called modano. This netting covers the vases found at the side of the coffin of a
remarkable burial of the seventeenth dynasty (1800 B.C.). Other specimens of lace made with bobbins (Fig. 9; Cluny Museum) and of lace stitches worked on linen have been found in Egyptian tombs of the first to the third century, and fine specimens of these are in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, and in the Cluny Museum, Paris. For many subsequent centuries we possess no actual specimens of lace fabrics, but records, illuminated manuscripts, sculpture, and paintings give us evidence that hand-work in lace and on linen was continuously and gradually developed into the beautiful products of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It will be worth while to quote some ancient references. The "Ancres Riwle of the thirteenth century cautions nuns against devoting too much time to lace and ornamental work, to the detriment of work for the poor. The record of a visitation at St. Paul's, London, in 1295, mentions laces under the name of album filum nodatum (knotted white thread). A roll of the possessions of the Knights Templars after their suppression in 1312 includes an inventory of the Temple Church, London. An item in this is "one net which is called Esponum to cover the Lectern."

On the question of design, as indicating the date of lacework, the early geometric character of design inspired by the East was modified as early as the eighteenth century, as we see, by realistic ornamentation, such as

![Fig. 2. Flounce of Milanese Bobbin Lace XVII Century, Pollen Collection, London](image)

![Fig. 3. Border of Needlepoint Worked at the convent of Youghal, Ireland, XIX Century](image)

punte tirate and is evidently of Eastern origin; the flounce of pillow lace was added at a later date.

Dr. Daniel Rock has pointed out that the long strips of laces and linen lace of early work, now sometimes found, were covers for the lectern; and this is confirmed by the fact that the figure subjects are usually worked across the width of the piece, as in a remarkable piece dating from the fifteenth century. This is a strip of tela tirata, six feet by twelve and one-half inches, probably worked by the nuns at Assisi as a lectern cover, and representing, among other sacred subjects, St. Francis receiving the Stigmata (Fig. 7, Pollen Collection). Existing records as early as the twelfth century mention "worked albs" belonging to the Abbey of St. Albans, and in an inventory of 1466 of St. Stephen's, London, we read of "worked altar cloths and towels" and some with three "rayes" at each end. These "rayes" were rows of insertion of reticello work.

There is no doubt that the Church was the first patron of lace-making in Europe, and the finest existing specimens both of early and late work were made to decorate albs, Mass vestments, etc. A very curious specimen of linen lace of pre-Reformation times is the pyx veil now existing in the parish of Hesthill in Suffolk. This beautiful square, entirely worked in...
lace tirata, has a hole in the centre through which the chain passed to hang the vessel containing the Blessed Sacrament.

Two examples of the flourishing industry of modern production of needle-point are given. Fig. 3 is a border worked at the convent at Youghal, Ireland. Fig. 4 is from the school of Burano, in Venice, patronised by the Holy Father, the Queen of Italy, and others.

Spanish needlepoint laces may be identified by a certain over-elaboration of design and ornaments. Much seventeenth- and eighteenth-century church lace came from Spain at the time of the Revolution and suppression of the monasteries in 1830: hence the name “Spanish point” is often given to gros point de Venise. The lace now made in Spain is distinctly derived and actually named from Flemish and Italian originals. Barcelona makes much silk lace.

A Venetian lace-designer was invited to France by Henry III about 1580, and lace-making was established in Auvergne. Fifty years later an edict of the Toulouse Parliament put a stop to this flourishing industry, and the inhabitants of Velay and Le Puy were reduced to misery, but by the exertions of the Jesuit Father John Francis Regis (afterwards canonized by Clement XII) the obnoxious law was repealed, and the saint is still the patron of lace-making. Lace in those days was even technically under the protection of the Church, among the names of stitches being “Pater”,

The earliest lace-pattern books now existing are dated 1527, which proves that the art was already well known and practised, as the patterns given in these books are only practicable for very experienced workers. From this time in Venice began the punto in aria, worked first as flat point and punto adorío, and then with numberless enrichments constituting raised, or rose, point, punto de neve, or rosalline point, caterpillar point, etc. The flowing scrolls and graceful, though always conventional flowers, are characteristic of the splendid Venetian laces. In the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, is a very remarkable set of Mass vestments, chasuble, stole, maniple, and chalice veil, made entirely of the finest seventeenth-century Venetian rose point; the veil has emblems of the Blessed Sacrament, the vine, ears of corn, etc. In the same place is a splendid altar-frontal of seventeenth-century gros point de Venise.

It should be remembered that many articles made for church use in early times are much to be admired as a testimony to zeal and devotion. But some,

such as the lace chasubles and the alb in Fig. 8, the rubrics at present in force would not approve of for use in the sanctuary. Albs and cottas should have the major part of linen; lace, to be correct, should be only twelve inches deep, as an alb flounce, and there should be no frill of lace at the neck.

"Ave Maria", "Chapelet", etc. More than 100,000 workers now make pillow lace and point Arabe, as the modern guipure is called, at Le Puy, and lace is also made in the departments of Cantal and Vienne, and at Mirecourt in the Vosges. Alençon had an early lace-making industry, and portions of laces made for church use about 1550 by the then Duchess of Alençon are now to be seen in the museum of that town. Later, the needlepoint industry of Alençon was founded by Venetian workers imported by the State in 1665, and the magnificent point de France was the result (Fig. 5). The French modifications of Venetian design were most ambitious and ingenious, and in any important piece of point de France may be found every variety of realistic design, or emblems of religion, war, or the arts, together with portraits of great personages and heraldic devices. Towards the end of the eighteenth century a less ambitious style was adopted, the Alençon laces lost their Venetian character, and the designs became for the most part a series of small floral patterns. Needlepoint is still made at Alençon by two or three hundred workers. Pillow lace flourished in Belgium and Holland from the fifteenth century and attained its apogee in the eighteenth; the designs closely followed the fashions of France and Italy. Magnificent flounces for albe of Brussels point

Fig. 5. Point de France
Made at Alençon by Venetian workers, about 1670

Fig. 6. Cap of Hollie (Holy) Point
XVII Century, Pollen Collection, London

Fig. 7. Strip of Tela Tirata
Probably worked by nuns of Assisi as a lectern cover, showing St. Francis receiving the Stigmata; XV Century. Pollen Collection
France may claim to have perfected them. The stock- ing machine was no doubt the parent of lace-making machinery. The machines were started at Nottingham in England, early in the nineteenth century, and were called bobbin-net, or point-net, machines, and the lace first made was often finished and enriched by hand. Owing to the destruction of more than a thousand stocking frames and lace machines by rioters, it was made a capital offence in 1812 to destroy machines. Imitation lace was shown at the Exhibition of 1851, and English lace now employs designers for lace of all kinds, and produces machines making the heaviest, as well as the finest, of modern laces. Calais in France, St. Gall in Switzerland, and Plauen in Saxony are centres of activity and enterprise in the production of lace fabrics, and the value of lace manufactured in England, France, Switzerland and Germany exceeds a billion dollars annually.

MARIA M. POLLEN.

Lacedonia, Diocese of (Laquedoniensi), in the province of Avellino, Southern Italy. Lacedonia is named in history for the 'laureate' kings of the Kingdom of Naples against King Ferdinand I, which took shape in the cathedral of Lacedonia (1484). The episcopal see dates from the eleventh century. The first known bishop is Desiderius, mentioned in 1062, but he is known to have had predecessors. Among the other noteworthy bishops were Fra Guglielmo Neritone (1392); Antonio Dura (1506); Gianfrancesco Carducci (1564); the distinguished mathematician Marco Pedaceca (1554); the learned and virtuous Giacomo Candido (1606); Giacomo Giordano (1651), who built the episcopal palace and planned a new cathedral; Benedetto Bartolo, who was seized by the brigands and later redeemed by the Marquess of Carpi; Morea (1684), who suppressed certain festivities of pagan origin celebrated on the vigil of Epiphany, and laid the corner-stone of the new cathedral; Francesco Ubaldino Romanz (1798), under whom the Diocese of Lacedonia was increased by unification for the adjoining diocese subject to the Metropolitan of Benevento, and which dates at least from the tenth century, when a Bishop Benedetto is mentioned (964). Lacedonia has suffered much from earthquakes, especially in 1694 and 1702. The diocese is a suffragan of Conza and Campagna, and has 11 parishes with 28,600 souls, 1 Capuchin monastery, and 1 house of the Daughters of St. Anne.

Cappelletti, La chiesa di l'Italia, XX (Venice, 1857). U. BENIGNI.

La Chaise (Chaise), François d'Aix de, confessor of King Louis XIV, b. at the mansion of Aix, in Forez, Department of Loire, 25 August, 1624; d. at Paris, 20 January, 1709. He entered the Jesuit novitiate at Reanne in 1649; after teaching the humanities and philosophy for some time at the Collège de la Sainte Trinité at Lyons, he became rector of the same college and, somewhat later, provincial of his order. In 1675 he succeeded the deceased Father Ferrier as confessor to King Louis XIV, and filled this influential but extremely delicate position conscientiously for thirty-four years. He is often accused of having connived at the king's liaison with Madame de Montespan, and of having advised the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and the violent suppression of Protestantism. The facts are that La Chaise used all his influence to put an end to the king's ill-considered affair with Madame de Montespan and finally succeeded, with the help of Madame de Maintenon, in breaking the liaison. After the death of Queen Maria Theresa in 1683, he advised the king's marriage to Madame de Maintenon, through whose
influence the king and the whole court of Versailles underwent a wholesome change.

It is not known in how far La Chaise was connected with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, but it is probable that, like most other Catholics of France, he advocated it. The accusation that he advised the use of force to effect a Protestant state, without foundation, and does not harmonize with the admitted mildness of his character. Saint-Simon (Mémoires, IV, 285-7), Voltaire (Séize de Louis XIV, III, 305), and other enemies of the Jesuits testify to his kindness and humanity. He corresponded with Edward Coleman concerning lawful means for behalf of the foundation of the Catholics in England; but a letter concerning the extortion of Protestantism, allegedly to have been written by La Chaise to Father Petre, the confessor of James II of England, has been proved to be a forgery. As a mark of esteem King Louis XIV presented him with Mont-Louis, a beautiful tract of land in the southeast part of Paris. In 1804 it was converted into a cemetery, and it is still known as Père Lachaise.

CHARITÉLABRIE, Le Père de la Chaise, confesseur de Louis XIV [signature], 1891; SOMMEOVRE, Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus, II (Brussels, 1891), 1033-40.

MICHAEL OTT.

Lacordaire, Jean-Baptiste-Henri-Dominique, the greatest pulpit orator of the nineteenth century, b. near Dijon, 13 May, 1802; d. at Sorèze, 21 Nov., 1861. When he was only four years old he lost his father, and was thenceforth under the care of his mother, "a brave Christian" but no poet. She came of a family of lawyers, and brought her son up for the bar. While still at school he lost his faith. From Dijon he went to Paris, to complete his legal studies under M. Guillenmain. His first efforts at the bar attracted the attention of the great Berruyer, who predicted for him a successful career as an advocate. Meantime, however, he regained his faith, and resolved to devote himself entirely to the service of God. He entered the seminary of Issy, 12 May, 1824, and, in spite of the reluctance of the superiors, was ordained by Mgr de Quelen, Archbishop of Paris, 22 Sept., 1827. His first years in the ministry were spent as chaplain to a convent and at the Collège Henri IV. This work was little to his taste. Accordingly, when Mgr. Dubois, Bishop of New York, visited Paris in 1829 in search of priests for his diocese, he found a ready volunteer in the young Abbé Lacordaire. All around the Church devoted to the Master, Lacordaire left starting to be made the Revolution broke out (July, 1830). The Abbé de Lamennais, at this time at the height of his reputation as a defender of the Church, immediately offered him the post of collaborator in "L'Avenir," a newspaper intended to fight for the cause of "God and Freedom." The story of this famous journal belongs to the article Lamennais. Here it will be enough to mention that Lacordaire gladly accepted the offer, and abandoned his proposed journey to America. He and Montalembert, whom he first met at the office of "L'Avenir," were the principal contributors. Their purpose was to reconvene all State protection and assistance, and to demand religious freedom, not as a favour, but as a right. They advocated free speech and a free press, and exhorted the Catholics to avail themselves of these weapons in defense of their rights. Their religious teaching was strongly Ultra- conservative; as a result, the Lettres and the article on seven occasions was from Lacordaire's pen. He did not write on abstract subjects; his line was to take some event of the day—some insult to religion, some striking incident in the action of Catholics in other countries, particularly Ireland—and make this a topic for denunciation. Mgr de Quelen. He now decided to enter the Dominican Order, whose name of "Friars Preachers" naturally appealed to him. Meantime he preached a course of conferences at Metz in the
Lenten season of 1838, which were equally successful with those of Notre-Dame. His "Mémoire pour le Rétablissement des Frères Prêcheurs" was preliminary to his reception of the habit at the Minerva in Rome (9 April, 1839). Next year he made his vows (29 March) and returned to France. The old house of the restored order was established at Nancy in 1843; a second at Chalais in 1844; a novitiate at Flavigny in 1845; and finally a French province was erected with Lacordaire as first provincial.

Meantime, in the Advent of 1843, the conferences were held in Notre-Dame, and continued one break until 1852. At first King Louis Philippe endeavoured to prevent the resumption of the conferences, but the new archbishop, Mgr Affre, was firm, and merely required that the preacher should wear a canon's rochet and mozetta over his Dominican habit. The interest in the conferences was greater than ever. It was noted that the orator had gained in depth and brilliancy by his years of retirement. And here it will be well to describe briefly the nature of the conferences and the causes of the extraordinary interest which they aroused. The old-fashioned sermon—telem, exordium, three points, and peroration—dealt with politics and more Rubricology, but to believers. It reached its highest perfection at the hands of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, and Massillon. The clergy in the first part of the nineteenth century went on preaching as before, speaking of the same subjects, bringing forward the same arguments, using the same methods; forgetting all the while that they had to appeal not only to believers but also to infidels. It was Lacordaire's merit that he discerned the necessity of a complete reform; new subjects, new arguments, new methods must be adopted. The matter must be apologetic, and, as apologetics vary according to the nature of the enemy's assault, it must be adapted to meet the attacks of the day. With the rare insight of genius, Lacordaire began where the ordinary apologist ends. He took the Church as his starting-point, considering her as a great historical fact, and drawing from her existence, her long-continued duration, and her social and moral action the proof of her authority. Thus the first conferences in 1835 treated of the Church's constitution and her social activity. In the second course he went on to speak of the doctrines of the Church viewed in their general aspect. When he resumed the conferences in 1843 he spoke of the effect of the doctrine upon the human soul, upon the soul (humility, chastity, and other virtues), and upon society. Again, before treating of God, he took Christ for the subject of the best known of all the series (1846). From the Son he passed to the Father (1848), proving the existence of God and dealing with His work of creation. From God he descended to man and the doctrine of man's Fall and Redemption (1849-50). The coup d'état prevented the continuance of the conferences in Notre-Dame, but a further course was delivered at Toulouse in 1854, treating of life, natural and supernatural.

The material of the conferences was quite unlike that of the ordinary sermon. There was no opening text, or prayer; no firstly, secondly, thirdly; no pause between the divisions. After a short exordium, indicating the subject to be dealt with, he plunged at once in medias res, and let his subject grow upon his hearers. His voice, feeble at the beginning, gradually grew in volume until it rang through the vast vault of the cathedral, sometimes breaking out into a cry which thrilled the hardest hearts. His gestures were graceful and yet full of vigour; his dark eyes flashed out the fire that was burning in Notre-Dame. "He chased the moment, coming freely to his lips after careful preparation of the matter and the main lines of his discourse; indeed, his most brilliant passages were inspired by some movement among his audience, or some sudden emotion within himself. We can understand the state of prostration produced by such delivery, and how his strenuous efforts tended to shorten his life.

The government of Louis Philippe came to an ignominious end in Feb., 1848. In his opening conference of that year, delivered at Notre-Dame, while the revolutionists were still standing, Lacordaire welcomed the Revolution in language which was greeted with prolonged applause. Now at last he hoped to carry out his old programme of "God and Freedom"—without youtual excesses that favoured the policy of "L'Avenir". A new parliament was started under his editorship, but he wrote little in its columns. He realised that his strength lay rather in speech than in writing. In the elections he accepted a nomination for Paris, but obtained only a small number of votes. He was, however, returned for the department of Bouches-du-Rhône. He took his seat on the Extreme Left, clad though he was in his Dominican habit. A few benches below him sat his former friend and master, now his bitter foe, Lamennais. The invasion of the Assembly by the rabble convinced him that his dream of a Catholic republic was not to be; he became, and was twice elected, a Royalist, and some months later gave up the editorship of "L'Ere Nouvelle". He did his utmost to prevent the Church from becoming identified with the Empire established by Napoleon III. For this reason he refused to continue his conferences in 1852, though urged to do so by Mgr Affre. The last course of the conferences was delivered in the church of Saint-Roch in 1853. It was a sermon on the text: "Esto vir" (III Kings, ii, 2), and was an outspoken attack on the new Government. After this it was impossible for him to remain in Paris. For the rest of his life he had charge of the military chapels in the department of Tarn, where he inculcated the duties of manliness and patriotism as well as religion. Though he was devoted to his youthful pupils, he naturally felt that he was exiled and silenced. In 1861 (24 Jan.) he was called out of his obscurity to take his seat in the Academy—an honour which cast a gleam of brightness over his last days. It was at this time that he uttered the famous words: "J'espère mourir en religieux pénitent et en libéral impénitent." Towards the end of the year (21 Nov.) he passed away at Sorèze, after a long and painful illness, in his sixtieth year.

Lacordaire was of middle height, sparely but strongly built. He always objected to sit for his portrait, but one day at Sorèze he submitted. He is represented seated, and absorbed in prayer, with his hands crossed one over the other, for the Elevation bell was ringing in the church when the portrait was taken. Besides his "Eloges funèbres" (Drouot, O'Connell, and Mgr Forbin-Janson) he published: "Lettre sur le Saint-Siège"; "Considérations sur le système philosophique de M. de Lamennais"; "De la liberté d'Italie et de l'Eglise"; "La vie de S. Dominique". "La vie de la Ville Madeleine". Some of the conferences were finally printed, and contain many sublime passages, but are of little historical value. Mme Swetchine said of him: "On ne le connaîtra que par ses lettres." Eight volumes of these have already been published, including his correspondence with Mme Swetchine and Mme de la Tour de Pins, and "Lettres à des Jeunes Gens", collected and edited by his friend H. Perreyve in 1862 (tr. Derby, 1864; revised and enlarged ed. London, 1902). Amongst Lacordaire's most celebrated works are his "Conférences" (tr. vol. I only, London, 1851); "Dieu et l'homme" in "Conférences de Notre-Dame" (tr. Derby, 1855); "Lettres à l'Auteur" (tr. London, 1869); "Dieu" (tr. London, 1870).

("Œuvres du R. P. H. D. Lacordaire" (Paris, 1873); "FOSSERT, VIE DE LACORDAIRE" (Paris, 1870); "CROJAC, LE R. P. LACORDAIRE, sieur virtuose et religieux" (Paris, 1866); Tr. THE LIVING LIFE OF LACORDAIRE (9th ed., London, 1901). These two lives mutually

Jean Thodore Lacaordaire, a distinguished French entomologist, brother of the famous preacher of the same name, b. at Reccey-sur-Ouese, Cote d’Or, 1 Feb., 1801; d. at Liége, 18 July, 1870. As a boy he was very fond of natural history and especially the study of insect life. Family circumstances, however, made it necessary for him to adopt a mercantile career; he was sent to Havre, and at the age of twenty-four sailed for South America. He soon after began to devote himself to the study of zoology. Visiting South America four times between the years 1825 and 1832, he travelled on foot through extensive districts in order to study the rich insect fauna, particularly the beetles. In his essay ‘Des Morts et des Gaz’ for Intervening years were spent at Paris, where he made the acquaintance of the foremost contemporary French zoologists and devoted himself entirely to scientific studies. In 1836 he was appointed professor of zoology and comparative anatomy in the University of Liége, which he held until his death, more than thirty years later.

He was a deeply religious man, particularly in his declining years, and one of his daughters became a nun. His scientific activity was conspicuous, unselfish, and untiring, and he was honoured with membership in many learned European societies. His principal works, which he began to publish in 1834, show independent and thorough research, and a full command of the extensive literature of entomology; while his first work, ‘Introduction à l’Entomologie’ (2 vols., Paris, 1834–38), relates to the whole science of entomology, the subsequent volumes deal exclusively with beetles (Coleoptera). In 1842 was published ‘Monographie des Érotyliens’; in 1845–48 (Paris, 2 vols.), ‘Monographie des Coleoptères subpentamères de la famille des Phytophages’, published also in the ‘Mémoires de la Société Royale des Sciences de Liége’. But his most important work was the monumental ‘Nouvelles Insectes’, with the sub-title, ‘Genera de Coleoptères’ (Paris, 1854–1876, 12 tomes in 14 vols.); it contains a detailed description of all the then known genera of beetles, numbering about 6000. Although Lacaordaire devoted the last eighteen years of his life to this work, he could not finish it. The last three volumes were written by his pupil, F. Chapuis. The text of this great work is accompanied by an atlas of 134 plates.

Chapuis in the preface to Vol. X of Genera des Coleopteres (1879); Krenkel, ‘Das Christum und die Verbreitung der neueren Naturwissenschaft’ (Freiburg, 1904).

Joseph Rompel.

La Crosse, Diocese of (Crossensis), erected in 1858, included that part of the State of Wisconsin, U. S. A., lying north and west of the Wisconsin River. In 1905 the establishment of the Diocese of Superior subdivided this territory and reduced it to the Counties of Adams, Buffalo, Chippewa, Clark, Crawford, Dunn, Eau Claire, Grant, Iowa, Jackson, Juneau, La Crosse, Lafayette, Marathon, Monroe, Pepin, Pierce, Richland, Sauk, Trempealeau, Vernon, and Wood; an area of 17,299 square miles. It is supplied to Milwaukee, Duluth and other cities by the Diocese there were ministering to the scattered Catholic population. Among the twenty-two priests who had to care for twenty-three churches and about fifty stations. Besides the English and German congregations provision had also been made for Poles and Italians. Franciscan sisters and lay teachers had charge of six parish schools. The Rev. Michael Heiss, then head of St. Francis’s Seminary, Milwaukee, was elected as the first bishop, and consecrated 6 Sept., 1868. He was born at Piatkowski, Bavaria, 12 April, 1815; two years later he entered the University of Munich, where Mohler, Dobler, and Góres were professors, intending to study law, but changed his mind, took a course in theology, and was ordained at the age of twenty-two. Knowing the need of German priests in the United States, he arrived in New York 17 December, 1842, and was affiliated to the Diocese of Milwaukee. Two years later he moved to Milwaukee at the invitation of Bishop Henni, and in 1846 erected the first parish church in that city, his charge extending over an area of fifty-two miles. He opened a seminary in a private house, which was subsequently merged into the Seminary of St. Francis, of which he was president. During the twelve years of his administration in La Crosse, he built several churches, including the cathedral, and the episcopal residence. While president of St. Francis’s Seminary he published in English ‘The Four Gospels Examined and Vindicated on Catholic Principles’ and ‘The New Testament Survey’. In 1856 he took a part in the Councils of Baltimore in 1844 and 1866, and Pius IX made him a member of one of the four great commissions of bishops engaged in the preparatory work for the Vatican Council, 1869–70. On 14 March, 1860, he was appointed coadjutor with right of succession to the Archdiocese of Milwaukee, and to succeed 7 September, 1881. He died at La Crosse, 26 March, 1890.

Kilian Flasch, second bishop, was born at Retsstadt, Bavaria, 16 July, 1837. His parents took him to the United States when he was ten years old, and settled near Milwaukee. He made his academic studies at Notre Dame University, and his theological course at St. Francis’s Seminary, where he was ordained 16 September, 1859. With two brief intermissions he spent the subsequent years as professor and rector of this seminary until he was selected as the successor of Bishop Heiss and was consecrated Bishop of La Crosse, 24 August, 1881. During his administration of ten years he laboured zealously to increase the churches and the schools of the diocese, and died after a long illness, 3 August, 1891.

James Schwebach, his vicar-general, succeeded him as the third bishop of La Crosse, and was appointed 25 February, 1892. He was born at Platten, Luxemburg, 15 Aug., 1847. He made his early studies at the college of Diekirch, and in 1864 emigrated to the United States, where he completed his course at the Seminary of St. Francis, Milwaukee, and was ordained 17 July, 1870. Soon after, appointed rector of St. Mary’s Church, La Crosse, he built two schools and two churches there, under Bishops Heiss and Flasch. The latter appointed him vicar-general and administrator of the diocese.

Religious communities in the diocese.—Men: Jesuits, Dominicans, Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart, Franciscan Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic, Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, Hospital Sisters of St. Francis, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of St. Dominic, Franciscan Sisters of Charity, School Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, Sisters of St. Benedict, Polish Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of the Society of the Divine Saviour. Priests, 177 (26 religious); churches with resident priests, 126; missions with churches, 86; stations, 6; chapels, 24; college, 1; students, 223; academies for girls, 2; pupils, 292; schools, 10; general hospitals, 2; general hospitals, 2, 4874, girls, 5044; orphan asylums, 2; inmates, 180; total young people under Catholic care, 10,468; hospitals, 5; Catholic population, 112,400.

Official Catholic Directory, 1890–1910; Catholic Family Almanac (New York, 1892); Benevier’s Almanac (New York, 1888, 1892, 1895).
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LACTANTIUS, LUCIUS CECELIIUS FIRMIANUS, a Christian apostle of the fourth century. The name Firmianus has misled some authors into believing that he was an Italian from Fermo, whereas he was an African by birth and a pupil of Arnobius who taught at Sicea Veneria. An inscription found at Cirta in Numidia, which mentions a certain L. Cecilius Firmianus, has led to the conclusion in some quarters that his father belonged to that place (Harnack, "Chronologie d. alt.-chr. Lit.", II, 416). Lactantius was born a pagan and in his early life taught rhetoric in his native place. At the request of Emperor Diocletian he became an official professor of rhetoric in Nicomedia. One of his poems (Hodoeporicum) is an account of his journey from Africa to his new home. It is probable that his conversion to Christianity did not take place until after his removal to Nicomedia. It seems clear, however, that he could not retain his position as public teacher after the publication of Diocletian's first edict against Christians (24 Feb., 303). After his dismissal it was not easy to find pupils in that Greek city who would patronize a teacher of Latin, and he was in consequence reduced to such poverty that he at times lacked the necessaries of life (St. Jerome, "Chron.", ad. ann. Abr. 2335). In those circumstances he attempted to make a living by writing. The persecution compelled him to leave Nicomedia, and from the outbreak of hostilities until perhaps 311 or 313 he had to find a home elsewhere. The friendship of the Emperor Constantine raised him from penury, and though very old (extrema senectute) he was appointed tutor in Latin to the emperor's son Crispus. This new appointment compelled him to follow his charge to Trier where he spent the remainder of his life. It seems very probable that his transfer to Trier did not take place until 317, when Crispus was made Caesar and sent to that city. Crispus was put to death in 326, but when Lactantius died and in what circumstances is not known. Like so many of the early Christian authors, Lactantius in all his works betrays his dependence on classical models, and, true to the requirements of his profession, he is polished rather than profound. He well merits the designation of the "Christian Cicero" bestowed on him by the humanists, for he exhibits many of the characteristics as well as the graces of his master. Among the works from his pen still extant, the earliest is the "De Opificio Dei", written in 303 or 304 during the Diocletian persecution, and dedicated to a former pupil, a rich Christian official named Demetrianus. The apologetic principles underlying all the works of Lactantius are well set forth in this treatise, which may be considered as an introduction to his great work "The Divine Institutions" (Divinum Institutionum Libri VII), written between 304 and 311. This, the most important of the writings of Lactantius, is systematic as well as apologetic, and was intended to point out the faults of pagan belief and the reasonableness and truth of Christianity. It was the first attempt at a systematic exposition of Christian theology in Latin, and though aimed at certain pamphleteers who were aiding the persecutors by literary assaults on the Church, the work was planned on a scale sufficiently broad to silence all opponents. The strength and the weakness of Lactantius are nowhere better shown than in this work. The beauty of the style, the choice and aptness of the terminology, cannot hide the author's lack of grasp on Christian principles and his almost utter ignorance of Scripture. The "dualestic and panecyral" passages which have been borrowed ultimately from his pagan pen, but from that of some one who lived close to his time, probably a rhetorician of Trier. The "Epitome Divinarum Institutionum", made by Lactantius himself at the request of a friend named Pentadus, is much more than a mere abbreviation, rather a more summary treatment of the subject dealt with in the older work. Another treatise, "De Ira Dei", directed against the Stoics and Epicureans, is supplementary to the "Divine Institutions" (II, xvii, 5) and deals with anthropomorphism in its true sense. Knowing the bent of Lactantius's mind it is not surprising that the only historical work we have from his pen, the "De Mortibus Persecutorum", should have an apologetic character. In this work we have an account of the frightful deaths of the principal persecutors of the Christians, Nero, Domitian, Decius, Vale- rian, Aurelian, and the emperor who gave him the idea himself, Diocletian, Maximian, Galerius, Maximus. This work, notwithstanding the manifest bias of the author, is of prime importance as a source for the last and greatest of the persecutions, though, somewhat strangely, the style is not so perfect as might be expected. The full text is found only in one manuscript, which bears the title: "Lucii Cecelii liber ad Donatum Confessorem de Mortibus Persecutorum". Many attempts have been made to show that the work was not written by Lactantius; however, the coincidences of name, both of author and recipient, the similarities in style and train of thought which the works of Lactantius, are too striking to admit of such a possibility. The chronological difficulties which Brandt thought he discovered are shown by Harnack to have no weight (Chronologie, II, 423). Of the poems attributed to Lactantius only one, besides the "Hodoeporicum", is genuine, viz. the "De Ave Phoeni- cri", an account, in eighty-five distichs, of the fabu- lous eastern bird which is reborn from its own ashes every thousand years. The poem "De Resurrectione" was written by Venantius Fortunatus, and the "De Passione Domini" is by a medieval huntsman. St. Augustine (De Vir. Ill. c. Ixx) mentions two other works, "Symposium" and "Grammaticus", which have not been preserved.


P. J. HEALY.

LACY, RICHARD. See MIDDLESBROUGH, DIACREE OF.

LADERCHI, JAMES, an Italian Oratorian and ecclesiastical historian, b. about 1678, at Faenza near Ravenna; d. 25 April, 1738, at Rome. He is chiefly known for his continuation of the "Annales" of Baro- nius and Raynalduz, which he brought down from the year 1566 to 1571. His work, though of some usefulness, is not sufficiently critical and is encumbered with numerous unimportant documents. It appeared at Rome (1728-1737), and extends from volume XXXV to volume XXXVII in the latest edition of Baroni (Bar-le-Duc, 1864-83). Laderchi was also the author of several other historical works, two of which in- cluded himself in the establishment of the "Life of St. Peter Damian" (Vita Sancti Petri Damiani, Rome, 1702) was mercilessly but ex- cessively criticized in the anonymous work entitled: "Sejani et Rufini dialogus de Laderchiana historia S. Petri Damiani" (Paris, 1705). When he published the second edition of the "Life of St. Peter Damian and companions" (Acta passionis SS. Crescenti et soci- orum martyrdom, Florence, 1707), the Servite G. Ca- passi attacked their authenticity and trustworthiness in a letter to the Roman scholar Fontenot. The lat- ter fell into the hands of Laderchi, who published it with a refutation. This book was translated from Latin into German and published under the title "Nuge Laderchiana" (Genoa, 1709). The ecclesiastical authorities seem to have put an end to the controversy; both works were placed on the Index (22 June, 1712). These contro
verses probably occasioned the composition of "La Critica d’oggi" by Laderchi (Rome, 1726). He was also the author of the following works: "De Basilicis SS. Martyrum Petri et Marcellini dissertatio historica" (Rome, 1705); "Acta S. Caecilii et transliterata basilica illustrata" (Rome, 1722); "Acta SS. Christi mensis Ianuarie, in catachrismum, triarcharum et prophetarum, confessorum, cultus perpetuos in Ecclesia catholica assertus et illustratus" (Rome, 1730).


N. A. WEBER.

Ladislaus, Saint, King of Hungary, b. 1040; d. at Neutra, 29 July, 1095; one of Hungary’s national Christian heroes. He was the son of Béla I; the nobles, after the death of Geisa I, passed over to Solomon, son of Andrew I, and chose Ladislaus to be their king in 1077. It is true that he made peace with Solomon, when the latter gave up all claims to the throne of Hungary; however, later on he rebelled against Ladislaus, who took him prisoner and held him in the fortress of Visegrád. On the occasion of the canonization of Stephen I, Ladislaus gave Solomon his freedom, but in 1086 Solomon, with the aid of the Hungarian Cumans, rebelled against Ladislaus a second time; the latter, however, vanquished them, and in 1089 gained another victory over the Turkish Cumans. In 1091 Ladislaus marched into Croatia, at the request of his sister, the widowed Queen Helena, and took possession of the kingdom for the crown of Hungary, where in 1092 he founded the Bishopric of Agram (Zagreb). In the same year (1092), he also founded the Bishopric of Grosswardein (Nagy-Várás), in Hungary, which, however, some trace back to Stephen I. Ladislaus governed the religious and civil affairs of his kingdom with a firm hand, particularly at the great assembly of the Imperial States at Szaboš, that might almost be called a synod. He tried vigorously to suppress the remaining heathen customs. He was buried in the cathedral of Grosswardein. He still lives in the sagas and poems of his people as a chivalrous king. In 1192 he was canonized by Celestine III.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Ladrones Islands. See MARIANA ISLANDS, Prefecture Apostolic of the.

Lady Day. See ANNUNCIATION, Feast of the.

Laennec, René-Théophile-Hyacinthe, d. at Quimper, in Brittany, France, 17 February, 1751; d. at Kerlouan, 13 August, 1826, a French physician, discoverer of auscultation, and father of our modern knowledge of pulmonary diseases. He was the son of a lawyer of the same name, and he was able to recall those of his better known compatriot De Forges Maillard. His mother died when he was six, and the boy went to live with his grand-uncle the Abbé Laennec. At the age of twelve he proceeded to Nantes where his uncle, Dr. Laennec, was professing in the medical faculty at the time. He was destined for the seminary of the university. He became a pupil of Corviant, Napoleon’s great physician, who had reintroduced into medicine Auenbrugger’s neglected method of diagnosis by percussion of the chest. Laennec followed up the idea, so readily suggested by this, of listening to the sounds produced within the chest and, after twelve years of careful study and observation, laid the foundation of the modern knowledge of diseases of the chest. He also invented the stethoscope, the first of the instruments being suggested by his desire to save a young woman’s modesty from the shock of having him listen directly to her chest. Roger sums up what Laennec had thus accomplished when he says that Laennec’s ear opened to man a new world in medical science (Roger, "La Medecine à l’affranchie"). Laennec published his book on the subject in 1819, with the modest motto in Greek “the most important part of an art is to be able to observe properly.” Prof. Benjamin Ward Richardson declared (Disciples of Aesculapius) that “true student of medicine reads Laennec’s treatise on mediate auscultation and the use of the stethoscope once in two years at least as long as he is in practice. It ranks with the original work of Vesalius, Harvey and Hippocrates.” Practically nothing of importance has been added to our knowledge of auscultation since Laennec wrote his book. Besides this he made very careful studies in pathology, especially on diseases of the liver. He was the first to study hydatides exhaustively, and it is to him we owe the name cirrhosis of the liver. Alcoholic cirrhosis is often spoken of as Laennec’s cirrhosis. He threw much light on sclerotic conditions generally. Unfortunately while studying tuberculous over assiduously at a time when its contagion was scarcely suspected, he contracted the disease and died at the early age of forty-five.

Laennec was noted for his kindness and was beloved by his colleagues and his students. He showed himself especially obliging towards his English-speaking pupils. As might be expected of a student from his BRETON heritage and training, he was intensely religious and was a devout Catholic all his life. A characteristic story illustrates this: On his way to Paris with his wife he was thrown from his carriage. When the vehicle was righted and they had once more been seated he said to her: "Well, we were at the third decade;" then they went on with the rosary they had been reciting just before the accident. His charity to the poor became proverbial and his principal solicitude towards the end of his life was to keep as far as possible from giving trouble to others. Dr. Austin Flint in his biography of Laennec said “there are few men of his age in whom is a striking instance among others disproving the vulgar error that the pursuit of science is unfavourable to religious faith.” He was one of the greatest clinical students of medicine of the nineteenth century. His principal work is "De l’auscultation médiate," Paris, 1819.

SAINTGIRON, Laennec, Sa vie et son œuvre (Paris, 1904); RICHARDSON, Disciples of Aesculapius (London, 1898); Roger, Les Médecins Bretons (Paris, 1890); WALSH, Makers of Modern Medicine (New York, 1907).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Letare Medal. See HOLY CROSS, Congregation of.

Letare Sunday, the fourth, or middle, Sunday of Lent, so called from the first words of the Introit at Mass, “Letare Jerusalem”—“Rejoice, O Jerusalem.” During the first six or seven centuries the season of Lent commenced on the Sunday after the Epiphany and was always celebrated with religious observance and services, and thus comprised only thirty-six fasting days. To these were afterwards added the four days preceding the first Sunday, in order to make up the forty days’ fast, and one of the earliest liturgical notices of these extra days occurs in the special Gospels assigned to them at the Westminster Sermons on the Sunday before Lent; the two Sundays after the first were formerly observed on the last Sunday of the middle of Lent, and it was at one time observed as such, but afterwards the special signs of joy per-
the Esquiline, on his way to his lectures where many eager hearers awaited him. He was a very conscientious professor, especially learned in Roman antiquities but exclusively a Latinist. He had declined to study any language but Latin. He died a Christian death. Alexander VI wished his obsequies at the church of Aracoeli to be magnificent. More than forty bishops attended. He was buried at San Salvatore in Lauro.

In the last period of his life, Pomponius Leto wrote short antiquarian treatises ("De magistratibus, aedificiis et legibus Romanorum"; "De romane urbis antiquitate"; "Compendium historiarum ab intestitu Gordiani usque ad Justinum III."). He produced an edition and commentary on the whole of Virgil, under the name of Julius Sabinus or Pomponius Sabinus (Rome, 1487–1490). He owned one of the most precious manuscripts of the poet, the "Medicus". Besides this, he edited the first edition of Quintus Curtius (about 1475), of Virgil's "Divinae M. (Rome, 1471), of Nonius Marcellus (Rome, about 1470). A little later he published the letters of the younger Pliny (Rome, 1490). We also owe to him the preservation of a part of the work of Festus. His MSS., which were first in the library of Fulvio Orsino and later at the Vatican, show his wide knowledge, his conscientious collation of authors, his art in reviving classical antiquity in the very land of pagan past. He had collected in his home on the Esquiline sculptures and inscriptions. He stands as one of the best representatives of Italian Humanism, uniting great love of the ancients and knowledge with enthusiasm to a purity of morals rare in such surroundings.

Leto, Pomponius, humanist, b. in Calabria in 1425, d. at Rome in 1497. He was a bastard of the House of the Sanseverino of Naples, Prince of Scafro, but owing to his great admiration for antiquity and the Roman Republic he would not recognize them as connexions. When very young he went to Rome and became a pupil of Valla. His brilliant capacities won him admiration and success. He wished to live the life of the ancients. His vineyard on the Quirinal was cultivated in accordance with the precepts of Varro and of Columella, and he was himself regarded as a second Cato. On holidays he went fishing or caught birds in his time-tweezers; sometimes he would simply spend the day in the open air, refreshing himself at a spring among the trees of the Tiber. One of the important and first known complete MSS. of Plautus, that of Cardinal Orsini (now Vaticanus 3870), had been brought to Rome in the year 1428 or 1429. It was suggested that the plays it contained should be performed in the palaces of the prelates. Leto became stage director of the performances. Finally, he and a few kindred souls, Platina, the future librarian of the Vatican, Sabellius, afterwards prefect of the Library of San Marco of Venice, founded a semi-pagan academy. Its members assumed Latin names and celebrated every year the festival of the Pallas—anniversary of the foundation of Rome. They also met to consecrate a new member. A prelate consecrated Mass, Leto delivered the eulogy. Latin recitations followed and a banquet closed every meeting. At other times, the members gave Latin farces much like the Atellane. But Paul II, a pope who did not favour the Humanists, occupied the Chair of Peter. Leto was looked upon as a seer of Christianity and conspirator. Venice delivered him into the hands of the pope. Confined in the Castle of Sant' Angelo in 1468, he with Platina and others was tortured. However, he defended himself and reminded them that he had maintained the immortality of the soul, a belief often discussed by the Humanists. The pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471) Leto was released and the academy allowed to continue its meetings. He lectured in the Roman University. He was often seen at daybreak, descending, with lantern in hand, from his home on
Lafitau, JOSEPH-FRANÇOIS, Jesuit missionary and writer, b. at Bordeaux, France, 1 Jan., 1651; d. there, 1746. He entered the Society in 1696, and the general, Tamburini, yielding to his entreaties, sent him to China. Appointed to the mission of Saint-Louis (Caughnawaga), he made a thorough study of Iroquois character and usages, as a preparation to his great work "Mémoires des Sauvages américains comprise aux mœurs des premiers temps," published in 1724. It was then that he discovered ginseng, a root highly prized as a panacea in China and Tartary, one ounce selling for as high as three ounces of silver. This discovery created an excitement comparable to that caused later by the finding of gold in California and Australia; but the exportation of the root, after promising immense profits to Canadian traders, rapidly decreased, owing to overproduction and inferiority of quality due to hasty and artificial desiccation. Lafitaus treatise on ginseng (1718) drew public attention to this apparent source of prosperity. In 1717, Lafitau returned to France in the interests of the mission, chiefly to obtain authorization from the Iroquois settlers at its present site, which was preferable to the former on account of its greater fertility. He likewise pleaded for the repression of the liquor traffic. In spite of his wish to return to Canada, where his knowledge of Indian languages and customs rendered him so valuable that Father Jules Gareau wished to have him recalled, he was retained in France, and there his later years were spent in writing several works, among which, besides those already mentioned, figures his "Histoire des découvertes et des conquêtes des Portugais dans le Nouveau-Monde" (1733). After Charlevoix, Lafitaus is the most remarkable historian and naturalist ever sent to Canada by the Society of Jesus.

Le P. Lafitauf et le ginseng (Montreal, 1858); ROCHEMONTEIX, Les Jeunes et la Nouvelle France (Paris, 1869).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Laflace, LOUIS-FRANÇOIS RICHER, French-Canadian bishop, b. 4 Sept., 1818, at Ste-Anne de la Pérade, Province of Quebec; d. 14 July, 1888. He studied the classics and theology at Nicolet College. Having offered his services to the pioneer Bishop Provencher of Red River, he was ordained in 1844, and travelled 750 leagues by canoe to reach St. Boniface. In 1846 he left with Father Taché for the mission of La Crosse island, 300 leagues distant. Besides the Sauteux language, he mastered those of the Crees and Montagnais prevalent in the North-West, and was the first Father to use the later text form. In 1849 Pius IX preconized him Bishop of Arath in partibus infidelium. Five years of illness and suffering leaving him an infirmity in one of his limbs which he bore to the end of his life, he begged to be released from the burden of the episcopate and have Father Taché succeed him in the Bulls of nomination. In 1851 he directed the most incredible defence of 80 half-breeds against 2000 Sioux near Turtle Mountain, North Dakota. After a siege of two days (13 and 14 July), the assualants spied the missionary in surplice and stole, and withdrew, convinced that the Great Spirit protected the half-breeds. In 1856 he retired to St. Patrice, where he engaged in astronomy, and philosophy at Nicolet College, of which he was appointed president in 1859. In 1886 Bishop Cook of Three Rivers chose him for coadjutor, and in 1870, when he might seem vulnerable. Besides these works should be mentioned: "Mémoires de la Cour de France pour les années 1688, 1689" (Amsterdam, 1731).

HAUMONVILLE, Les grands événements français (Paris, 1891); AUBRY, Les mémoires d'histoire et de littérature d'un pèlerin d'Amérique (Paris, 1882); SAINTE-BEUVE, Portrait de femmes célèbres (Paris, 1886).

PIERRE MARIE.

La Fontaine, JEAN DE, French poet, b. at Chateau-Thierry, 8 July, 1621; d. at Paris, 13 April, 1695. He was the eldest son of Charles de La Fontaine, a deputy-ranger, and Françoise Fidoux. After he had finished his studies at the college of his native town, he entered the Oratory (2 April, 1641) and was sent to the Seminary of Saint-Magloire. At the end of a novitiate of eighteen months, he realized that he was not fit for the religious life and returned to the world. He studied law and was admitted to the bar, a fact now proved by the title given him in several of his official deeds. In 1647 he married Marie Héricart, who gave him a son in 1653. Their married life proved unhappy, and they agreed to live apart (1658). From his childhood he had shown a strong fondness for poetry. When a boy he used to write verses for his own pleasure. The first work he published was an imitation of Terence's "Ennuceus" (1654). Two years later he was introduced to Fouquet, who granted him a pension with the understanding that the poet should send every month, as a receipt for the financial, some little piece of poetry —a verse or ocarine—. For six years he divided his time between Paris and Chateau-Thierry, giving six months to his official functions and six months to the pleasures of a courtier's life. In 1664 he was sworn in as a gentleman-in-waiting to the Dowager Duchess of Orleans, and was installed in the Luxembourg. It was at this time that he made the acquaintance of Molière, Racine, Boileau, and Chapel. Three series of "Contes", the first six books of his "Fables", and "Peyrub", a novel, were published from 1665 to 1671. The poet was in full possession of his genius and had acquired a great reputation. In 1672, having squandered his fortune, he sold his park and settled in Paris. For the remainder of his life he had to depend on the generosity of his patrons. He
first lived at Madame de la Sablière's, in the Rue Saint-Honoré (1672–93), where he met a most brilliant society and became the intimate friend of men like Turenne, the Prince of Conti, Condé, La Rochefoucauld, and distinguished ladies like Mme de Sévigné, Mme de La Fayette, Mme de Thiers. In 1674 he published a new series of "Contes", which were seized by the lieutenant of police, and, in 1678, five books of "Fables", that Mme de Sévigné pronounced "divine". He was elected to the French Academy, but his election was suspended by Louis XIV, on account of the scandal of the "Contes", and finally approved only in the following year, after the poet had publicly atoned for his licentious works in a "Ballade" published in the "Mercure" (January, 1684), and had promised "to be good". When Mme de la Fayette died, in January, 1685, he was sheltered by M. d'Hervart, maître des requêtes in the Parlement of Paris. A few months before, having been taken dangerously ill, he had begun to come back to the faith of his youth. In spite of his bad conduct, he had been indifferent rather than incredulous. The last two years of his life were most edifying. When he died, they put him into his shroud found him wearing a hair-cloth. He was buried in the cemetery of the Holy Innocents, in Paris. On account of his vivid and picturesque descriptions of the manners of animals, his wit, and his admirable naïveté, as well as the concise and firm composition of his little poems, he will forever be regarded as the greatest of French fabulists.

FAGUET, La Fontaine (Paris, 1888); LAFONNETTER, La Fontaine (Paris, 1890); SAINT-EUZÉ, Poésies littéraires (Paris, 1892); VAUDE, La Fontaine et ses œuvres (Paris, 1883).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Laforêt, Nicolas-Joseph, Belgian philosopher and theologian, born at Graide, 23 January, 1823; died at Louvain, 26 January, 1872. After the regular theological course at the seminary of Namur, he entered the University of Louvain, where he applied himself especially to the study of Oriental languages, Holy Scripture, and philosophy. In 1848, he was appointed to the chair of moral philosophy at the university, and the same year, received the doctorate in theology. Two years later he became president of the Collège du Pape. Upon the death of Mgr de Ram, the bishops of Belgium chose Laforêt to succeed him in the regency of the university. One of his main tasks was the foundation and organization of the schools of civil engineering, industry, and mines. He also established a new literary and pedagogical school, the Justus Lipsius Institute. Moreover his example and advice were a constant encouragement for both professors and students. Laforêt was a prebendary Apostolic ad instar participantium, an honorary canon of the cathedral of Namur, an officer of the Order of Leopold, a commander of the Order of Christ, a member of the Royal Academy of Belgium, and of the Roman Academy of the Catholic Religion. Besides a great number of articles, especially in the "Revue catholique", Laforêt's main works are: "Dissertatio historico-dogmatica de methodo theologico, aevae de auctoritate Ecclesiae catholicæ sanitum regulæ fidei christianæ" (Louvain, 1849); "Études sur la civilisation européenne considérée dans ses rapports avec le christianisme" (Brussels, 1850); "La vie et les travaux d'Arnold Tite" (Brussels, 1853); "Principes philosophiques de la morale" (Louvain, 1852; 2nd ed., under the title "Philosophie morale", Louvain, 1855); "Les dogmes catholiques exposés, prouvés et vengés des attaques de l'hérésie et de l'incéritulité" (Brussels, 1854); "Lettres de mon oncle Louis, d.s.d., and new ed., New York, 1909; Germ. tr. by Vossen, "Der moderne Unglaube und seine Hauptursachen", Mains, 1873); "Histoire de la philosophie" (Brussels, 1866–67), which includes only the history of ancient philosophy, the author dying before he completed the work; "Les martyrs de Gorem" (Louvain, 1867; Germ. tr. Münster, 1867); "Le syllabus et les plaies de la société moderne", a posthumous work, including the life of the like Mme de Sévigné, Mme de La Fayette, Mme de Thiers. In 1674 he published a new series of "Contes", which were seized by the lieutenant of police, and, in 1678, five books of "Fables", that Mme de Sévigné pronounced "divine". He was elected to the French Academy, but his election was suspended by Louis XIV, on account of the scandal of the "Contes", and eventually approved only in the following year, after the poet had publicly atoned for his licentious works in a "Ballade" published in the "Mercure" (January, 1684), and had promised "to be good". When Mme de la Fayette died, in January, 1685, he was sheltered by M. d'Hervart, maître des requêtes in the Parlement of Paris. A few months before, having been taken dangerously ill, he had begun to come back to the faith of his youth. In spite of his bad conduct, he had been indifferent rather than incredulous. The last two years of his life were most edifying. When he died, they put him into his shroud found him wearing a hair-cloth. He was buried in the cemetery of the Holy Innocents, in Paris. On account of his vivid and picturesque descriptions of the manners of animals, his wit, and his admirable naïveté, as well as the concise and firm composition of his little poems, he will forever be regarded as the greatest of French fabulists.

FAGUET, La Fontaine (Paris, 1888); LAFONNETTER, La Fontaine (Paris, 1890); SAINT-EUZÉ, Poésies littéraires (Paris, 1892); VAUDE, La Fontaine et ses œuvres (Paris, 1883).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Laforêt, Nicolas-Joseph, Belgian philosopher and theologian, born at Graide, 23 January, 1823; died at Louvain, 26 January, 1872. After the regular theological course at the seminary of Namur, he entered the University of Louvain, where he applied himself especially to the study of Oriental languages, Holy Scripture, and philosophy. In 1848, he was appointed to the chair of moral philosophy at the university, and the same year, received the doctorate in theology. Two years later he became president of the Collège du Pape. Upon the death of Mgr de Ram, the bishops of Belgium chose Laforêt to succeed him in the regency of the university. One of his main tasks was the foundation and organization of the schools of civil engineering, industry, and mines. He also established a new literary and pedagogical school, the Justus Lipsius Institute. Moreover his example and advice were a constant encouragement for both professors and students. Laforêt was a prebendary Apostolic ad instar participantium, an honorary canon of the cathedral of Namur, an officer of the Order of Leopold, a commander of the Order of Christ, a member of the Royal Academy of Belgium, and of the Roman Academy of the Catholic Religion. Besides a great number of articles, especially in the "Revue catholique", Laforêt’s main works are: "Dissertatio historico-dogmatica de methodo theologico, aevae de auctoritate Ecclesiae catholicæ sanctitum regulæ fidei christianæ" (Louvain, 1849); "Études sur la civilisation européenne considérée dans ses rapports avec le christianisme" (Brussels, 1850); "La vie et les travaux d’Arnold Tite" (Brussels, 1853); "Principes philosophiques de la morale" (Louvain, 1852; 2nd ed., under the title "Philosophie morale", Louvain, 1855); "Les dogmes catholiques exposés, prouvés et vengés des attaques de l’hérésie et de l’incéritulité" (Brussels, 1854); "Lettres de mon oncle Louis, d.s.d., and new ed., New York, 1909; Germ. tr. by Vossen, "Der moderne Unglaube und seine Hauptursachen", Mains, 1873); "Histoire de la philosophie" (Brussels, 1866–67), which includes only the history
work, however, and the one by which he is best known, is his "Historia general de España", which he published in Madrid (1830-1839, 30 vols.). A second edition (15 vols.) was published in 1874-1875. Among his other works may be mentioned his "Teatro social del siglo XIX" (1846), dealing with the manners and customs of the day; "Viaje aerostático del Fray Gerundio y Tirabucle". The latter is divided into two parts, the first being a review of aerial navigation, and the second, a description of the political situation in Europe. The important events of 1848 caused him to write his "Revista Europea" which he published as a periodical for about one year. His works are all written in an easy, flowing, popular style.

**Perez del Rio y Zamudio, Historia general de España (Madrid, 1874-75).**

VENTURA FUENTES.

**Lagana, a titular see in Galatia Prima. The town is mentioned by Ptolemy, V, 1, 14, and in several ancient geographical documents, often with an altered name and with no historical information. It received the name of Anastasiopolis in the 5th century, of Anastasius I (491-518), and is very probably to be identified with the actual Bey-Bazar, chief town of a casa of the vilayet of Angora, with 2500 Musulman inhabitants. Lagana, or Anastasiopolis, had an episcopal see, suffragan of Anchialus, and mentioned by the "Notitia Episcopatarum" up to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Lequien (Oriens Christi, I, 485-88) wrongly took these names as indicating two distinct sees, and his list of bishops is very incorrect. It must be revised as follows: Euphrasius, who attended the Council of Nicaea, 325; Theodotus, end of the sixth century; Timothy, his successor; St. Theodor the sycoce, c. 22 April, 613; Genesius, present at the Councils of Constantinople, 680 and 692; Theophilius, at Nicaea, 787; Marianus, at Constantinople, 879.

**Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor (London, 1890), 249; Perrot, Exploration archéologique de la Galée (Paris, 1872), 217-19; Baude de Lattre, Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique, s. v. Anastasiopolis.**

S. PÉTRIDÉS.

**Lagrené, Pierre, a missionary in New France, b. at Paris, 12 Nov. (al. 28 Oct.), 1658; d. at Quebec in 1726. He was of a noble family. In 1674-1775, he studied philosophy at La Flèche (1679-81), and after teaching some time, was ordained priest, and in 1694 was sent to the Canada mission. After a short stay at Lorette, spent in the study of the Huron language, he was stationed (1697-1701) at Sault St. Louis with the Iroquois, then returned to Lorette for a year. In 1704 he was back at Sault St. Louis, where he remained until transferred to Montreal in 1707, of which residence he was named superior in 1716. This position he still occupied in 1720. During the last eleven years of his stay in Montreal, besides his spiritual ministrations to the transient bands of Indians, and the ordinary ministry of the Church, he was director of the Montreal Congrégation des Hommes, then in its infancy. This sodality, affiliated to the Roman, 3 May, 1693, by the General of the Society of Jesus, under the title of the Assumption of Our Lady, passed into the hands of the priests of St-Sulpice, when the last Jesuit at Montreal, Father Bernard Well, died in 1791. To Father Lagrené it owes in great part its admirable organisation, which has enabled it to resist to the present the test of time. On 10 August, 1710, Lagrené had the satisfaction of seeing the completion of the church (23 Oct.) was completed 24 May, 1709. Among his works are the following: "Essai sur l'héroïsme", followed by a second volume, "Héroïdes et Poésies fugitives" (Paris, 1762). In the following year, his tragedy "Warwick" met with a failure. He became extremely acquainted with Voltaire, whose "son" he professed to be, and whom he imitated so closely that he was nicknamed "the monkey of Voltaire". A few other tragedies—"Timoléon" (1784), "Pharamond" (1765), and "Gustave Wasse" (1768)—were a complete failure. In 1768 he entered the "Bibliothèque" then a famous magazine, and contributed some remarkable articles. His dramas, "Mélanie ou la réligieuse" (1770), a violent attack upon the religious vows, the representation of which was forbidden by the censors, was enthusiastically received by the public and widely read, although it is the most tedious book that has ever been written. Three years in succession he won the prize in the competition instituted by the French Academy, with his "Éloge de Henri IV" (1770), "Éloge de Fénélon" (1771), and "Éloge de Racine" (1772) respectively. In 1776 he was elected to the Academy. He then once more attempted to work for the stage and force the admiration of the public, but failed anew. His tragedies, "Menzicoff" (1778), "Les Barmécides" (1778), "Jeanne de Naples" (1781), "Les Brames" (1783), "Coriolan" (1794), and "Virginie" (1796), were received worse than the others; or was a complete failure. In 1785 he was made professor of literature in the Lyceée, a school recently established in Paris by Plâtre du Rozier. The lectures he gave in that institution were published in eighteen volumes (Paris, 1799-1808) under the title of "Lycée, ou Cours de littérature". To this work, written in a style sufficiently clear and eloquent, is now antiquated. When the French Revolution broke out, he welcomed it with enthusiasm until he was sent to prison (1794). Once set free, he renounced his former ideas and became a zealous Catholic. His last works bear the stamp of his new-found faith. Among them may be mentioned: "De la guerre déclarée par nos derniers tyrans, du Raisson, à la Morale, aux Lettres et aux Arts" (Paris, 1796); an epic in six books, "Le Triomphe de la Religion, ou le Roi Martyr", published after his death; "La prophétie de Casotte", which was regarded by Sainte-Beuve as a masterpiece.

**Peignot, Recherches historiques, bibliographiques et littéraires sur la vie et les ouvrages de La Harpe (Paris, 1830); Sainte-Beuve, Coursées du Loua, VI, 379; Larousse de la langue et de la littérature française, VI (Paris, 1894).**

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

**La Haye, Jean de, Jesuit Biblical scholar, b. at Bauffe, Hainaut, 26 Sept., 1540; d. at Douai, 14 Jan., 1614. The Jesuit catalogue of admission makes Douai his birthplace. The Belgian poet-historian, Philippe Brasseur, devotes five distichs to Father de La Haye in "Sydera illustrium Hannoniae Scriptorum" (p. 135), and says the great scholar was born at Bauffe,
and made his early studies at Chèvres near by. De La Haye entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus on 13 Feb., 1655. After the usual training in the spiritual life, the classics, philosophy, and theology, he entered upon his life-work, and taught philosophy and Sacred Scripture at Louvain and Douai. 'The works of de La Haye that made his reputation as a Biblical scholar are the Gospel harmony and commentary, "Evangelistarum Quaternio" (Douai, 1607), is a harmony of the four Gospel narratives; the words of each Evangelist are retained and set in what the author deemed to be the historical order of the life of Christ. 'Triumphus Veritatis Ordinarii Evangelii Quadrigata Instructum in Paulum et Petrum S. I. Epistulam' (two vols., Douai, 1609) is a Gospel commentary quaintly entitled "the triumph of truth borne in upon the four-horsed chariot of the Gospel-hymn and backed up by the army of the Fathers." The array of citations from the Fathers is a veritable and a redoubtable array, which makes it regrettable that this rare old book has not been reissued. "Apparatus Evangelicorum" (Douai, 1611) gives a scientific treatment of the most questions in regard to the Four Gospels. Huster, Nomenclator; SommervogeL, Bibl. de l'ev. de, J., IV (Paris, 1883).

La Haye, Jean de, Franciscan Biblical scholar, b. at Paris, 20 March, 1593; d. there 15 Oct., 1661. He passed his boyhood in Spain and received the Franciscan habit in the province of St. Gabriel of the Alcantarine Reform. He taught philosophy and theology, and distinguished himself as pulpit orator. Being called to France in 1620, he was assigned important offices both in the order and at the Court of Louis XlII. De La Haye is the author or editor of some forty folio volumes, besides several unpublished manuscripts. He edited the works of St. Bernardine of Siena, and the writings of St. Francis and St. Anthony of Padua, but his project of bringing out all important works by Franciscan authors in a "Bibliotheca Ordinis Minorum" was not realized. Designed principally for the use of preachers are his commentaries "In Genesim, sive Arbor vitae concionatorum," 4 vols.; "In Exodum, vel Concionatorum virga, percussiones pecna
tores," 3 vols.; "In Apocalypsim," 3 vols. We have here his two most important works of monumental importance, namely, the "Biblia Magna," 5 vols. (Paris, 1643) and the "Biblia Maxima," 19 vols. (Paris, 1660). The text of the Vulgate forms the basis of the two. In the former the author quotes verbatim, after every chapter, the commentaries of Gagneau, Estius, Sez and Tironius, but whereas in the latter he appends to each extract the various readings of the versions, a paragraph in which the harmony of these readings and the literal meaning of the text are briefly discussed, and (3) annotations drawn from the commentators above cited, but headed, in this case, by Nicolaus Lyranus, O.F.M. The methods followed by the author have been pronounced excellent, and the wonderful assiduity and toil to which the twenty-four volumes bear witness have been the object of undivided praise; yet it has been rightly observed that the prolegomena and his own interpretations of the text are lacking in judgment and solidity. Withal, the "Biblia Maxima," and even more so the "Biblia Magna," will continue to be of invaluable service to the student of exegesis.

Wadding, Scriptores (Rome, 1908), s. v.; SharaLea, Supplem
ta, s. v.; Joanne, s. v.; Januarius, s. v.; Alhaye; Jeiler, ibid., s. v.; Huster, Nomenclator.

La Hire, Philippe de, mathematician, astronomer, physicist, naturalist, and painter, b. in Paris, 18 March, 1605; d. 1718. As Fontenelle said, an academy in himself. His father, Laurent de La Hire (1606-1650), was a distinguished artist. Philippe first studied painting in Rome, where he had gone for his health in 1660, but on his return to Paris, soon devoted himself to the classics and to science. He showed particular aptitude for mathematics, in which subject he was successively the pupil and associate in original investigation of Desargues. In 1678, he was made a member of the Academy of Sciences, needed encouragement in connexion with the construction of a map for the Government, he made extended observations in Brittany, Guienne, Calais, Dunkirk, and Provence. In 1683, he continued the principal meridian north from Paris, Cassini at the same time continuing it south, and, in 1732, Stiparini, in 1791, by the use of the pendulum, made important observations, which led to the phenomena of the Earth's rotation in connexion with the construction of a map for the Government. His attainments won him professorships both at the Collège de France, in 1682, and at the Academy of Architecture. Two of his sons rose to distinction, Gabriel-Phlippe (1677-1719), in mathematics, and Jean-Nicolas (1685-1727), in botany. Industry, unselfishness, and piety were noteworthy traits of his character.

The chief contributions of La Hire were in the department of pure geometry. Although familiar with the analytic method of Descartes, which he followed in many of his later work, important works were developed in the method of the ancients. He continued the work of Desargues and of Pascal and introduced into geometry, chiefly by a new method of generating cones in a plane, several conceptions related to those of recent times. In his exhaustive work on conics, published in 1685, not only simplified and improved the demonstrations of many well-known theorems, but he also established several new ones, particularly some concerning the theory of poles and polars, a subject not fully developed until the nineteenth century. In this work appears the first time the term "La Hire" of La Hire which were, for the most part, published in the "Mémoires" of the Academy of Sciences, and which treat of mathematics, astronomy, meteorology, and physics, the following are the most important:

"Nouvelle Méthode en Géométrie pour les points des superficies coniques et cylindriques" (1673);
"Nouveaux Éléments des Sections Coniques... Les Lieux Géométriques: Les Constructions ou Effec
tions des Equations" (in one vol., Paris, 1679); "Traité de Gnomonique" (1682); "Sections coniques in novem libros distributae" (Paris, 1685); "Tables... du soleil et de la lune" (1686); "Tables... du soleil de la lune et de la voûte céleste" (1689); "Mémoire sur les épicycloïdes" (Paris, 1994); "Tabulæ astronomicae" (1702); "Traité des rou
telles" (1704); "Mémoire sur les conchoïdes" (1708); "Traité de mécanique" (Paris, 1729).


Paul H. Linnerman.

LaHore, Diocese of (LaHoreensib), in northern India, part of the ecclesiastical Province of Agra. Its boundaries comprise the civil Province of the Punjab, except two small portions assigned to Kashmir and Agra respectively. It also includes the native state of Bahawalpur. Down to the sixteenth century Christianity seems never to have come in touch with the Punjab. During the reign of Akbar, and in his successor, Sher Shah, and in Jahangir, and in Shah Jehan, after 1656, the Mogul court visited the Mogul court, spending part of their time at Fatehpur-Sikri and at Lahore (1579-81). Akbar's successor, Jahangir, allowed some Portuguese Jesuits to build a church and establish a mission at Lahore, and assigned a salary for their maintenance. In their favour was written by Father J. F. de Wana in 1696, the famous "Journey to the Mogul Emperor, Shah Jahan, who, being a strict Moslem, withdrew the pension and ordered the church
to be pulled down. Some fragments of it still remained when Lahore was visited by the French traveller Thévenot in 1665; but these have since been totally effaced, and from that time all traces of Christianity disappeared from the place. About 1637 the Holy See established the Vicariate of the Deccan, which soon afterwards (1669) became the Vicariate of the Great Mogul, with an indefinite extension over the whole of the Mogul empire. But missionary enterprise was limited to the southern parts, such as Surat, Golconda, Bijapur, etc., nothing being done for the Punjab. From 1720 this vicariate came to be centred in Bombay, and so acquired that name. In 1784 the northern portion, including the Punjab, was divided off and attached to the mission of Tibet, which had been assigned to Italian Capuchins in 1703. The Prefecture Apostolic of Tibet developed into the Vicariate of Agra in 1822. It continued to include Lahore till 1880, when the Punjab was divided from Agra and made into a separate vicariate. In 1882 the limits of the Vicariate of Lahore were more exactly defined and made to include Kashmir. In 1886, when the Indian hierarchy was established, Agra was elevated into an archbishopric with the Diocese of Lahore as one of its suffragans. In 1887 Kashmir and Kahistan were separated into a new prefecture Apostolic. Down to 1889 the Lahore diocese was in charge of the Italian Capuchins, but in that year it was taken over by the Belgian province of the same order in whose hands it now remains. The following is a list of the bishops who have governed Lahore:—Paul Tosi, Bishop of Rhodiopolis, Vicar Apostolic of Patna, took charge of the new vicariate in its formation in 1880 and became the first Bishop of Lahore in 1886; Symphorien Mouard, transferred from the Seychelles in 1888; Emmanuel van den Bosch, 1891, transferred to Agra in 1892; Godfrey Peckmans, 1892; Fabian Anthony Eestermans, from 1905.

Out of a total of 16,000,000 inhabitants the Catholic population is calculated at about 5700. The diocese is served by 38 Capuchin fathers and contains 30 churches and chapels. Of educational institutions for boys there are the following: St. Anthony’s High School, Lahore, for Europeans and Eurasians, with 108 pupils; Anglo-vernacular school, Dalwal, with 280 native pupils; St. Francis’s primary school, Lahore, under the Tertiary Brothers of St. Francis of Assisi, with thirty orphans; elementary schools at three other places with 300 pupils. Agricultural school orphanage at Maryabad, under the same territories, with thirty orphans. Educational establishments for girls: two under the Nuns of Jesus and Mary, namely, at Lahore with sixty boarders and sixty day-scholars, and at Sialkot with sixty-seven pupils; four under the Sisters of Charity, namely, St. Mary’s Convent, Multan, with about eighty-six pupils, St. Joseph’s Orphanage, Lahore, with thirty native pupils, including a founding home and high class school for native girls, Convent of the Sacred Heart, Dalhousie, with forty-six pupils; and St. Vincent’s convent dispensary, school, and catechumenate at Khushpur—two under the Franciscan Nuns of the Propagation of the Faith, namely, Convent School with catechumenate at Maryabad, with seventy-five children, and a lunatic asylum for females at Lahore. Total, 5 high schools, 15 middle or primary schools, 2 industrial schools, 5 orphanages, 1 home for abandoned children, 6 free dispensaries, and 1 lunatic asylum. The mission at Lahore, Multan, Firozpur, Amritsar, Jalandhar, Dalhousie, Sialkot, Mean-Meer, Maryabad, Adah, Sahowala, Khushpur, Francisabad, and Lyallpur. A new cathedral at Lahore, in the Romanesque style, and of notable size and magnificence, built at a total cost of about four lacs of rupees, was consecrated 19 November, 1907.

Lahore, Diocese of (Labacensis), Austrian bishopric and suffragan of Görz, embraces the territory of the Austrian crown-land of Carniola (Krain).

History.—The Diocese of Lahore was founded in the fifteenth century. From the overthrow of the Kingdom of the Avars (811) to the date of the erection of the new see, the region now included in the diocese always belonged ecclesiastically to the Patriarchate of Aquileia, of which is formed one of the five archidIOconsates. The German emperors repeatedly invested the patriarchs of Aquileia with the title and authority of Margrave of Krain (as in 1077, 1093, 1210), but the patriarchs were never able to maintain themselves in this position for any length of time. Rudolf of Habsburg secured the territory for the House of Habsburg, and as in the later Middle Ages the secular power of the patriarchs of Aquileia had been almost entirely acquired by the Republic of Venice, Frederick III determined in 1461 to found a new see and detach the province ecclesiastically also from Aquileia. The erection of the Diocese of Lahore was confirmed in 1462 by Pius II, who made it directly dependent on the Holy See. The first bishop was Sigismund von Lamberg (1463-86). The new diocese did not include the whole of Carniola, large portions of which were subject to the bishops of Brezen and Freising, while on the other hand parts of Carnithia and Styria, where the episcopal resident of Oberberg was situated, belonged to Lahore. The work of the bishops was greatly hampered by this irregular distribution of their territory. The teachings of Luther gained a footing in the diocese under the second bishop, Christoph Rauber (1495-1536), and still more under his successor, Franciscus Kazianer von Katenstein (1534-44). The new doctrines found warm supporters in two cathedral canons, Primus Truber and Paul Wiener, so that by the middle of the sixteenth century the great part of the nobility and almost a majority of the middle class professed Protestantism.

Bishop Johann Tautescher (1580-97), who lived most of the time at Graz with Archduke Karl, energetically combated the further advance of the new doctrine, and laboured incessantly for the reform of the clergy, the promotion of church services, and the re-establishment of the Catholic Faith. Still greater credit is due to his successor, Thomas Chroen (1589-1830), called the “Apostle of Krain”, who in a few years brought about the triumph of the counter-Reformation in the city and diocese. His success was...
LAICIZATION

largely due to the aid received from the Archdeacon Fer-

dinand, who had become Emperor Ferdinand II in 1597,

and from the Jesuits who had been called to Lai-

bach. In 1616 the bishop sent a detailed report of his

labours to Pope Paul V (cf. Joseph Schmidlin: Die

katholiken in Deutschland von den Decennien des

siegreichen Krieges", I, Freiburg, 1908, 33–50;

concerning Bishop Chroën see the monograph by Stepi-

schneg, Salzburg, 1856). On the reorganization of

the dioceses by Joseph II, Laibach was raised to an

archdiocese (1787), the elevation being confirmed by

Pius VI in 1788. The Archdiocese of Görz was sup-

pressed on 1 July 1823, and Laibach absorbed the di-

ceses of Zengg-Moedru, Gradisca, and later also Triest.

In 1807 Pius VII dissolved the Archdi-

ocese of Laibach, and made it once more a simple di-

ocese directly dependent on the Holy See. On the

re-elevation of Görz to an archdiocese in 1830, Laibach

was made suffragan to it and given its present bound-

aries. The then Bishop of Laibach, Antonius Aly-

sius Wolf (1824–59), received as compensation the

title of prince-bishop. The present bishop is Antonius

Bonaventura Jeglič (b. 20 May, 1850, at Begunjče; con-

secrated 12 September, 1897, at Serajevo).

Since higher ages still stand in the dioceses of

5 arch-

deaneries: Laibach, Upper Krain, Interior Krain, Mid-

dle Krain, and Lower Krain. These are subdivided

into 22 deaneries. At the beginning of 1909 the see

contained 17 cathedral prebends, 266 parishes (of

which 28 were vacant), 1 vicarship, 3 ancient chap-

laincies, 17 Expositures (i.e. filial churches joined to

the mother church only by some unimportant link to

recall their former relations), 235 positions for

assistant clergy (95 vacant), 36 other benefices, 321

parish churches, 1000 dependent churches, 11 mon-

astery churches, 229 chapels. Besides the prince-

bishop's canons are 14 canons, 444 parish priests,

76 ecclesiastics in other positions, 51 priests retired

on pensions, 134 regulars. The population consists

of 572,613 Catholics, about 400 Protestants, 290 Or-

thodox Greeks, 145 Jews. The language spoken by

the great majority of the inhabitants of the diocese

(about 94 per cent.) is Slovenian. German is spoken

in the larger cities like Laibach and Rudolstadt, and in

the German-speaking centre of Gotschee. The cathe-

edral chapter consists of 12 regular and 6 honorary ca-

nones; they are nominated in part by the emperor, in

part by noble families and the provincial council, and

also by the free appointment of the bishop. Since

1493 a collegiate chapter has also existed in connex-

tion with the parish church of St. Nikolaus at Rudolfswurt;

it consists of a mitred provost and 4 members. The

consistory of the prince-bishop is made up of the ca-

thedral chapter, 2 honorary canons, and 2 other mem-

bers. The training of the clergy is provided for by a
diocesan theological institute, founded in 1791, which

has a pro-rector, 8 professors, and 3 instructors; a dio-

cesan clerical seminary with 63 students, and a semi-

nary for boys, the Collegium Alumnorum, founded in

1846, which has 36 students. Ecclesiastical profes-

sores are the religious institutions of the Stra-

veit near Laibach (190 students), in the 3 gymnasia

and the upper high school at Laibach, also in other

schools.

The religious orders and congregations for men in

the diocese are: Cistercians, 1 abbey at Sittich, 12

priests, 3 clerics, and 14 lay brothers; Carthusians, 1

monastery at Pletrije, 29 priests, 31 brothers; Francis-

cans, 5 monasteries, 49 priests, 17 clerics, 32 lay

brothers; Capuchins, 2 ,monasteries, 8 priests, 6

brothers; Brothers of Mercy, 1 monastery, 1 priest, 18

brothers; Jesuits, 1 residence, 7 priests, 3 coadjutors;

Society of St. Vincent de Paul, 1 residence, 24 priests,

6 clerics, 5 lay brothers; Fathers of the Teutonic Order,

1 branch monastery, 8 priests, 2 clerics, 1 lay brother;

Salesians, 2 houses, 10 priests, 24 clerics, 33 novices,

7 brothers. The religious orders and congrega-

for women in the diocese are: Ursulines, 187 in 23

houses with which are connected primary schools and

2 seminaries for female teachers; Discalced Carmelites

Nuns, 1 convent with 16 sisters; Sisters of Christian

Charity, 284 sisters in 17 houses, nearly all of which

are connected with hospitals, orphanages, insane asyl-

ums, and similar institutions. Society of St. Vincent

(Third Order of St. Francis, 68 sisters in 4 houses; 1

orphan asylum, and 3 schools; Sisters of Mercy of the

Holy Cross, 7 sisters attached to the home for girls,

Josephinum, at Laibach. Among the religious asso-

ciations of the diocese are: the Society of St. Herma-

nius, which, like the Society of St. Charles Borromeo

(q.v.), encourages the diffusion of good literature; the

Society of St. Cyril and Methodius, which aims to

promote religious and national instruction in the ele-

mentary schools; the Third Order of St. Francis; the

Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and the Congregation of

Mary. The Cathedral of St. Nikolaus was built 1700–07 in

Renaissance style by the Jesuit Andrea Pozzo. hardly

any large churches of the early Middle Ages still exist,

on account of the repeated incursions of the Turks into

Krain from 1396. The largest Gothic church of the

province is the church of St. George in Kamnik (completed

1491, of which the church at Bischofshäck, erected in

1532, is a copy. The finest churches in the Baroque style

are: the Franciscan church at Laibach (1546), the

church of St. Peter (eighteenth century) at the same

place, and the church of St. Jakob (1714), also at Laibach.

SCHOENLEBEN, Cornelia antiqua et nova (Laibach, 1861:—).
VALYVARIO, Ehre des Herzogtums Krain (1889; new ed. Lai-

bach, 1877–83); DRÜTZE, Geschichte (4 th ed., 1870); Die

österreich-ungar. Monarchie in Wort u. Bild, VIII (Vienna,

1901); Catalogus clericorum ecclesiae austriaci pro 1909 (Laibach, 1909); Die Mützungen des histor. Vereins für Krain und Archiv für Gesch.

von Krain.

JOSEPH LINS.

Laicization (Lat. laicus, lay).—The term laity signifies the aggregation of those Christians who do not form part of the clergy (see LARRY). Conse-

quently the word lay does not strictly connote any

type of hostility towards the clergy or the Church,

much less towards religion. Laicization, therefore,

considered etymologically, simply means the reducing

of persons or things having an ecclesiastical chara-

acter to a lay condition. In the course of time, and

especially in France, the word lay has assumed a decid-

edly anti-clerical and even anti-religious meaning,

which has extended also to the derivatives laïcize and

laicization. This change seems to have origi-

nated in the struggles and controversies, at once

religious and political, that have arisen in that
country in connection with the educational question:

teachers belonging to religious congregations (con-

greganistes) have been driven from the public schools;

all religious instruction has been forbidden therein;

and this new lay character (laïcised) of the public

school has been declared to be essential and inviolable.

The expression, once current, has received a formidable

extension and an aggressive anti-religious meaning as

applied to everything relating, whether more or less

remotely, to the Catholic Church and even to religion

in general. So it is usual to designate as "laicized"

any institution withdrawn from the influence of ecle-

siastical or religious authority, or from which the

priest and his ministry have been excluded. A "lay"

school, therefore, is one in which, not only is no place

found for the catechism or the priest, but wherein the

instruction given ignores all religion and God him-

self; "lay" legislation is that which is inspired by no

religious idea, which looks on society as atheistic, and

reduces religious worship to the purely voluntary acts

of individuals; finally, the "lay" State, or Govern-

ment, is one that recognizes no Church, no religion,

and which excludes even the name of God from all its
institutions or establishments, and from all its acts. An attempt has been made to set up a "lay" morality, i.e. a moral code independent of all revealed religion, if Christian morality were aught else than the dictates of natural law; while some think they can extol the moral life without a Deity, without a future life, and with no real responsibility—a determinist morality which is the very negative of all morality. (See Ethics.)

To laicize, then, is to give this lay character to whatever had not previously had it—or, at least, not entirely. It is to exclude religion from entering in at all into the life of the nation; to separate the way education, the courts of justice, the army, the navy, the hospitals—in a word all activities under the control of the public authorities have been laicized in France. Laiization is the externalization and product of the rationalistic, anti-Catholic, and anti-religious movement. It is evident, therefore, that laicization, thus understood, goes far beyond "equality", by which the State recognizes equal rights as possessed by various confessions or religions; it is much more than "neutrality", the attitude adopted by the State in its dealings with the diverse confessions, making them all equal in the eyes of the law, quite different from "separation", it is a complete abolition of the official character of the Church, as hitherto recognized by the State, abolished. In addition to all this, the "laicization" of which we are speaking implies the negation of all religion in matters concerning temporal society; it is the ultimate outcome of absolute Rationalism applied to social life as at present.

Looked at historically, laicization is the final outcome of what was formerly called "secularization", i.e., the hostile action of the secular power, which has succeeded in despoliation the Church of the prerogatives and dominion, which she enjoyed in European society as moulded by the influence of Christianity for centuries. It is true that all the European nations have not moved with equal rapidity in this matter, and that they are far from having all arrived at the same point in their evolution towards complete secularization. Moreover, it must be recognized that this movement, hastened, in so far as concerns the Catholic religion, by the Reformation, has been retarded and partially eliminated in non-Catholic countries—where the civil power already possesses more or less complete influence, if not authority, over the Church. In Catholic countries, in the presence of an independent religious authority which it even accuses at times of being foreign. But if we abstract from local differences, the main lines of this secularizing movement, as yet incomplete, are clearly traceable in all the nations of the Christian world. It is advancing towards two not disconnected results: first, it is marking off more and more distinctly the sphere of action of the two powers, "the spiritual and the temporal", as the Gallicans formerly said; secondly, the secular power, while it frees itself from the influence of the spiritual power, confines the latter to a purely spiritual domain, depriving it generally of the privileges it enjoyed in the Christian societies of the Middle Ages.

It is not the object of this article to give the history of secularization, which rather belongs to the history of each country where it has been attempted or effected. This is only a cursory review, pointing out in their chronological order the various stages and the diverse aspects of the movement. If at first we consider the privilege situation of the Church in the Roman Empire, and the intimate union of the two powers occasionally confused, we must admit that the Church, though greatly favoured, was in real danger of losing its property to the imperial authority arrogated to itself in religious affairs. The Church received from the emperors, not only considerable endowments, but numerous privileges: she acquired an official position such as had been held by the ancient pagan religion. The Theodosian Code and, still more, that of Justinian are impregnated with Christianity: the bishops are official personages and the emperor executes ecclesiastical duties. Yet it is clear that he controls the Church. He is no longer the power merely of formalities and the title "Bishop of the Exterior", convokes councils, makes and unmakes bishops, and legislates in ecclesiastical and even spiritual matters. Under these circumstances, the only peril for the Church lay in too close a dependence on the civil authorities, a misfortune that happened to the Church in ancient paganism. On a few occasions she did suffer some violence—e.g. certain attacks on the popes, and the laicization of the monasteries by Constantine Copronymus (767).

The situation of the Church in the Western kingdoms that rose on the ruins of the empire was different. The two authorities are still closely united, but the power of the king is less, while the Church is the civilizing element, and represents the tradition of government. As a natural result, her influence preponderates; she receives considerable gifts from kings and princes, and from the faithful; her influence is constantly extended. Thus, when the feudal order came into being, many ecclesiastical dignitaries were in possession of extensive rights, and some were of considerable size. The kings were always influential, and even real power, over the Churches in their realms; they took part in the selection of bishops, when they did not elect them; they called the bishops together in councils or mixed assemblies; they authorized and confirmed disciplinary canons, which they afterwards published as state or capitular laws; but they did not interfere with the purely spiritual power. Under the Church the State had not to fear any hostile civil legislation; yet she had to submit to a certain amount of usurpation on the part of the royal power, particularly in connexion with episcopal elections and church property. The institution of the precaria, by which princes bestowed on their lay servants, especially their fellow-warriors, the revenues of churches and monasteries, was really a secularization of the goods of the Church. The abuse had existed in the sixth century, but it developed to an alarming extent under Charles Martel (716-41), who adopted the system to reward his soldiers (see Charles Martel; Frankish). The system was confirmed in the presence of an independent religious authority which it even accuses at times of being foreign. But if we abstract from local differences, the main lines of this secularizing movement, as yet incomplete, are clearly traceable in all the nations of the Christian world. It is advancing towards two not disconnected results: first, it is marking off more and more distinctly the sphere of action of the two powers, "the spiritual and the temporal", as the Gallicans formerly said; secondly, the secular power, while it frees itself from the influence of the spiritual power, confines the latter to a purely spiritual domain, depriving it generally of the privileges it enjoyed in the Christian societies of the Middle Ages.

Under Pepin and Carloman, sons of Charles Martel, the Frankish councils, especially that of Lectestes (also called Lifstines and Leptines), in 743, corrected the abuse to a certain extent (Hefeke, "Hist. des conciles", III, 342 sqq.). Canon ii, owing to the circumstances of the times, does not go to the Church a tax of a silver penny per hearing (casata); on the death of the beneficiary the property returns to the Church, though the prince may bestow it again. In this way the Church's right of property was safeguarded against indefinite transmission, and at the same time she enjoyed some portion of the revenues accruing from her property. Although less common, the practice continued for a long time, gradually changing into the system of "commendations". The latter, though differing judicially from the precaria, had the same effect so far as the property of the Church is concerned: the revenues were diverted to the prince purely as a reward for his good services, named by the king. This abuse spread extensively in the ninth century, especially under Emperor Lothair, and we find reforming councils of the Frankish Em-
pure, particularly that of Meaux (845), striving to end it. In the tenth century, when the papacy had grown weak and was unable to counterbalance the civil power, the dignities and property of the Church were invaded by the creatures of kings and emperors: the Othos and their successors made the popes and, at times, the imperial insignia; they invaded the dignities with cap and ring, symbols of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Such secularization would soon have proved fatal to the necessary independence of the spiritual power. The liberation of the Church from secular control was accomplished by Gregory VII. After long years of struggle, the separation of the spiritual and temporal powers was marked; the dispute about investitures was ended by the Concordat of Worms (1122); lay influence was eliminated from the elections of popes and bishops, from ecclesiastical trials, synods, and, to a large extent, from the administration of church property; and under the great popes who succeeded Gregory VII it seemed for a while as if the ideal of the Christian world was realized, the Catholic nations forming one family under the high suzerainty of the pope, the representative of God upon earth, among nations and individuals.

This was the apogee: the movement towards secularization began in the twelfth century, under the influence of Innocent, the school of Bologna witnessed a revival of the Roman Law; the laws of the Cesaras became the basis of the claims of the secular power; and, while the canonists, finally systematizing the ecclesiastical laws, were establishing the thesis of pontifical power, indirect or even direct, over empires and kingdoms (the Bull "Unam sanctam"), the imperial and royal jurisconsults were building up the opposite thesis, and claiming for secular princes entire independence in temporal matters, authority in ecclesiastical matters not strictly spiritual, and eventual liberties for the clergy and the civil authorities. Their opinion was supported by the pope, and these jurisconsults ecclesiastical privileges and immunities were graceful concessions of the civil authorities, who could, consequently, withdraw them. From that time laicalization had begun, thenceforward carried into effect, not by expedients or by violence, but on principle; it was a battle of systems, in which the secular power, becoming more and more centralised and conscious of its strength, was destined always to prevail.

The struggle which, as before, centres around the temporal goods of the Church, begins with Philippe le Bel and Philip the Bold and Edward I, who imposed taxes on church property; after having resisted as a matter of principle, the pope authorised their imposition, provided it was done with his consent. In this way the canonical immunity of ecclesiastical property was violated. Later it was the jurisdiction of the Church in mixed matters which yielded little by little to that of the royal courts: these adjudicated, not only in questions arising out of marriage—e.g. inheritances, legitimacy of children, adultery—but also in most cases relating immediately to matrimony or benefices, whether presenting questions of fact or involving bare right of possession, further, the system of appeals against so-called abuses of ecclesiastical power (appel comme d’abus) permitted almost all ecclesiastical acts to be brought, if the State so chose, under the cognizance of the royal judges. Papal Bulls and decrees of councils were recognized only after examination and in virtue of royal authority; municipalities, they had to be ratified in order to obtain the force of laws. In regard to benefices, the pontifical laws were openly resisted; the royal prerogative of nomination to vacant benefices was exercised, and the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, under Charles VII (1438), applying in France the quasi-eclesiastical principles of the Council of Basle, acknowledged the principle of reservation and forbade direct appeals to Rome. If the principle of spiritual jurisdiction was safeguarded by the Concordat of 1516 between Leo X and Francis I, this agreement, nevertheless, abandoned to the civil power all control of the temporal possessions of the Church. The clergy of France came to depend more on the king than on the pope: Louis XIII forbade the holding of ecclesiastical assemblies and councils without the royal permission; Louis XIV put into practice the most advanced principles of Gallicanism, and remodelled the affairs of the Church almost as if he were a Justinian; his parliamentary courts, his grand conseil adjudicated in all ecclesiastical affairs, except questions of dogma and purely spiritual matters. In a word, while the Church was treated with favour and was enjoyed numerous privileges, it was in no better yielding to the State all authority in temporal or mixed affairs.

Other Catholic countries followed in the same path. The extreme limits of this encroachment of secular power were reached by the minute ecclesiastical regulations of Joseph II of Austria. In other countries the Reformation greatly advanced the policy of secularization. The privileged situation of the Church in the matter of temporal property had been weakened by the errors of John Hus and Wycliffe, and the troubles resulting therefrom. Soon the leaders of the Reformers took a hand in the secularization of the Church princes and gave them, with the property of the Church, an almost absolute authority over the new religious bodies. In many German principalities, in England, and in the countries of Northern Europe, the Church disappeared, her goods were confiscated, pillaged, or else transferred to the new religious organizations. It suffices to recall the secularizations of the Teutonic Knights and their property and then, in England, the confiscation of the monasteries and churches under Henry VIII and his successors. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was also secularized and taken over by the civil powers, or at most had a second-class degree with the clergy, who were entirely dependent on the civil power. A little more, and the two powers would have blended into one.

To return to the Catholic Church, the most complete secularization was that effected by the French Revolution; if the movement seemed at first to be the advantage of the "constitutional church", a creation of the civil power, and afterwards to that of a vaguely Deistic form of worship, it was to the profit of the sovereign State, freed from all religion, rationalistic if not atheistic. The facts are well known: church property was confiscated by law into "juroirs", or "constitutionalists", and "non-juroirs" an absolute proscription of the Catholic religion. The functions confided for ages to the Church were again assumed by the State: schools, hospitals, registration of births, marriages, and deaths, marriage itself, and even worship—all was secularized. And when, after the storm, the Concordat of 1801 restored the Church to her official position, everything or almost everything remained secularized. The property that had been confiscated and sold was not returned to her; the places of worship left at her disposal still remained the property of the civil authorities; public teaching had become a function of the State, whose permission she had to obtain for her few schools; civil life and marriage were regulated independently of her, while awaiting the re-establishment of divorce; her tribunals were no longer acknowledged; the members of her hierarchy were officially recognised, but only as functionaries in the State, to hold in accordance with the law at least, a survival of the old regime; her former immunities were restricted and finally abolished.

Like the other developments of the Revolution, the policy of secularization was imitated by the different States in varying degrees. The ecclesiastical principles of the Thirty years' War, the principle of reservation and forbade direct appeals to Rome. If the principle of spiritual jurisdiction was safeguarded at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the movement culminated in
the suppression of the Papal States, swallowed up in the new Kingdom of Italy. Ecclesiastical property, especially in the city of Rome, was confiscated by partial secularization in the eighteenth century, was confiscated in Spain (1820, 1835, and 1837), in Portugal (1833), in Mexico (1856), and, for the most part, in Italy (1866). Almost everywhere the ecclesiastical immunities (see Immunity) disappeared, legislation became more secular, cures were established, and the Church, except in the case of Divine worship, excluded from public service, or participating in it only by the favour of the sovereign State.

In this brief exposé it has not been intended to generalize to any great extent. The situation is not the same in all respects, and the doctrine "less is more" of secularity and laicisation have been carried to the extreme limits. On the other hand, we are far from overlooking those deeply rooted general causes of the transformation of modern society which have rendered inevitable a certain amount of secularisation. There is no longer unity of faith: various confessions have multiplied and mingled in the same country; temporal interests have assumed a preponderating importance in the life of each state; ideas of religious toleration and liberty have spread and are accepted everywhere. In a word, the ideal harmony between the two powers is no longer capable of realization. Any marked separation of the two authorities is not without certain advantages for the Church. But while all this must be recognised, it remains true that laicisation pushed to extreme limits is contrary to Catholic teaching, and therefore must be condemned; moreover, it is injurious to the real interests of temporal society. To understand the position of the Church in this matter, we must first make allowance for her just protests against violation of her acquired rights. Theoretically, the Church can and does submit to secularisation that does not affect her rights as a spiritual society or interfere with the exercise of these rights in concrete social contexts, the demand (1830) of Alcalá naturally varying according to time and place. However, she must condemn any measures that affect her essential rights and the freedom necessary for the exercise of her sacred ministry. No principle can justify in a society composed of Christians the exclusion of every Christian idea, nor in any human society the exclusion of all religion and of the Deity. The Catholic doctrine on the juridical relations of the Church and the State is explained elsewhere (see Pius IX, "Syllabus", prop. 39 sq., 77 sq.). But the most superficial attention to the influence of religion, especially of the Catholic Church, is necessary for the moral sufficiency of the Church. The laicisation and danger of laicisation, even when this is not identical with legalized persecution of the religious idea.

(See also State. For the present progress of laicisation in France, see France, VI, 179 sqq. For the facts relating to the history of the different countries see England; France; Germany; etc. Also Invention, Conflict, Galianism; Louis XIV, etc.)

The principal facts may be found in Sigmüller, Kirchenrecht (2d ed., 1899), containing a full bibliography. On the question of ecclesiastical rights, see Catholic, institutio juris publici ecclesiastici, I (Rome, 1890); Weber in Kirchenrecht, s. v. Secularisation der Kirchenmacht (for Germany).

A. Boudinhon.

Laines (Layne). James, second general of the Society of Jesus, b. in 1512, at Almansor, Castilla, in 1512; d. at Rome, 19 January, 1574.

His family, although Christian for many generations, had descended from Jewish stock, as has been established by Sacchini (Historia Societatis Jesu, II, sec. 32). Laines graduated in arts at the University of Alcalá (1531), and won his licentiate in philosophy the next year. A young Castilian and his friend Salmerón had heard of Ignatius Loyola. To meet him, they betook them to the great University of Paris (1533) and there fell under the spell of the spirituality, poverty, and obedience which, as second to Loyola and was one of the seven who, on 15 August, 1534, made the vows of religion in the chapel of St. Denis, on Montmartre. Three years were now spent by Laines, in works of charity and zeal, for the most part in Northern Italy. In 1537, Ignatius sent him to Flanders to prepare the text of "Admiranda," the Holy Father. Paul III discussed doctrinal questions with them. He was struck by their bearing and learning, granted them permission to be ordained priests and to go to the Holy Land. This pilgrimage was prevented by political troubles. Laines was sent to Spain to teach there the "Admiranda," his calling was teaching. His teaching and preaching were productive of immense good in those unsettled days. Rome, Venice, and Vicenza were saved from heresy by his labours. Paul III became an enthusiastic admirer of the new society. He chose three Jesuits, Laines, Salmerón, and Lejévre as sole papal theologians to the Council of Trent. The latter died in Rome before the council began its sessions. Laines and Salmerón were joined by two other Jesuits at Trent, Lejévre, who represented the Bishop of Augsburg, and Covillon the theologian to the Duke of Bavaria.

At Trent, Laines and Salmerón stood out most prominently. These dogmatic discussions, in the early sessions of Trent, took place without formalities. The theological discussions were under the charge of Cardinal Cervini, later Pope Marcellus II; he arranged that Salmerón should be among the first speakers on each topic, so as to set down the right doctrine from the outset. Laines should be the last to speak, so as to avoid repetition and point out clearly the errors of preceding theologians. The two Jesuits were immensely influential against some of the Lutheran ideas whereas, fortunately not a few of the theologians of the council were tainted. The bishops asked for copies of the writings of Laines and Salmerón. While the two papal theologians thus bore the brunt of the battle for Catholic truth in the matter of justification, at Trent, strong influence was brought to bear on Ignatius to send Laines to do apostolic work in Florence. Salmerón prevented such a loss to the council by telling Ignatius the political purpose of the council. Subsequently, Laines did his greatest service to the council in the discussion on justification. Jerome Seripando, a most devoted and saintly man, who later presided over the sessions of Trent, tried to combine the Catholic with the Lutheran ideas of justification. But Laines came to prominence in this matter of the imputed justice of Christ (Theiner, "Acta Con. Trid.", I, 235). The answer of Laines so pleased the Fathers of Trent that they honoured it by incorporating it word for word in the Acts of the council, a unique honour. On 13 January, 1547, by unanimous vote, their clear and definite decree on justification was passed unanimously, the doctrines which Laines had stood for being defined. Hereafter, whereas very few theologians were allowed to speak an hour, Laines was privileged to address the assembly for three hours or more. We are not surprised to find Salmerón writing to Ierger, 20 January, 1547: From Trent: "were, without any exaggeration whatever, to take away one of its eyes from this council" (Epistola Salmerón, 20 Jan., 1547). In April, 1547, Laines went with the council to Bologna, where he spoke on penance and extreme unction. The opposition of Charles V, preventing many theologians from reaching Bologna, the council was indefinitely pro-
rogued. When the Fathers met a second time at Trent (1 May, 1551) Laines (now provincial of the Jesuits in Italy) and Salmerón were there as papal theologians. It is said that the decrees and canons of the Fourteenth Session were at this time written by him (Cartas de S. Ignacio, I, 491).

After the death of St. Ignatius (1556) Laines was elected vicar-general of the Society; about two years later he became its second general (1558). Paul IV in 1561 insist ed on the triennial election of a general and the chancing of the Office in the church by the Jesuits. His wish was only verbally expressed, and that by a messenger. After his death (1559), at the advice of eminent canonists, Laines discontinued the choir, and observed the constitutions of the order in regard to the generalate. A new difficulty now confronted him. Twelve votes were wanted to choose a successor for Paul IV, the reform party being intent upon electing him. His entreaties and sudden departure for parts unknown saved him from the possibility. To Laines is due the adoption of the "Constitutiones" of the Society, and the importance that higher education be placed by its wording, in detail, general principle of its institution. Notwithstanding the labours incident to the governing of his order, Laines still busied himself with the battle of the Church against heresy and neglect of ecclesiastical discipline. Pius IV sent him as theologian to the famous Conference of Polesy (1561) along with Cardinal Ippolito d'Este. There he engaged the Calvinistic ministers in dispute before the Queen Regent Catherine de' Medici. In his absence, Salmerón was vicar-general at Rome. Meanwhile the third convocation of Trent was opened (18 January, 1562). Two Jesuits were present, Covillon and Canisius. Pius IV was not satisfied, nor were the party of reform, that the two protagonists of former convocations were absent; Salmerón, Laines, and Polanco were straightway ordered by the Holy Father to go to Trent as his theologians. Salmerón was the first to arrive. He spoke three hundred sermons, who are gloved by the Pope as reached in Trent in August, 1562. He was the first, as papal theologian, to speak on the Sacrifice of the Mass. His proofs were well under way, when the Fathers voted to allow him the whole of the next day for his discourse, which he delivered from a platform in the body of the Church. Then only in matters dogmatic but in the practice of refusing the cup to the faithful, prevailed in the twenty second session.

The matter of the next session was exceedingly delicate—the question of orders, involving as it did the origin of episcopal jurisdiction. Laines was one of the committee appointed to draw up the decrees and canons on the Sacrament of Orders; and to him the rest of the committee consigned that task. At the very outset of the discussions, the question of the Right of bishops came up; the discussions were carried on vigorously for nine months. Laines stood firm for the Divine origin of the powers of the order of bishops, the Divine right of the episcopal body to jurisdiction and the conferring of this jurisdiction upon each individual bishop directly by the pope and not by God. On two other occasions at Trent Laines disputed the original origin of episcopal jurisdiction. In the end the council left the sole form of episcopacy in abeyance; but no one holds that the monarchical episcopacy succeeded a period of anarchy or of government by a community where all had equal authority. The organization of all Christian Churches under the authority of the bishops and clergy, as early as the third century, is

LAITY

Laité (Gr. λαίτε, "the people"); whence Latin, "one of the people") means the body of the faithful, outside of the ranks of the clergy. This article treats the subject under three heads: (1) General Idea; (2) Duties and Rights of the Laity; (3) Privileges and Restrictions of the Laity.

General Idea.—Whereas the word faithul is opposed to infidel, unbaptized, one outside the pale of Christian society, the word laity is opposed to clergy. The laity and clergy, or clerics, belong to the same society, but do not occupy the same rank. The laity are the members of this society who remain where they are, and the clerics, those who are the depositaries of sacred or spiritual authority under its triple aspect, government, teaching, and worship, i.e. the clergy, the sacred hierarchy established by Divine law (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIII, can. vi); in the second place, those who over whom this power is exercised, who are governed, taught, and sanctified, the Christian people, the laity: though for that matter clerics also, considered as individuals, are governed, taught, and sanctified. But the laity are not the depositaries of spiritual power; they are the flock confided to the care of the shepherds, the disciples who are instructed in the Word of God, the subordinate and not the superior, whose task it is to assist towards their last end, which is eternal life. Such is the constitution which Our Saviour has given to His Church. This is not the place for a detailed demonstration of this assertion, the proof of which may be reduced to the following points: (1) Lainé, who was a Jesuit in the Church: on the one hand, a distinction between the governed and those governing is necessary in every organized society; now Jesus Christ established His Church as a real society, endowed with all the authority requisite for the attaining of its object. On the other hand, in the Church, government has always been in the hands of those who were entrusted with authority with the teaching of doctrine and the care of Divine worship. If one studies without prejudice the New Testament and the beginnings of Christianity, some doubt may arise on certain matters of detail; but the conclusion will certainly be that every Christian community had its superiors, these superiors had a stable spiritual authority, and this authority had as its end the exclusive care of religious functions (including teaching) as well as the government of the community. There have been differences of opinion concerning the origin of the monarchical episcopacy, which soon became the sole form of episcopacy in the Church; but no one holds that the monarchical episcopacy succeeded a period of anarchy or of government by a community where all had equal authority. The organization of all Christian Churches under the authority of the bishops and clergy, as early as the third century, is
so evident as to place beyond all doubt the existence at that time of two distinct classes, the clergy and the laity. Moreover, in all societies among which Christianity had spread, religious service had already its special classes, and the Church would have retrograded if its worship and its sacrifice had not been entrusted exclusively to a special class.

Christ selected the Apostles from among His disciples, and among the Apostles He selected Peter to be their head. He entrusted them with the furtherance of His work on earth, they have the keys of spiritual authority, for they are the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt., xvi, 19); He gave them the mission to teach and baptize all nations (Matt., xxviii, 18); to them also He addressed those words at the Last Supper: "Do this in commemoration of me." (Luke, xx, 19). As soon as the Church begins to live, the Apostles appear as its leaders; they are distinct from the "multitude of believers"; it is into their ranks that they bring the consecrated grapes of the Holy Ghost, Saul and Barnabas, whom they receive with the imposition of hands (Acts, xii, 2). Where St. Paul founds Christian churches: also all by the "Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of the Church of God." (Acts, xx, 28); the Pastoral Epistles reveal to us a directing body composed of the bishops, or priests, and deacons (I Clement, xiii, 4); and they it is, especially the bishops, who perform exclusively the liturgical services (Ep. Ignat., "Ad Magnesiam," v. 3). It is true that the clergy, or the body represents the church, not to individual moral perfection. It is true that the clergy, being dedicated to the service of the altar, are thereby bound to strive for perfection; yet neither their virtues nor their failings influence in any way their powers. On the other hand, the clergy, besides their right to aspire freely to admission into the ranks of the clergy, on complying with the requisite conditions, are exalted to exercise every virtue, even in the highest degree. They can also bind themselves to observe the evangelical counsels, under the guidance of the Church, in either the world, as did the ancient ascetics, or by way of deviation, as the religious houses. But ascetics, nuns, and unordained members of religious associations of men were not originally in the ranks of the clergy, and, strictly speaking, are not so even to-day, though, on account of their closer and more special dependence on ecclesiastical authority and guidance, they are among the acknowledged clergy in the broader sense (see Religious). The juridical condition of the clergy in the Christian society is therefore determined by two considerations: their separation from the clergy, which excludes them from the performance of acts reserved to the latter; and second, their subjection to the spiritual authority of the Church, without which they are excluded from the clergy which is of obligation for the laity, abstracting from individual cases when there may be a legitimate excuse. On the other hand, more or less frequent confessions and communions, hearing of daily Mass, frequenting the Divine Office, asking for specific ceremonies (for instance, churching) celebration of Masses, obtaining services and prayers for the dead, or for other intentions, are things that are perfectly legitimate and are counseled, but are optional. We may also mention the obligatory or free acts intended for the personal sanctification of the laity, which do not require the help of the clergy: private prayer, the recitation and abstention on fast days, Sundays and holy days of obligation, and, lastly, in general all that relates to the moral life and the observance of the commandments of God.

Duties and Rights of the Laity.—Having come through Baptism to the supernatural life, being members of the Christian society and adopted children of God, the laity belong to the "chosen race," the "royal priesthood" (I Peter, ii, 9) formed of all those who are born again in Christ. They have therefore a right to share in the common spiritual goods of the Christian society, which implies a corresponding obligation on the part of the clergy to bestow on them these goods, in as far as this bestows requires the intervention of the ministers of religion and of the spiritual authority. But if the laity are to share in these common goods they must employ more or less frequently the means of sanctification instituted by Jesus Christ in His Church, and of which the clergy have been put in charge. Further, the laity, being subject to ecclesiastical authority, must obey and respect it; but in return they have the right to obtain from it direction, protection, and service. Thus, for the laity rights and duties are relative: the first duty of a Christian is to believe; the first obligation imparted to the laity is, therefore, to learn the truths of faith and of religion, at first by means of the catechism and religious instruction, and later by being present at sermons, missions, or retreats. If they are thus obliged and directed to attend the Church, they have a right to be heard and consecrated to require their priests to give them and their children Christian teaching in the ordinary way.

Second, a Christian's moral conduct should be in keeping with his faith; he must, therefore, preserve his spiritual life by the means which Jesus has established in His Church: the Divine service, especially the Mass, the sacraments, and other sacred rites.

This necessity of having recourse to the pastoral ministry gives rise to a right in the laity as regards the clergy, the right of obtaining from them the administration of the sacraments, especially Penance and the Holy Eucharist, and others according to circumstances. It may be an obligation imposed by a command of the Church, or necessitated by personal reasons; in other cases, it may be a matter of counsel and left to the devotion of each one. This is a subject which exhibits most clearly the difference between a precept and a counsel with regard to our outward Christian life. Assistance at Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation, annual confession, Easter communion, the reception of the viaticum (q. v.) and the last services of religion, the celebration of marriage in the prescribed form, the baptism and religious instruction of children, and, finally, the rites of Christian burial—these are all the matters of the clergy, yet the clergy which is of obligation for the laity, abstracting from individual cases when there may be a legitimate excuse. On the other hand, more or less frequent confessions and communions, hearing of daily Mass, frequenting the Divine Office, asking for specific ceremonies (for instance, churching) celebration of Masses, obtaining services and prayers for the dead or for other intentions, are things that are perfectly legitimate and are counseled, but are optional. We may also mention the obligatory or free acts intended for the personal sanctification of the laity, which do not require the help of the clergy: private prayer, the recitation and abstention on fast days, Sundays and holy days of obligation, and, lastly, in general all that relates to the moral life and the observance of the commandments of God.

From these obligatory and optional relations existing between the laity and the clergy there arise certain duties of the former towards the latter. In the first place, respect and deference should be shown to the clergy, especially in the exercise of their function, on account of their sacred character and the Divine authority with which they are invested (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXV, c. xx). This respect should be shown in daily intercourse, and laymen inspired with a truly Christian spirit do homage to God in the person of His ministers, even when the conduct of the latter is not in keeping with the sanctity of their state. In the second place the laity are obliged, in proportion to their
means and the circumstances of the case, to contribute towards the expenses of Divine service and the fitting support of the clergy; this is an obligation incumbent on them in return for the right which they have to the services of their priests with regard to the Mass and the administration of the Sacraments, and under two distinct classes: certain gifts and offerings of the faithful are intended in general for the Divine services and the support of the clergy; others, on the contrary, are connected with various acts of the sacred ministry which are freely asked for, such as the stipends for Masses, the dues for funeral services, marriages, etc. There is no fixed sum for the former class, the matter being left to the generosity of the faithful; in many countries they have taken the place of the fixed incomes that the various churches and the clergy were possessed of, arising especially from landed property; they have likewise replaced the tithes, no longer recognized by the secular governments. The latter class, however, are fixed by ecclesiastical authority or custom and may be demanded in justice; not that this is paying for sacred things, which would be simony, but that they are offerings for the Divine service and the clergy, on the occasion of certain definite acts (see **Offerings; Tithes**).

There remains to speak of the duties and rights of the laity towards the ecclesiastical authority as such, in matters foreign to the sacred ministry. The duties, which affect both laity and clergy, consist in submission to legitimate authority: the pope, the bishops, and, in a proportionate degree, the parish priests and other acting ecclesiastics. The decisions, judgments, orders, and directions of our lawful pastors, in matters of doctrine, morals, discipline, and even administration, must be accepted and obeyed by all members of the Christian society, at least in as far as they are subject to that authority. That is a condition requisite to the well-being of any society whatsoever. However, in the case of the Christian society, authoritative decisions and directions, in as far as they are concerned with faith and morals, bind not merely to exterior acts and formal obedience; they are, moreover, a matter of conscience and demand loyal interior acceptance. On the other hand, seeing that in the Church the superiors have been established for the welfare of the subjects, so that the pope himself glories in the title "servant of the servants of God," the common right to the care, vigilance, and protection of their pastors; in particular they have the right to refer their disputes to the ecclesiastical authorities for decision, to consult them in case of doubt or difficulty, and to ask for suitable guidance for their religious or moral conduct.

**Privileges and Restrictions of the Laity.**

Since the laity is distinct from the clergy, and since Divine worship, doctrinal teaching, and ecclesiastical government are reserved, at least in essentials, to the latter, it follows that the former may not interfere in purely clerical offices; they can participate only in a secondary, privy, and inferior capacity, and to a more or less explicit authorization. Any other interference would be an unlawful and guilty usurpation, punishable at times with censures and penalties. We will apply this principle now to matters of worship, teaching, and government or administration.

(1) As to the Liturgy. — As to Divine service, the liturgy and especially the essential act of the Christian worship, the Holy Sacrifice, the active ministers are the clergy alone. But the laity really join in it. Not only do they assist at the Sacrifice and receive its spiritual effects, but they offer it through the ministry of others. For hereby they can and even more be obliged to, bring and offer at the altar then, there of the sacrifice, i.e., the bread and wine; that is what they really do to-day by their offerings and their stipends for Masses. At several parts of the Mass, the prayers mention them as offering the sacrifice together with the clergy, especially in the passages immediately after the consecration: "Unde et memores, nos servti tu (the clergy) sed et plebs tua sancta (the laity) . . . offerimus praecae Majestati tuae, de tuis donis ac datis", etc. The laity reply to the salutations and prayers by the priest and they are limited to tempus prayer; especially do they share in the Holy Victim by Holy Communion (confined for them in the Latin Liturgy to the species of bread), which they can receive also outside of the time of Mass and at home in case of illness. Such is the participation of the laity in the Liturgy, and although they are limited to tempus prayer, all the active portion is performed by the clergy.

Regularly, no layman may sit within the **presbyterium**, or sanctuary, nor may he read any part of the Liturgy, much less pray publicly, or serve the priest at the altar, or, above all, offer the Sacrifice. However, owing to the almost complete disappearance of the inferior clergy, there has gradually arisen the custom of appointing lay persons to perform certain minor clerical duties. In most of our churches, the choirboys, schoolboys, sacristans, and chanters, serve low Masses and Missa cantatae, occupy places in the sanctuary, and act as acolytes, ministers, and even as lectors. On such occasions they are given, at least in solemn services, a clerical costume, the crosier and surplice, as if to admit them temporarily to the ranks of the clergy and thus recognize and safeguard the principle of excluding the laity. It is only to the Mass, to the Mass, and to all liturgical services: the laity are separated from the clergy. In processions especially, confraternities and other bodies of the laity precede the clergy; the women being first, then the men, next regular clergy, and lastly the secular clergy.

In the administration of the sacraments, the sacramentals, and other like liturgical offices, the same principle applies, and ordinarily everything is reserved to the clergy. But it should be mentioned that the laity may administer baptism (q.v.) in cases of necessity, and though not of practical importance with regard to adults, this frequently occurs when children are in danger of death. In the early ages, the faithful carried away the Blessed Eucharist to their homes and gave themselves the Holy Communion (cf. Tertullian, "Ad uxorern", ii, 5). That was a purely material administration of the sacrament, and hardly differed from the reservation of the Blessed Eucharist for the sick; in other ages, the consecrated host was placed in the hand of each communicant. We should mention also the use of the blessed oil by those who were sick, if that be considered an administration of extreme unction (cf. the Decretal of Innocent I to Desentius of Eugubium, n. 8; serm. cclxv and cclxxii; appendix of the works of St. Augustine, really the work of St. Cassarius of Arles). But those practices have long since disappeared.

As to matrimony, if the sacrament itself, which is none other than the contract, has as its authors the lay persons contracting, the liturgical administration is reserved to the ecclesiastics. It may be asked whether, in those cases, there is nothing to prevent the laity from using the liturgical prayers in their private devotions, from reciting the Divine Office, or the various Little Offices drawn up particularly for them, or from joining in associations or confraternities to practise together and according to rule certain pious exercises, the confraternities having been formed lawfully in virtue of episcopal approbation.

(2) As to Doctrine.—The body of the faithful is strictly speaking the Ecclesia docta (the Church taught), in contrast with the Ecclesia docens (the teaching Church), which consists of the pope and the bishops. When the question is whether the laity, when teaching of religious doctrine, the laity is neither competent nor authorized to speak in the name of God and the Church (can. xii et sq. lib. V. tit. vii, "De haereticis"). Consequently they are not allowed to preach in church, or to
undertake to defend the Catholic doctrine in public discussions with heretics. But in their private capacity, they may most lawfully defend and teach their religion by word and writing, while submitting themselves to the control and guidance of ecclesiastical authority. Moreover, they may be appointed to give doctrinal instruction more or less officially, or may even orate, defend the faith, or give excellent help to the clergy in teaching catechism, the lay masters in our schools give religious instruction, and some laymen have received a missio canonica, or due ecclesiastical authorization, to teach the religious sciences in universities and seminaries; the importance of this, for the Church, is that the laymen are to be submissive to the legitimate teaching authority.

(3) As to Jurisdiction and Administration.—The principle is that the laity as such have no share in the spiritual jurisdiction and government of the Church; but they may be commissioned or delegated by ecclesiastical authority to exercise certain rights, especially when there is no question of strictly spiritual jurisdiction, for instance, in the administration of property. The laity are incapable, if not by Divine law at least by canon law, of real jurisdiction in the Church, according to chap. x, "De constit." (lib. I, tit. ii): "Alius autem non ordinatur nisi persona sacerdotalis a pontifici constituta," i.e., the laymen have no authority over things or persons ecclesiastical; it is their duty to obey not to command. Therefore no official acts requiring real ecclesiastical jurisdiction can be properly performed by the laity; if performed by them, they are null and void. A layman therefore cannot be at the head of a Church or any Christian community, nor can he legislate in spiritual matters, nor act as judge in essentially ecclesiastical cases. In particular, the laity (and by this is not meant ordinary laymen, who do not bestow ecclesiastical jurisdiction on clerics under the form of an election properly so called, conferring the right to an episcopal or other benefice. An election by the laity only, or one in which the laity took part, would be absolutely null and void (c. liv., "De elect.") (see ELECTRON.) But this refers to canonical election strictly so called, conferring jurisdiction or the right to receive it; if it is merely a question, on the other hand, of selecting an individual, either by way of presentation or a similar process, the laity are not excluded, for the canonical institution, the source of spiritual power, is ecclesiastical, not ecclesiastical authority. That is why no objection can be raised against the principle we have laid down from the fact that the people took part in the episcopal elections in the first ages of the Church; to speak more accurately, the people manifested their wish rather than took part in the election; the real electors were the clerics; and lastly, the bishops who were present were the judges of the election, so that in reality the final decision rested in the hands of the ecclesiastical authority. It cannot be denied that in the course of time the secular power encroached on the ground of spiritual power, a matter there was the case of the Pope taking the temporal elections; but the Church always asserted her claim to independence where spiritual jurisdiction was involved, as may be clearly seen in the history of the famous dispute about investitures (q. v.).

When jurisdiction properly so-called is duly protected, and there is question of administering temporal goods, the laity may and do enjoy as a fact real rights recognized by the Church. The most important is that of presentation or election in the wide sense of the term, now known as nomination, by which certain laymen select for the ecclesiastical authorities the person they wish to see in temporal benefices or offices. The best known example is that of nomination to sees and other benefices by temporal princes, who have obtained that privilege by concor-

data (q. v.). Another case recognized and carefully provided for in canon law is the right of patronage. This right is granted to those who from their own resources have established a benefice or who have at least amply endowed it (contributing more than one-third of the revenue). The patrons can, from the moment of foundation, reserve to themselves and their descendants, the right to choose the person to whom they will give the benefice, or to mention other privileges rather honorary in their nature; in exchange for these rights, they undertake to protect and maintain their foundation. The right of active patronage consists principally in the presentation of the cleric to be invested with the benefice by the ecclesiastical authority, and is subject to certain conditions. The right of passive patronage consists in the fact that the candidates for the benefice are to be selected from the descendants or the family of the founder. The patrons enjoy by right a certain precedence, among other things the right to a more prominent seat in the churches founded or supported by them; sometimes, also, they enjoy other honours; they can reserve to themselves a part in the administration of the property of the benefice; finally, if they fall upon evil days, the Church is obliged to help them from the property that was acquired through the generosity of the laity who established and endowed it. It is clear, and particularly that of presentation, are concessions made by the Church, and not privileges which the laity have of their own right. It is but equitable that those who furnish the resources required by the Church should not be excluded from their administration. For this reason the participation of the laity in the administration of church property, especially parish property, is justified.

Under the different names such as, "building councils", "parish councils", "trustees", etc., and with rules carefully drawn up or approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, and often enshrined in civil law, there exist almost everywhere administrative organizations charged with the care of the temporal goods of churches and other ecclesiastical establishments; most of the members are laymen; they are selected in various ways, generally co-optation, subject to the approval of the bishop. But this honourable office does not belong to the laity in their own right; it is a privilege granted to them by the Church, which alone has the right to administer her own property (Conc. Plen. Baltim. III, n. 284 sq.); they must conform to the regulations and act under the control of the ordinaries. The reservations of ecclesiastical jurisdiction rests; lastly and above all, they must confine their energies to temporal administration and never encroach on the reserved domain of spiritual things (Conc. Plen. Baltim. II, n. 201; see BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL). Lastly, there are many educational and charitable institutions, founded and directed by laymen, and which are not strictly church property, though they are regularly subject to the control of the ordinary (Conc. Trid., Sess. VII, c. xv; Sess. XXII, c. viii); the material side of these works is not the most important, and to attain their end, the laity who govern them must be directed by the advice of their pastors, whose loyal and respectful auxiliaries they will prove themselves to be.

FERRARIS, Prompta Bibliotheca, s. v. Laicus; SIGMULLER, Kirchenrecht (Freiburg, 1909); KIRCHENRECHT EISENBERG, n. 50 sq. (Freiburg, 1908); Kirchenlexikon, s. v. Clerus.

A. BOUDINON.

Lake Indians, called by themselves SENJUITE, and possibly identical with the LAHANNA of Lewis and Clark in 1805, a small tribe of Salishan stock, originally ranging along Columbia River in north-east Washington from about Kettle Falls to the British line. In 1850 Fort Colville with the Columbia was established by the Hudson Bay Company in their company but remained almost unchanged until Christianized in 1846, chiefly through the efforts of the Jesuit Father Adrian
Hoecker, who in that year established the summer mission of St. Paul at the Falls. In 1870 they were officially designated a mission. In 1871, going fishing, selling their furs to the traders, well fed and clothed, peaceful, friendly, independent, and Catholic in religion. They numbered then 239. In 1872 they were collected with other kindred tribes upon Colville Reservation in the same territory. With the other confederated tribes they were received by the mission of Saint John Francis Regis, at Ward, in charge of the Jesuit Fathers, assisted by the Sisters of Charity of Providence. They numbered 283 in 1908, a considerable increase over earlier figures. (See also KALISPEL INDIANS."

James Mooney.

**Lallemant, Charles**, b. at Paris, 17 November, 1587; d. there, 18 November, 1674. He was the first superior of the Jesuit missions in Canada, and his letter to his brother dated 1 August, 1626, inaugurated the series of "Relations" about the missionary work in that country. Thwarted by the Trading Company at Quebec in his efforts to evangelize the Indians, he went to France to obtain permission to return to America his vessel was captured by Kirke who was then blockading the St. Lawrence, and he was sent as a prisoner to England. A second attempt resulted in shipwreck off Cape Canso, and on his way back to France in a fishing smack which picked him up he was wrecked a second time on the coast of Spain. He finally reached America in 1632 after Quebec was restored to the French. He was the friend and confessor of Champlain, who died in his arms. He returned again to France in 1638, where he became procurator of the Canadian missions, vice provincial and superior of the "Professed house" in Paris. It was he who obtained the concession of the Island of Montreal for the colony of Dauversière, and he also got Maisonneuve and Jeanne Mance to engage in the undertaking. When there was question of appointing the first Bishop of Quebec, his candidate was Lallemant, the superior of a spiritual work, not generally known, entitled "La vie cachée de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ," and is not to be confounded with Louis Lallemant who is the author of "Les conférences spirituelles".

T. J. Campbell.

**Lallemant, Gabriel**, Jesuit missionary, b. at Paris, 10 October, 1610; d. in the Huron country, 17 March, 1649. He was the nephew of Charles and Jerome Lallemant, and became a Jesuit at Paris, 24 March, 1630. He arrived in Canada, 20 September, 1649, and after remaining in Quebec for two years, was sent to the Huron missions as de Brébeuf's assistant. He was scarcely a month when the Iroquois attacked the settlement of St. Ignatius which they burned, and eleven men were killed on the mission. Lallemant was then de Brébeuf and Lallemant. After setting fire to the village and killing many of the inhabitants, they led the two priests back to St. Ignatius where they were tied to stakes and after horrible torture put to death. Lallemant stood by while his companion was being killed. De Brébeuf expired at the last moment. Lallemant, who had been with them six that evening and lasted until nine o'clock next morning. When the Iroquois withdrew, the bodies of the two priests were carried over to St. Mary's where they were interred. Some of the relics of Lallemant were subsequently carried to Quebec.

T. J. Campbell.

**Lallemant, Jerome**, alias Hierosme, Jesuit missionary, b. at Paris, 27 April, 1593; d. at Quebec, 16 November, 1655. He returned to the missions of Paris, 20 October, 1610. Arriving in Canada 25 June, 1635, he immediately went to the Huron missions as superior. He took the first regular census of the Indians, instituted the organization of the donnes or lay assistants of the missionaries, and re-arranged the different missionary posts attached to the new establishment of St. Mary's on the Wye the central one. In 1645 he returned to Quebec as general superior. In 1656 he was recalled to France and in 1658 was made rector of the Royal college of La Flèche; but was hardly installed when he was asked for by Laval as vicar general of Quebec. He left at once for France, and acted as his vicar during all the troubles with the Governors d'Argenson, d'Avaugour, and de Mesy, and also with de Quelusy who was an aspirant for the Bishopric of Quebec. He remained superior and vicar-general until the end of his life. He wrote many of the "Relations," and also most of the only volume we have of the "Journal des Jésuits".

T. J. Campbell.

**Lallemant, Jacques-Philippe**, French Jesuit, b. at St.-Valéry-sur-Somme about 1660; d. at Paris, 8 April, 1707. Little is known of him beyond his writings. He took part in the discussions of the question of returning to America and in 1704 wrote the "Journal historique des assemblées tenues en Sorbonne pour condamner 'es Mémoires de la Chine" (Paris, 1700), a defence of his confère Leconte against the Sorbonniste, Jacques Lefèvre. In his "Histoire des Contestation sur la Diplomatique" (Paris, 1708) he sided with the Jesuits Hardouin and Papbroch against the Benedictine Mabillon. His principal works, however, are against the Jansenists. In close succession he published: "Le Père Quesnel séditieux dans ses Réflexions sur le Nouveau Testament" (Brussels, 1704); "Jansenius condamné par l'Eglise, par lui-même et par ses défenseurs" (St.-Augustin" (Brussels, 1705); "Le véritable esprit des nouveaux disciples de St-Augustin" (Brussels, 1706-7); "Les Hexaples ou les six colonnes sur la Constitution Unigenitus" (Amsterdam, 1714), with a number of pamphlets in defence of the same; "Entretiens au sujet des affaires présentées par rapport à la religion" (Paris, 1734-1743). The better to counteract Quesnel's "Réflexions morales," Lallemant composed, in collaboration with other Jesuits (e. g. Bouhours and Michel), "Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament traduit en français" (Paris, 1713-24), which Fénéon styled very pious and one of the most read through any part of the sacred text. This work, translated into many languages, enjoyed a well-deserved popularity, and the latest edition (Lille, 1836) was warmly praised by the "Revue Catholique." Lallemant is also the author of "Le Sens propre et littéral des Psaumes de David" (Paris, 1709) and of "L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, traduction nouvelle" (Paris, 1740), of which there have been countless editions and translations. The "Mémoires de Trévoux" (Aug., 1713, and May, 1714) contain several dissertations with Lallemant's initials, and the Jansenists attributed to him several writings like the "Mandement de M. de Vicintille contre les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques" (1732) and the supplement to the "Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques" (1734-8).


**Lallemant, Louis**, French Jesuit, b. at Châlons-sur-Marne, 1588; d. at Bourges, 5 April, 1635. After making his studies under the Fathers of the Society of Jesus, he entered that order, and having completed the usual course of study and teaching which is
the lot of its younger members, he was ordained, and

taught philosophy and theology for some time until he

was made master of novices, an office he filled for four

years. He was, however, transferred to the post of di-
pointed director of the fathers in third probation; but

after three years in this difficult post he broke down in

health, and was sent to the college of Bourges, in the

hope that change of occupation would restore him.

The hope was not to be fulfilled; and he died after a

few months. He has been called the "Balthasat Alvares of

France, and not without reason.

His ideals were no less heroic and his efforts after

them as uncompromising as those of that great mas-
ter of spiritual life. Like him also, he expected from

others what he did himself. He set, therefore, the big-

gest idea before his disciples, especially the Fathers

of the third probation, and required them to rise to

such ideals. Moreover, as Father Balthasat Alvares

may be held to have contributed not a little, through

the great masters of spiritual life he formed, to fix that

special type of spirituality which characterized the

Spanish Jesuits, so to Father Lalor's teaching may

be traced in no small measure the special spirituality of

the French Jesuits, which the eminent men who

came under his teaching and formation diffused

throughout the French provinces. He is known to

day chiefly by his "Doctrine Spirituelle," a collection

of his discourses and instructions. His pupils and, in

particular, his spiritual, Father Jean Rigoleuc, one of his disciples, and de-

tailing very thoroughly his spiritual method.

Champion, La Doctrine Spirituelle du P. Louis Lallemant (Paris, 1848); GUILLEMIN, Memoires de l'Assistance de France, 5 April; PATRIGNANI, Memoria della Compagnia di Gesù.

HENRY WOODS.

LALOR, TERESA, co-foundress, with Bishop Neale of

Baltimore, of the Visitation Order in the United

States, b. in Ireland; d. 9 Sept., 1846. Her child-

hood, spent on a farm, gave such evident fea-

tures of a vocation to the religious life that Bishop

Napahan of Ossory had made arrangements for her

entrance into a convent of his diocese, when she

was obliged to accompany her family to America.

Arriving at Philadelphia in 1797, she became ac-

quainted with Père d'Herin, pastor of St. Joseph's

church in that city, and under his direction she

devoted herself to works of piety and charity.

He recognized in her an instrument for the formation of

a religious community, and with this object in view

an academy was opened for the instruction of girls.

But an epidemic of yellow fever carried off Miss

Lalor, and as Father Neale was transferred in 1799 from Philadelphia, to become president of Georgetown College, she also went to Georgetown, D. C., and was for a time domiciled with a small community of Poor Clares, exiled from France. On the departure of the Poor Clares from America, Miss Lalor and two companions opened a school of their own in a

house which stood within the present grounds of the Visitation convent, the oldest house of the order in the United States. The "pious ladies," as they were
called, aspired to become religious, and, as Bishop Neale was greatly in favour of the rule of St. Francis de Sales, he wished to affiliate them with the order

founded by the saintly Bishop of Geneva; but the disturbed condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Europe prevented this until 1816, when he obtained a grant from Pius VII for the community to be considered as belonging to the Order of the Visitation, sharing in all the advantages that the order enjoyed. Miss Lalor and Teresa with two other sisters was professed on the feast of the Holy Innocents of that same year, and

became the first superioress of the Georgetown Con-

vent. She lived to see three other houses of the

instituted founded, of which the mother-house: Mo-

selle de Reims, Kew, and Bay Shore, N. Y., were transferred to St. Louis, in 1833; and Baltimore, in 1837. She was

assisted in her last moments by Archbishop Eccles, of Baltimore. She was about seventy-seven years of

age, forty-six of which had been spent in the enclosure where her remains repose, with those of Bishop Neale, in the crypt beneath the chapel of the convent

which they founded.

LATEROP (GEORGE PARSONS AND ROSE HAWTHORNE), A

Story of Courage (Cambridge, Mass., 1840); MS. of the Visita-

tion convent, Georgetown, D. C., a short account of the life

of the foundress of the Visitation Order in America.

E. DEVITT.

LA LUSERNE, CÉSAR-GUILLAUME, French cardinal, b.

at Paris, 1738; d. there, 1821. He studied at the

Collège de Navarre, and rose, through the influence of

his kinsman Lamoignon, to the See of Langres (1770),

thus obtaining the first benefice of the Palatinate. In this

capacity he took part in the Assemblée des Notables

(1788) and in the États-Généraux (1789). The calling

efforts of his desires to keep the "Constituante" within

the limits of moderation caused him to withdraw from

that body. In 1791, he refused to take the constitu-

tional oath and emigrated to Constance and Venice

where he gave a generous hospitality to the French

exiles and wrote extensively. Under the Restoration he

returned to France, became cardinal and state

minister (1817) and was re-appointed to the See of

Langres which he had resigned at the time of the Con-

stituent Assembly. His pastoral works are: "Oraison funèbre de Louis XV" (Paris, 1774); "Considérations sur divers points de la morale chrétienne" (Venice, 1795-

1799); "Explication des évangiles des dimanches et des fêtes" (Venice, 1807); "Considérations sur la déclaration du clergé de France en 1822" (Paris, 1821).

An excellent apologist and a loud exponent of Catholic faith and Christian ethics, La Luserne, like Frayssinous, Talleyrand-Périgord and Bausset, was a

belated representative of the old Gallicanism. His

efforts to revive it failed, owing partly to the fall of the

Bourbons and partly because of the galaxy of brilliant

sisters who, in "L'Avenir" and other publications, gave to France a definite Roman orientation.


J. F. SOLLIER.

LAMARCK (LA MARCK; post. abbr. Lam., zool. Lm.),

JEAN-BAPTISTE-PIERRE-ANTOINE DE MONET, CHE-

VALIER DE, a distinguished botanist, zoologist, and

natural philosopher, b. at Barentin in Picardy (de-

partment of Somme), France, 18 December, 1744; d. at

Paris, 18 December, 1829. His father, Pierre de

Monet, intended him for the priesthood, so Lamarck

first studied at the Jesuit college at Amiens. Upon

the death of his father, however, he joined, in 1671,

the French army in northern Germany, and on the day

of his arrival, during the War of the Spanish Succession, was made an officer on the field of battle for bravery.

When twenty-four years old he was obliged, on account of

illness, to leave the army with a very small pension.

While supporting himself by working as clerk in a

bank at Paris, he studied medicine, meteorology, and

botany in his spare hours. He never published medi-

cine, and his numerous meteorological writings have

no scientific value; the same is true of his physical and

chemical works, in which he opposed Lavoisier. They

were all written to support himself and his family.

It was otherwise with the different branches of biology:

from 1778 he was an able botanist, from 1794 a

zoologist, about 1800 began his speculative labours upon

the variation of species.

In 1778 he wrote in six months the first complete

account of the flora of France, "Flora franciaca" (3

vols., Paris, 1778; 3rd ed. edited by de Candolle, 8

vols., 1805-15). Lamarck's work and in several treatises, Lamarck explained the
analytical, dichotomous system of determining the species of plants, a system originated by him and now much used. In classification he maintained the principle, in opposition to Jussieu, that a single part, no matter how small, was not sufficient for the classification of the plant but that, in classification, all parts should be considered. This work led to his acquaintance with Buffon and in 1779 gained his election to the Académie of Sciences. With Buffon's son he then travelled through Holland, Germany, and Hungary, once more in Paris, he joined the "Encyclopédie méthodique," for which he wrote the first four volumes of the "Dictionnaire de botanique" (Paris, 1783–96). In this work the genera of plants are skillfully treated in alphabetical order from A to P; the great collections of Paris being exhaustively drawn upon. The large atlas "Illustration des Genres," which accompanied the work, contains 900 plates. Lamarck began a "Histoire naturelle des végétaux" (Paris, 1802), as part of the compilation "Suites de Buffon"; Mirbel continued the "Histoire naturelle" from volume III to XV. In the meantime Lamarck had received, in 1799, the position of keeper of the Jardin des Plantes, assistant to Daubenton, but he soon lost it. At no time in his life he was in very prosperous circumstances. When the Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle was reorganized in 1793 there were no professors of zoology. The professorship for the lower animals was offered to Lamarck, and he had the courage at the age of forty-nine to teach himself zoology. He commenced his zoological lectures in 1794 and carried them on until blindness forced him in 1818 to transfer them to the entomologist Latreille.

Lamarck began by separating the animal kingdom into the two important divisions of vertebrates and invertebrates. He sought to develop the classification of invertebrates ("Système des animaux sans vertèbres", Paris, 1801), and established numerous new genera and species for them. His most important zoological work is the "Histoire des animaux sans vertèbres" (7 vols., Paris, 1815–22; 2nd ed., 11 vols., 1838–45). Particular mention should be made of Lamarck's investigations concerning molluscs, especially his studies of the geologically important fossil molluscs. For the last twenty years his reputation has been far greater than in his lifetime in a steadily increasing degree. His theoretical views concerning life-forms which were often regarded by his contemporaries, as by Cuvier, only as droll, fantastic crotchets, unworthy of notice or even of contradiction, are now considered by many biologists as showing in the highest degree the originality of genius. These views are expressed in numerous treatises issued during the period 1802–20 but especially in his work "Philosophie zoologique" (2 vols., Paris, 1809, 1839, 1873, etc.; lately translated into other languages). They are the basis of that form of evolution which as Lamarckism, and of late in sharp opposition to Darwin's neo-Lamarckism, has distinguished adherents among biologists, zoologists, and paleontologists. These adherents, however, do not agree among themselves. Every year in increasing number appear popular and scientific works upon Lamarck and Lamarckism. His ideas were partly influenced by Maillet, Condillac, Rousseau, and especially by Buffon. Lamarck can with more right than Darwin be called the originator of the theory of evolution, just as he was also the first to choose the form of a genealogical tree to illustrate the genetic connection of organisms. According to him only a few species have died out; for the most part they have been modified. However, the work of Lamarckism means almost all the opposing forces, postulated by Lamarck, of phylogeny: the use or disuse of the organs, occasioned by need, consequently by a factor inherent in the life-form, is said to call forth adaptations which become permanent by heredity. Lamarck was, therefore, a vitalist, not a materialist; he was also neither an atheist, nor irreligious, nor an opponent of the Scriptures. On the contrary, in regard to the creation of man he frankly asserted the authority of the Bible higher than his own ideas. At least there is no valid reason for regarding his words relative to this as hypocritical, as many Lamarckians do. Lamarck's name is perpetuated in botany in the genera Monetia, Markea, Lamarchea, and Lamarcia. In 1809 a monument to him was unveiled in the Museum d'Histoire Naturelle at Paris.

Of the extensive literature on Lamarck may be mentioned:
Cuvier, Éloge de Lamarck (Paris, 1833); Cosson, The Origin of the Fossil (New York, 1887); Packard, Lamarck; the Founder of Evolution (New York, London, 1859); Darwinius and Lamarckismus (Munich, 1906); Lortet, Verleihungen über Descendenztheorien (Geneva, 1906–08); Borchardt, Geschichte der Zoologie (Leipzig, 1917); Pierron, Goupil, and Delage in Acad. des Sciences, Inst. de France, CXLIX (Paris, 1899); Rödl, Geschichte der biolog. Theorien (Leipzig, 1895–99).

Joseph Rompel

Lamartine, Alphonse de, poet, b. at Mâcon, Saône-et-Loire, France, 21 Oct., 1790; d. at Paris, 1 Mar., 1869, a son of a noble and Christian family, Lamartine at an early age read selected passages from the Bible, later from Fénelon, Bernard, Saint-Pierre, Chateaubriand, Mme de Staël, Racine, Voltaire, Parny, and among foreign poets, Dante, Petrarch, Shakespeare, Ossian, especially the last, who was then very popular. About the age of twenty he met at the house of one of his relatives at Naples a little cigarette girl called Graziella, who captured his heart or his views concerning his works. Two years later, in 1814, when he was a member of the life-guards, he made the acquaintance of a delicate young woman, the wife of a physician named Charles, who died shortly afterwards. This ideal passion and the grief which followed so soon upon its blossoming revealed him to himself. Henceforth he had been an imitator; henceforth he would accept no guide save his own inspiration. Madame Charles is the Julie of his "Rahel" and the Elvire of his poems. He made his entrance into the field of poetry by a masterpiece, "Les Méditations Poétiques" (1820), and awoke to fullness; he may be said to have taken glory by storm. His other poetical works are "Les Secondes Méditations" (1823); "Harmonies Poétiques et Religieuses" (1830); "Jocelyn" (1836); and "La Chute d'un Ange" (1838); two fragments of a great epic which he dreamed of dedicating to humanity, and lastly the "Recueillements Poétiques" (1839), in which he returned to lyricism, but without equaling his early works. He had already made himself known in prose. In 1835 he published the "Voyage en Orient," a brilliant and bold account of the journey he had made in royal luxury, to the countries of the Orient, and in the course of which he had lost his only daughter. Henceforth he confined himself to prose. He published volumes on the most varied subjects (history, criticism, personal confidences, literary conversations) especially during the Empire, when, hav-
Lamb retired to private life and having become the prey of his creditors, he condemned himself to what he called “literary hard-labour in order to exist and pay his debts”. He finally retired to his native town of Poissy, where he wrote the “Histoire des Girondins” (1847). Lamartine had long been taking part in politics, and had been elected a member of Parliament in 1833. He displayed astonishing ability as an extempore speaker, his brilliancy and grace being joined to fluency and action, and he formed a formidable opposition against the government of Louis-Philippe. The “Histoire des Girondins” was an episode in this: it was written with the desire to glorify the principles and the men of the French Revolution, without, however, approving their crimes. Immediately becoming popular the author shook in the provincial government at the death of the monarchy (1848). But his popularity was ephemeral and the Coup d’état of 2 December, 1851, caused his return to literature for the remainder of his life. He died quietly, almost forgotten.

In him France lost a great poet; Lamartine may be reproached with not paying sufficient attention to the poetic vocation for which he affected an aristocratic disdain. Hence his lack of revision and faultiness of plot, whenever his plot required detailed thinking out, as in his longer compositions; hence also his carelessness in rhyme and sometimes even in syntax. Even when he is an improviser who abandon himself to nature. But on the other hand he displays great simplicity, imagination, ease, fullness, and melody.

When the “Meditations” first appeared they revealed to France an entirely new kind of poetry, one which, according to the phrase of the author, “c’est un jeu stérile de l’esprit pour renaitre fille de l’enthousiasme et de l’inspiration”. In fact, despite the softness of the sentiments to which he abandoned his heart, he was a writer of rare elevation. No poet has sung of God with more Christian love than he in his earliest works; though in later life he became a mere spiritualist, he returned in his old age to the religion of his youth, and died the death of a Christian. But at every period he loved to see the Creator through the transparent veil of the creature and to sing to Him hymns of adoration.

Lamb, Paschal, a lamb which the Israelites were commanded to eat with peculiar rites as a part of the Passover celebration. The Divine ordinance is first recorded in Exodus, xii, 3–11, where Yahweh is represented as giving instructions to Moses to preserve the Hebrews from the last of the plagues inflicted upon the Egyptians, viz. the death of the firstborn. On the tenth day of the first month each family (or group of families, if they are small) is commanded to take a lamb without blemish, male, of one year, and keep it until the fourteenth day of the month, and sacrifice it in the evening. The blood of the lamb must be sprinkled on the transom and doorposts of the houses in which the paschal meal is taken. The lamb should be roasted and eaten with unleavened bread and wild lettuce.

The whole of the lamb must be consumed—head, feet, entrails—and if anything remains of it until morning it must be burned with fire. The Israelites are commanded to eat the meal in haste, with girded loins, shoes on their feet, and staves in their hands, “for it is the Phase (that is, Passage) of the Lord”. The blood of the lamb on the doorposts served as a sign of immunity against the destroying angel, who smote in one night all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast. This ordinance is repeated in abridged form in Numbers, xix, 11, 12, and again in Deuteronomy, xvi, 2–6, where sheep and oxen are mentioned instead of the lamb.

That the Paschal Lamb prefigured symbolically Christ, “the Lamb of God”, who redeemed the world by the shedding of His blood, and particularly the Eucharistic banquet, or new Passover, has always remained the constant belief of Christian tradition.

Lamb, The, in Early Christian Symbolism.—One of the few Christian symbols dating from the first century is that of the Good Shepherd carrying on His shoulders a lamb or a sheep, with two other sheep at His side. Between the first and the fourth century eighty-eight frescoes of this type were depicted in the Roman catacombs.

The significance which may be attached to this symbol, according to Wilpert’s interpretation, is as follows. The lamb or sheep on the shoulders of the Good Shepherd is a symbol of the soul of the deceased being borne by Our Lord into heaven; whereas the two sheep accompanying the Shepherd represent the saint already enjoying eternal bliss. This interpretation is in harmony with an ancient liturgical prayer for the dead of the following tenor: “We pray God... to be merciful to him in judgment, having redeemed him by His death, freed him from sin, and reconciled him with the Father. May He be to him the Good Shepherd and carry him on His shoulders [to the fold]. May He receive him in the following of the King, and grant him to participate in eternal joy in the society of the saints” (Muratori, “Lit. Rom. Vet.”, I, 751). In catacomb frescoes this petition is represented as already granted; the deceased is in the company of the saints.

Another cycle of catacomb paintings (not numerous) represents a lamb, or a sheep, with a milk-pail either on its back or suspended from a pastoral staff. A unique fresco of this order shows a shepherd milking a sheep, while still another shows a milk-pail on an altar between two sheep. The frescoes of this type (of the sheep and milk-pail) were, until recently,
generally regarded as symbols of the Eucharist, but
Mgr. Wilpert dissent from the received opinion, and
regards all frescoes in which allusions to milk occur as
symbolic of the joys of Heaven. While both the earli-
ner interpretations depend on a well-known text of the
Acts of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas. While in
prison awaiting martyrdom, St. Perpetua tells us she
believed in a vision "an immense garden, and in the
centre thereof the tall and venerable figure of an old
man in the dress of a shepherd, milking a cow. When
Raising his head, he looked at me and said, 'Welcome,
my daughter.' And he called me to him and he gave
me of the milk. I received it with joined hands and
partook of it. And all those standing around said
'Ges. Amen.' And at the sound of the voice I awoke,
tasting an indescribable sweetness in my mouth." The
community of ideas between this description and the
catacomb frescoes of the sheep and milk-pail is so
apparent that, at first view, the current interpreta-
tion of this class of representation would seem to be
obviously accurate. Wilpert, however, calls atten-
tion to the fact that the things described in the
vision of St. Per-
petua took place
not on earth, but
in heaven, where the Eucharist is no longer received.
Hence he regards the frescoes of the milk-pail class as
symbolic of the joys which the soul of the deceased
possess in paradise.

The lamb, or sheep, symbol, then, of the first class
described, has, in all catacomb paintings and sar-
cophagi of the fourth century, always a meaning asso-
ciated with the condition of the deceased after death.
But in the new era ushered in by Constantine, the
Great the lamb appears in the art of the basilicas with
an entirely new significance. The general scheme of
apseal mosaic decoration in the basilicas that every-
where sprang into existence after the conversion of
Constantine, confounded in the main to that described
by St. Paulinus as existing in the Basilica of St. Felix
at Nola. "The Trinity gleams in its full mystery," the
saint tells us. "Christ is represented in the form of a
lamb; the voice of the Father thunders from heaven;
and through the dove the Holy Spirit is poured out.
The Cross is set above by a circle of light as by a
crown. The crown of this crown are the apostles
themselves, who are represented by a choir of doves.
The Divine unity of the Trinity is summarized in
Christ. The Trinity has at the same time its own em-
bles: God is represented by the paternal voice, and
by the Spirit; the Cross and the Lamb denote the
Holy Victim. The purple background and the pictur-
ery indicate royalty and triumph. Upon the rock He
stands Who is the Rock of the Church, from which
flow the four murmuring springs, the Evangelists, liv-
ing rivers of Christ" (St. Paulinus, "Ep. xxxii, ad
Severum", §10, P. L., LXI, 336). The Divine Lamb
was usually represented in apsidal mosaics standing on
the mystic mount, whence flow the four streams of
Paradise symbolizing the Evangelists; twelve sheep,
six on either side, were further represented, coming
from the cities of Jerusalem and Bethlehem (indic-
cated by small houses at the extremities of the scene)
and proceeding towards the Lamb. The lower sône,
in no longer in existence, of the famous fourth-century
mosaic in the church of St. Petronian, Rome, origi-
nally represented the lamb on the mountain, and prob-
ably also the twelve sheep; the existing sixth-century
apseal mosaic of St. Cosmas and Damian at Rome,
gives a good idea of the manner in which this subject
was represented.

According to the "Liber Pontificalis", Constantine
the Great presented to the Lateran baptistery, which
he founded, a golden lamb, resting on a golden
cross, which was placed between two silver statues of Christ
and St. John the Baptist; the Baptist is represented
holding a scroll inscribed with the words: "Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tolit pecata mundi." From the
fifth century the head of the lamb began to be encir-
cled by the nimbus. Several monuments also show
the lamb with its head surmounted by various forms of
the Cross; one monument discovered by de Vogüé
in Central Syria shows the lamb with the Cross on its
back.

The next step in the development of this idea of
associating the Cross with the lamb was depicted in
a sixth-century mosaic of the Vatican Basilica,
which represented the lamb standing on a throne, at
the foot of a Cross studded with gems. From the
pierced side of this lamb, blood flowed into a chalice,
whence again it issued in five streams, thus recalling
Christ's five wounds. Finally, another sixth-century
monument, now forming part of the ciborium of St.
Mark's, Venice, presents a crucifixion scene with the
two thieves nailed to the cross, while Christ is repre-
sented as a lamb, standing erect at the junction of the
crosbeams. One of the most interesting monuments
showing the Divine Lamb in various circumstances is
the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus (d. 358). In four of
the spandrils between the niches of the sarcophagus,
Christ, in the character of a lamb, is represented as
follows: (1) raising Lazarus, by means of a rod, from
the tomb; (2) being baptized by another lamb, with a
dove dominating the scene; (3) laying the sick in
baskets, by the touch of a rod; (4) joining three
other lambs. Two other scenes show a lamb re-
cieving the Tables of the Law on Mount Sinai and
striking a rod whence issues a stream of water.
Thus, in this series, the lamb is a symbol, not only of
Christ, but also of Moses, the "Shepherd of the Three
Children in the fiery furnace." The fresco in the
cemetery of Praetextatus, showing Susanna as a
lamb between two wolves (the elders), is another
example of the lamb as a symbol of one of the
ordinary faithful.

Maurice M. Hassett.

Lambeck, Peter, generally called Lambechianus,
historian and librarian, b. at Hamburg, 13 April,
1628; d. at Vienna, 4 April, 1699. After studying
under private tutors and at the Johanneseum, he
entered in 1644 the gymnasium under the influence of
Friedrich Lindenborg, and especially of his mother's brother, Lucas Holste (Holstein, Hol-
stenius), the most distinguished philologist, anti-
quarian, and critic of his time. The latter had early
recognized his nephew's gifts, and entered into a lively
Correspondence with the lad of being, his
recommendation Peter went in 1645 to Holland to
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continue his studies, and at the University of Amsterdam, came in contact with many scholars, especially the philologist Gerhard Johann Voss. He later left the Netherlands at his uncle's wish and went to Paris, where his relationship with the celebrated Holste, as well as his own abilities, secured him access to the most distinguished scholars of his time. At the age of twenty-one, he received the degree of Doctor of Laws. After finishing his studies, he made a tour through France, Liguria, and Etruria, and spent two years in Rome, where under the special direction of his uncle, who in the interim had become papal librarian, he undertook classical and historical researches. When barely nineteen years of age, he learned from the commentaries on Auli Gellii Noctes Atticas, Paris, 1647) had already brought him the approval of the learned public of Paris.

On his return to Hamburg, he was made in 1652 professor of history at the gymnasium, and in 1664 became rector. He had many enemies on account of his successes, and, being accused of atheism, decided to give up his position. He was confirmed by his unfortunate marriage in his decision to leave the country and return to Rome. Here he soon won the favour of Alexander VII. Queen Christina of Sweden, then resident at Rome, also exercised a great influence over him, and some time he entered the Catholic Church. To secure a permanent position he went to Vienna, where Emperor Leopold appointed him librarian and court historiographer. In this position he performed great services by his arrangement of the library, and especially by his catalogues of its treasures ("Commentaria in Bibliotheca Caesaris Vindobonensis libri VIII", Vienna, 1655-79; re-edited by Kollar, 1766-82). These catalogues are even of-day of value, being especially important for the numerous contributions they contain to our knowledge of the Old German language and literature. Of great importance for the history of literature is the "Friedrichshain" (Hamburg, 1659), of which a second enlarged edition was issued by J. A. Fabricius (Leipzig, 1710), with a biographical sketch of the author, published separately at Hamburg in 1724. The "Friedrichshain" was the first comprehensive history of literature, chronologically arranged. Lambeck also published among other works a history of his native town ("Origines Hamburgenses ab anno 808 ad annum 1292", 2 vols., 1652-61), and researches into the history of the Byzantine Empire ("Syntagma originum et antiquitatum Constantinopolitanarum", Paris, 1682).

PACIFICUS SCHLAGER.

Lambert (Lambers), Saint, martyr, Bishop of Maestricht, b. at Maestricht between 633 and 638; d. at Liége, between 698 and 701. His parents, who belonged to the nobility, gave him a very religious education, and chose as his preceptor St. Landaldaus, priest of the cathedral church at Maestricht. Later, Lambert received instruction from St. Theodardus (656 or 660), whom he succeeded in the See of Maestricht. During the calamitous days of Ebiron, Mayor of the Palace, Lambert, having defended the interests of King Childeric, was forced to flee from Maestricht.

When Pharamundus administered his see, Lambert spent seven years (674-81) in the well-known Abbey of St. Gall, and became so identified with it that he died there. In 681 Ebiron received his well-earned retribution, and Pepin of Heristal became mayor of the palace, at first of Austrasia, but in 687 of the whole domain of the Franks. Pepin, who liked Lambert, permitted him to return to Maestricht and resume the archbishopric. Some time later we find Lambert as a missionary in Toxandria, the present Holland and Brabant of to-day. In order to spread the Gospel, he descended the River Meuse as far as Tiel and laboured along its banks in company with St. Willibrord, who had come from England in 691. It is very probable that Lambert came in contact with Sts. Wiro, Plechelmus, and Otger, who had built a church and monastery on the Petersburg, later called the Odilenberg, near Roermond. St. Landradaid aided Lambert in founding the Abbey of Maastricht.

For several centuries a controversy has been carried on concerning the manner of the saint's death. According to tradition, Lambert became a martyr by his defence of marital fidelity. The Bollandists, Maillot, Valois, Leconte, Pagi and others held, however, that the saint was killed by Frankish nobles in anger for the failure of a plundering expedition. Kurth in 1876 critically examined the centuries-old tradition and documents, and in hand, proved beyond further doubt that Lambert was martyred because of his defence of the marriage tie. Pepin of Heristal lived for many years in irreproachable wedlock with the pious Plechelmus, who bore him two sons. Later he entered into unlawful relations with Alpais, who became the mother of Charles Martel. When no one had the courage to remonstrate with Pepin, Lambert went to his court like another John the Baptist. Alpais, fearing that Pepin might heed the admonitions of the saint, appealed to Emperor Louis the Deacon. Lambert had sought revenge and caused Lambert to be assassinated in the chapel of Sta. Cosmas and Damian, built by St. Monulphus, at Liége. His heart was pierced by a javelin while he was at the altar. The servants of the martyr placed his remains in a vessel, descended the Meuse to Maestricht, and buried them in the cemetery of St. Peter, in the vault of his parents, Aper and Herasplundis, beneath the walls of Maestricht. Between 714 and 723, St. Hubert exhumed the remains and had them translated to Liége, whither he had transferred, presumably as early as 723, his episcopal See. The saint is celebrated every 12th Sept., a large number of churches have St. Lambert as their patron.

Acta SS. Sept. V: STEPHANDRVS, VITA S. LAMBERTI IN MIONA, P. L. CXXXII, 643; DEMARIA, Vie de S. Lambert, ed. vers par H. Baudet de St-Amand, et documents du Xe siecle (Liége, 1878); ALBERS, DE H. LAMBERTVS, XXe bishop of Maestricht in "Archaeologia" van Alberdingh 74p (Amsterdam, 1898); KURTH, Etude critique sur St. Lambert et son premier biographe en Annales de l'Académie d'Archéologie de Belgique, XIII, 3rd series, III.

P. ALBAS.

Lambert Le Bâgé, priest and reformer, lived at Liége, Belgium, about the middle of the twelfth century. The son of poor people, he was ordained priest in a more or less legitimate way, and was probably parish-priest of St-Christophe at Liége. He began preaching against the abuses and the vices of the clergy, protecting against simony, the ordination of sons of priests, and certain customs in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism and the celebration of Mass. Some of his opinions are not above suspicion, his ideas for instance concerning the day of rest, and Masses for the dead. In time he gathered about him a popular following, for whom he translated into the vernacular the Life of the Blessed Virgin, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, with commentaries; these translations unfortunately have not been preserved. Probably at this period he organized the association known as Bognes, whose name cannot be derived philologically from "to beg" (i.e. to pray), but is probably derived from the French word Bâgé (stammerer) given to Lambert in Whi's time, in fact the foundation is attributed by several contemporary and trustworthy authorities. But he also had adversaries, especially among the clergy, and it was to refute them that he wrote a defence of his theses, entitled "Antiphraenum Petri". His writings are considered a man very learned for his time; they are filled with quotations, not only from the Bible, but also from the Fathers of the Church (e. g. St. Gregory, St.
Augustine, and St. Bernard), and even from profane authors like Ovid, Virgil, and Cicero. Accused of heresy, he was condemned and imprisoned notwithstanding his appeal to the Holy See. He succeeded on many occasions to escape and went over to the Antiochian Calistus III, who had been recognized by Baoul of Za-}

ning, Prince-Bishop of Liège. He wrote to the pope several letters in justification of his doctrines and conduct, but the result of these endeavours is not known. In all probability he returned to Liège and died there in 1777.


M. A. PAYEN.

Lambert of Hersfeld, a medieval historian; b. in Franconia or Thuringia, c. 1024; d. after 1077. On 13 March, 1068, he entered the Benedictine monastery of Hersfeld and was elected prior in the same year, at Aschaffenburg, by Bishop Liutpold of Mainz. Immediately after his elevation to the priesthood he started on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land without previously obtaining the permission of his abbot. On 17 September, 1059, he returned to Germany and, according to a story reported by his abbot, Meginer, who was then lying on his deathbed, pardoned for this act of disobedience. Only once more during the rest of his life did Lambert leave his monastery. It was in the year 1071 when, by order of his abbot, Rudhard, he spent fourteen weeks at the monasteries of Siegburg and Saalfeld, studying the reform which had been introduced into these monasteries from the Italian monastery of Fruettaria in Piedmont. Lambert was not favourably impressed with the reform. In his opinion the old monastic discipline, if strictly observed, was more in accordance with the spirit of St. Benedict than the reform of Fruettaria.

Lambert of Hersfeld is best known to the world as the author of "Annales Lambertii", a chronicle of the world from its beginning to the year 1077. Up to the year 1040 the Annals of Lambert are little more than a reproduction of preceding Annals; from 1040 to 1068 they become more diffuse, and to some extent based on personal observation and the authority of eyewitnesses; from 1068 to 1077 they widen into an elaborate history of the times written in the elegant style of Sallust and ranking among the most perfect literary productions of the Middle Ages. The impartiality and truthfulness of Lambert as a historian were unquestioned until the middle of the nineteenth century. The German historian Ranke ("Zur Kritik fränkisch-deutscher Reichsanalisten") printed in "Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie" (Berlin, 1854), 436 sq. was the first to discredit Lambert's reliability on the basis of his history, which has been corroborated by the results of succeeding historians, some of whom have charged him even with wilful falsifications of historical facts. Lefarath and Eigenbrodt (loc. cit. in bibliography below) attempted to rehabilitate Lambert, but with little success. They believe that the history may not have been a wilful falsifier of historical facts, as has been asserted by Delbrück and Holder-Egger (loc. cit. below) it is an established fact that he was prejudiced against Henry IV, so much so on account of the emperor's encroachments upon the rights of the pope as on account of the injury sustained by the monastery of Hersfeld from the encroachment of the tithes in Thuringia (see Lambert's "Annales", ad annum 1073, pp. 141 sqq.). Though not in sympathy with the great ideas of Gregory VII, he was prepossessed in his favour simply because the emperor was his enemy. His method, moreover, of writing history was to a great extent pragmatic. Instead of impartially investigating into the motives of his historical personages, he is often led by his prepossessions and prejudices to give a very subjective clothing to historical facts.

Lambert is also the author of "Vita Lulli" a life of Archbishop Lullius of Mainz who founded the monastery of Hersfeld in 768. It was written between 1063 and 1073, is of even less historical value than the "Annales", but, like the "Annales", it is a masterpiece of pure and elegant latinity. His history of Hersfeld, entitled "De institutione ecclesiae Hervefeldensis", has been lost, with the exception of the prologue and a few fragments. It was written before the year 1076. His epic on the history of his times has been entirely lost. Some historians thought it was identical with "Carmen de Bello Saxonic" written by an unknown author shortly after the victory of Henry IV over the Saxons (1075), but of late this opinion has lost ground. The complete works of Lambert were edited, with a learned disquisition, by Holder-Egger "Lamperti monachi Hersfeldensis opera" (Hanover, 1884). The "Annales" are printed separately in "Mon. Germ. Script. III, 22-263. They are also in P. L., up to the year 1040, CXLI, 450-582, and from the year 1040 to 1077, CXLVI, 1053-1248. Lambert's "Vita Lulli" is also printed in Acta SS., 16 October, VII, 1083-1091 and in "Mon. Germ. Script. XV, 1, 132-148. A new edition of the "Vita Lulli" has been obtained from the manuscript of the monastery (Innsbruck, 1894–99), II, 191, sq., and Kurze in "Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft", New Series (Freiburg im Br., 1888), II, 174 sq., attempt to prove that Lambert is identical with Abbot Hartwig of Hersfeld.

LAMBERT

Lambert of St-Bertin, Benedictine chronicler and abbot, b. about 1060; d. 22 June, 1125, at St-Bertin, France. He came of a distinguished family, and, when still young, entered the monastery of St-Bertin. He afterwards visited several famous schools in France, having first laid the foundation of his subsequent learning by the study in his own monastery of grammar, theology, and music. For some time he filled the office of prior, and in 1095 was chosen abbot at once by the monks of St-Bertin and by the canons of St-Omer. He was thus drawn into closer relations with Clotild, and insinuated through the Cluniac monks and his own monastic reforms in his somewhat distant monacal monastery. Needless to say, he encountered no little opposition to his efforts, but, thanks to his extraordinary energy, he finally secured acceptance for his views, and rehabilitated the financial position of the monastery. He was a friend of St. Anselm and exchanged verses, still extant, with Reginald of Canterbury. Liihin- mann in "Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere Geschichte", XII, 1888, pp. 526; 531-34). Even during his lifetime, Lambert was lauded in glowing terms for his great learning by an admirer—not a monk of St-Bertin—in the "Tractatus de moribus Lambertii", ed. H. W. B. Hart ("Mon. Germ. Hist. SS.", V, 2, 946–53). This work mentions several otherwise unknown writings of Lambert, e.g. "Sermones de Veteres Testamento", also studies on free will, the Divine prescience, original sin, origin of

M. A. PAYEN.
LAMBERT, Jacques de, Jesuit missionary, b. at Rouen, 1641; d. at Quebec, 1710. He joined the Society in 1661, and proceeded to Canada in 1675 to labour almost uninterruptedly on the Iroquois missions until his death. At Onondaga he discerned the soul of a saint in the Algonquin captive, Catherine Tegawktha, whom he instructed and baptised. He helped his brother Jean to pacify the Iroquois, irritated by Governor de la Barre's untimely campaign. After a few years of respite in Quebec and Montreal, he returned to Onondaga at the request of the natives, only to leave it in 1709 through the intrigues of Abraham Tenaker. Like his elder brother, he lived among the Iroquois during a period when the rivalry of the French and English to secure the alliance of that fierce nation endangered the lives of the missionaries. Charlevoix says he was "one of the holiest missionaries of New France"; he was called the "Divine man" by the Indians.

JEAN DE LAMBERVILLE, elder brother of the preceding and also a Jesuit missionary, b. at Rouen, 1633; d. at Paris, 1714. He joined the Society in 1656, and came to Canada in 1669. He spent fourteen years with the Onondaga Iroquois. His patriotic aim was to maintain peace between the French and Indians, with the latter of whom his influence was paramount. When Denonville secretly prepared to avenge the humiliating conditions of peace resulting from the Barraque's rash expedition, Lamberville's life was greatly exposed through the governor's fault, as he had been deceived into convoking the assembly at Cataraqui where several Iroquois chiefs were treacherously captured and condemned to the galleys; his reputation for honesty and uprightness alone saved him. He vainly strove to prevent the devastation of the Tsaumontouan villages, of which the massacre of Laechin by Brébeuf (1639) was the retaliation. When the Onondagas and Mohawks harassed the French allies, Lamberville consented to negotiate peace. His wise diplomacy obtained a mitigation of the humiliating terms proposed at Governor Dongan's instigation, and Denonville duly praised his ability and devotedness. From France where shattered health forced him to retire, he tried to come back to his mission, but his death intervened in 1714. The Menology of the Society says that "he had the spiritual physiognomy of Brébeuf."

BACON, CAMILLE, Les Jeunes et la Nouvelle France (Paris, 1906); LINDLEY, N. D. de Loredet en la Nouvelle France (Montréal, 1900); CAMPBELL, Pioneer Priests of North America (New York, 1905).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Lambillette, Louis, Belgian Jesuit, composer and paleographer of Church music; born at La Hamaide, near Charleroi, Belgium, 27 February, 1827, and died at Paris, 27 February, 1855. His name is now chiefly remembered in connection with the restoration of Gregorian music, which he inaugurated and greatly promoted by his scientific researches and publications. At the age of fifteen, he became organist of Charleroi; he was subsequently in a similar capacity at Dinant-sur-Meuse. In 1830 he was appointed choirmaster and organist of the Jesuit College of Saint-Auchel, Amiens. While exercising these functions he also studied the classics, and at the end of five years, in 1835, he entered the Society of Jesus. The thirty years of his Jesuit life were spent successively in the colleges of Saint-Auchel, Fribourg, Estavayer, Briguelette and Vaugirard. While occupied in teaching and directing music, he gave himself up more entirely to composition, with a view to enhancing the splendour of both the religious ceremonies and the solemn occasions in those newly founded colleges. His powers of composition were necessarily checked by the limited ability of his performers, his orchestra, like his chorus, being entirely recruited from the ranks of the students; nevertheless his facility and his fluency were such that he could produce new music for church services in a very short time, producing in the course of time, besides his celebrated volumes of cantiques (French hymns or sacred songs), a vast number of motets, short oratorios, masses and secular cantatas, mostly for four-part chorus and orchestra. This music became very popular, especially in educational institutions. Late in life Lambillette regretted having published those written improvisations without taking time to revise them. After his death a revision of the greater part of them was made and published (Paris, 1870) by his pupil, Father Camille de la Croix, S.J., and by Louis Dessenne, organist of Saint-Sulpice, and afterwards of St. Francis Xavier, New York.

The irreligious levity of some of Louis Lambillette's church music is condemned by his own writings in which he upheld the correct principles; that he did not always remember them in practice is owing no doubt to the utterly secular style prevalent in his day. He spent his best energies in seeking to restore to Gregorian music its original sweetness and melodious character. The decadence of the liturgical chant had been brought about by its faulty execution, and this in turn was due to the corrupt versions that had been in use. As a Jesuit, he paid close attention towards a radical restoration the celebrated Benedictine Abbé Dom Guéranger, in his "Institutions Liturgiques", had laid down the principle that "when a large number of manuscripts of various epochs and from different countries agree in the version of a chant, it may be affirmed that those MSS. undoubtedly give us the phrase of St. Gregory." Acting upon this principle, Lambillette for many years gathered and compared all the documents that were to be found in the Jesuit houses. He next undertook to visit and re-visit almost every country of Europe, exploring libraries, secular and monastic, in search of the most ancient MSS. and treatises bearing on the history or the theory of the chant.

His success surpassed all his expectations when, in the library of the former Benedictine Abbey of St. Gall in Switzerland, he found himself in presence of what seems to be the most authentic Gregorian MS., in existence, i.e. a transcription from the original "Anthophorion of St. Gregory", brought from Rome to St. Gall by the monk Romanus in the closing years of the eighth century. The doubts of Féts and Danjou regarding the identity of this document are proved by Lambillette to be founded on mere conjectures. This volume of 131 pages of old parchment, the elegant binding of which depicts ancient Etruscan sculptures, contains all the Graduals, the Alleluias, and the Tracts of the whole year, in the ancient neumatic notation (a sort of musical stenography), together with the so-called Romanian signs, i.e. the special marks of time and expression added by Romanus. The discovery was not preceded, not without serious difficulty, in obtaining permission to have a facsimile of this manuscript made by an expert copyist. This he published (Brussels, 1851), adding to it his own key to the neumatic notation, and a brief historical and critical account of the document. The appearance of the "Anthophorion de St. Grégoire" made a deep impression on the
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A learned world, and obtained for its author a Brief of congratulation and encouragement from Pope Pius IX, 1 May, 1852, and a very honourable mention from the Pope himself in his Bull of 12 June, 1852, the same year. Lamblin now undertook to embody the results of his investigations in a new and complete edition of the liturgical chant books. He lived to finish this extensive work, but not to see its publication. The Gradual and the Vesperal appeared 1855-1856 in both Gregorian and modern notations, under the editorship of Father Dufour, who was for years the successor of Lamblin the elder. He also published the "Esthétique," a volume of 418 pages, 8vo., setting forth Lamblin's views on the theory and the practice of Gregorian music. This treatise is the best testimony to the author's untiring zeal and critical ability.

Dom Pothier, the learned Benedictine, who has gone over the same ground, and who has just succeeded in completing the Gregorian restoration, says of the "Esthétique" that it is "filled with precious information" (Mélanges Grégoriennes, p. 145, note). At the same time he calls attention to some serious errors in translation, and even in reading, on the subject of rhythm, which, he holds, have been conclusively refuted by Chanoine Contier, in his "Méthode de Plain Chant," pp. 96 et seq. De Monter also speaks of grave errors and numerous assertions contrary to its own method, that have crept into the treatise. He attributes the fault to Lamblin in his his Lamblin's scales to the editors of this posthumous work (p. 207). Lamblin's "Gradual" and "Vesperal" were adopted by only a small number of French dioceses.

The time had really not yet arrived for the practical application of theories, nor for the introduction of the full text of St. Gregory. This Lamblin seemed to have felt when he so far yielded to the temper of his generation as to make some of those very cuts and alterations which had been the chief reproach of former editions. Twenty-five years were still to elapse before the classical work in Gregorian music, the "Mélodies Grégoriennes" by Dom Pothier, O.S.B., could make its appearance (Tournay, 1880), and another twenty-five before the teaching of Dom Pothier was to receive official sanction and practical application through the Vatican edition, now in progress of publication. To Father Louis Lamblin belongs the credit of having successfully inaugurated this important work. By his writings the impulse of Gregorian restoration was forced upon the world; by his researches and especially by the publication of the "Antiphonarium of St. Gregory," this arduous enterprise was placed on a solid, scientific basis. His contemporaries placed the following inscription on his tomb at Vaugrard:

Qui cecinit Jesum et Mariam, eruditque tenebris Gregorium, hume superius inerme, Christi, choris.

Receive, O Christ, into Thy choirs above him who sang the praises of Jesus and Mary, and rescued the music of Gregory from the darkness of ages.

The detailed list of works is given by Sommervogel in Bibliothèque de l'Oeuvre de Jésus, IV (Paris, 1888); also by De Monter in Dictionnaire des biens et critique, I, p. 310. Louis Lamblin et ses frères, which contains a portrait by Jacquot, and two autographs (Paris, 1871); Didot. Nouvelle biographie générale; Fétis. Biographie des musiciens, 2nd ed.; Le Glat, Supplément au Dictionnaire de l'Art, 1856; Soullier, De la restauration du chant grégorien in Etudes religieuses, XLVI (1860), 12-15.

J. B. YOUNG.

Lamb, Denis (Dionysius Lambris), French philologist, b. about 1520, at Montreuil-sur-mer, in Picardy, 1572. The effects of the shock given to him by the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. He began his studies at Amiens. He entered the service of the Cardinal de Tournon, whom he accompanied on two visits to Italy (1549-53; 1555-60). In this way he saw Rome, Venice, and Lucca, and was brought into contact with Italian scholars such as Faerno, Muret, Sirisleo, Fulvio Orsini. During his sojourn in Venice, at the suggestion of the Cardinal de Tournon, he translated Aristotle's "Ethics" (1558). In the year he translated the same "Politics" (1567), and also various orations of the orators and of Demosthenes (1565, 1587). Shortly before his death he published a discourse on the usefulness of Greek studies and on the method of translating Greek into Latin (1572). On his return to France (1561) he was appointed royal professor of Latin language and literature in the Collège de France, but the ""Bible de Tours"" was transferred to the chair of Greek. However, excepting his translations and an edition of Demosthenes (1570), his most important works are editions of Latin authors: Horace (1561), Lucretius (1564), Cicero (1568), Cornelius Nepos (1569). In the matter of these four authors Lambin's work shows a marked advance, and opens a new era in the history of their text. He does not, however, indicate with sufficient exactness the manuscripts he consulted. It is evident that for Lucretius he had examined one of the two manuscripts recognized as fundamental by Lachmann. Moreover, the commentary on Horace and Lucretius is extensive and accurate, contains many quotations, correct remarks, and explanations based on a profound knowledge of Latin. Lambin does not affect the rigorous method of modern philologists. Like older scholars he is often capricious, arbitrary, erratic. Despite these defects, Lambin's edition of Cicero has an important value and is consulted even to-day.

In 1559 Muret published his "Variae Lectiones". Lambin recognized in it some of his own notes on Horace, and accused Muret of having abused his confidence and plagiarized him. In 1561 he published an answer to Muret. The two other friends, moreover, were separated by their tendencies. Muret had become a friend of the Jesuits, whom Lambin detested on account of their differences with the University of Paris. Lambin was regarded by the Catholics of Italy as inclined to heresy, although on 8 July, 1568, he, with seven of his colleagues, took the oath of Catholicism. Before his death Lambin had undertaken a commentary on Plautus, and had begun the notes on the thirteenth play, the "Mercator." His notes, though imperfect and unmethodical, were published (1767) after his death.

Lamburcshini, Luigi, Cardinal, b. at Sestri Levante, near Genoa, 6 May, 1775; d. at Rome, 12 May, 1854. As a youth he entered the Order of the Barnabites, on account of which his learning he was made consultor of several Roman Congregations, and in 1815 accompanied Cardinal Consalvi to the Congress of Vienna in the capacity of secretary. After his return to Rome he was made secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, then recently instituted by Pius VII, and thus took a great part in concluding concordats with various states, especially with Naples and Bavaria. In 1819 he was appointed Archbishop of Genoa and governed the archdiocese with prudence and zeal. His efforts to rescue the diocesan archives, his pastoral letters exhibit much spiritualunction. In 1827 Leo XII sent him as nuncio to Paris, but the Revolution of July, 1830, compelled him to interrupt his mission. On his return to Rome he was made a cardinal (1831) by Gregory XVI, who, on the resignation of Cardinal Bernetti, appointed Lam-
LAMBOT, JOSEPH, VENDEMBE, English martyr, b. 1569; d. at Newcastle-on-Tyne. The day of his death is variously given as 23 June, 23 July, and 27 July, and the year as 1592 and 1593; but from a letter of Lord Huntingdon it is clear he died before 31 July, 1592, and Father Holty’s Stonyhurst MS. says he died on a Monday, so that the probable date is 24 July, 1592. He was the second son of Thomas Lambton of Malton-in-Rydall, Yorks., and Katharine, daughter of Robert Birkhead of West BRANDON, Durham. He arrived at the English College, Reims, in 1584, and at the English College, Rome, in 1585. Being allowed to curtail his theological course, he was ordained priest when only twenty-three, and sent on the mission on 22 April, 1592. He was arrested at Newcastle on landing with the Ven. Edward Waterson, and condemned at the next assizes under 27 Eliz., c. 2. He was put down alive, and the depriver of Flen who acted as hangman refused to complete the sentence, which was at last carried out by a Frenchman practising as a surgeon at Kenton.


JOHN B. WADSWORTH.

LAMEGO, DIOCES OF (LAMECENSIS), situated in the district of Vizeu, province of Beira, Portugal. The city has a Gothic cathedral, with a high tower, and a Moorish castle, and is known as the meeting-place of the famous parliament of 1413, which decided the hereditary succession for the kingdom of Portugal and established the old feudal Cortes, convened for the last time in 1598; the Cortes of Lamego spoken of in modern Portuguese history is the one called by Dom Miguel after he had dissolved the constitution in 1825. According to local but unreliable tradition, he received the Gospel from St. James the Greater, or St. Paul. Many Portuguese authorities mention as first Bishop of Lamego Petrus Rathensis, who is said to have been a disciple of the Apostle St. James, and who subsequently became first Bishop of Braga and a martyr (see BRACA, ARCIDIACONE OP.). The authentic history of the See of Lamego begins with Bishop Sar- dinarius, whose signature appears in connexion with the Second (Third) Council of Braga (572) among the suffragans of the well-known Martin of Braga. Shortly before this, at the Council of Lugo (569), at the commission of King Theodomir, several new dio- ceses were created. It is probable, therefore, that the foundation of the See of Lamego took place between 569 and 572. Among its early bishops are: Philippus (c. 580-59), Profuturus (c. 630-33), Witaricus (c. 646), Filimirus (563-56), but scarcely more than their names is known. In 1190 the See of the Lusitanian sees was made, by which Lamego was placed under the jurisdiction of Mérida (Hefle, “Conciliengeschichte,” III, 2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 110). From 693 to 576 there is a gap in the episcopal list of Lamego. On the invasion of the Moors, in 714, the Bishop of Lamego, a temporary, was obliged to take refuge in the Asturias. It is not until 576 that we again come across a Bishop of Lamego, Argimirus (Flórez, “Españ Grajada,” who is apparently identical with Argimirus (II) who, in 899, took part in the consecration of the cathedral of Compostela (cf. Lope Ferreiro, “Historia de la Santa A. M. Iglesia de Santiago de Compostela”, II, Santiago, 1899, 192). It is doubtful if even the few known bishops of Lamego who are mentioned during the time of the Moors (except Argimirus, Brandericus, Pantaleon, and Jocoubs) resided at all at Lamego; it is probable that they were only titular bishops, especially as Almanser of Cordova destroyed the city in 982. This confusion lasted till Ferdinand the Great reconquered the city in 1037 (or 1038) and the Church was reorganized. In 1071 a Bishop Peter of Lamego is mentioned in a deed of gift by the Infanta Francisca, daughter of Ferdinand III at the Church of Tuy. The see seems to have been vacant for several decades, as is evident from a letter of Pope Paschal I (1099-1118) to Bishop Mauritius of Cimbra. When Portugal was established as an independent kingdom, in 1143, by Alfonso I, the See of La- mego was revived and the Augustinian Mendicant Oridina.
(d. 1176) became the first bishop. It was at that
time a suffragan of Braga. At the instance of Arch-
bishop Peter of Santiago de Compostela, Innocent III,
in 1199, re-arranged the Dioceses of Coimbra, Vizeu,
Lamego, and Évora (the present Guarda), allotting
that of Braga to the Archdiocesie of Braga and the last
two to Santiago de Compostela. The Lamego, op. cit. IV,
274 sqq.; Lopez Ferreiro, op. cit. V, 29 sqq.). Lamego
remained a suffragan of Compostela until the Archdi-
cocese of Lisbon was established in 1394, after which it
was a suffragan of that see. The diocese was enlarged
in 1442, when the dioceses of Riba Côa was ceded to
Portugal, and the Kingdom of Portugal, enclosed the
district that belonged to the Spanish See of Ciudad
Rodrigo, but once joined to Portugal, it became part
of the Diocese of Lamego. Clement XIV (10 July,
1770) created the Diocese of Pinhel (Pinhelmis) in the
aforesaid district, which, however, was suppressed by
Leo XIII by the Bull "Gravissimum" (30 Sept.,
1881), which replaced Lamego under the metropolitan
of Braga and gave new limits to the diocese.
Lamego is bounded on the east by the Diocese
of Guarda, on the south by that of Vizeu, on the west
by Coimbra, and the north by Porto and Braga; it has
(1899) 273,741 inhabitants, 283 parishes, 283 parish
churches, 1144 public chapels, 314 secular priests,
one college for boys at Lamego conducted by Benedictines;
2 houses of Portuguese Franciscan nuns, one house of Sisters of St.
Joseph of Chuyé, and one of Franciscan nuns. The present
bishop (1910) is Francisco José de Veira e Brito,
who was born 5 June, 1850, at Rendufeio (Archdio-
cese of Braga), studied at Coimbra, was professor of
theology at the seminary at Braga, also canon and
vicar-general there. On 13 Jan., 1892, he was nomi-
nated to the See of Angra (Azores), and in 1902 was
transferred to Lamego. He restored the cathedral and
the palace, studied the cathedral seminary, and assisted in the
founding of a new Catholic workingmen's club.
Félicité, Español Sagrado, XIV (Madrid, 1758), 153-66; da
Fonseca, Memoria de escomissas e procuras do bispo do
Lamego (Lisbon, 1789); de Ferreira, Introdução para a his-
tória ecles., do bispo de Lamego, (Lisbon, 1787); de Azevedo,
História ecles. da cidade e bispo de Lamego (Porto, 1878).
GREGOR REINHOLD.

Lamennais, (1) Félicité Robert de, b. at Saint-
Malo, 29 June, 1782; d. at Paris, 27 February, 1854. His
father, Robert de Lamennais, was a merchant of Saint-Malo,
who, on the request of the States of Brittany in acknowledgment of his
patrician devotion. Of the six children born of his marriage with Gratienne
Lorin, the best-known are Jean-Marie (see below) and
Félicité. The latter, though delicate and frail in phys-
ique, early exhibited an exuberant nature, a lively but
indocile intelligence, a brilliant but highly impression-
able imagination, and a will resolute to obstinacy and
vehement to excess.

Education.—At the age of five Lamennais lost his
mother, and one absorbed in business, was the
obliged to confide the education of Jean-Marie and Fé-
licité to Robert des Sourdains, the brother-in-law of his
wife, who had no children of his own. Jean-Marie and Félicité—or Féli,
as he was called in the family—were
taken to live with their uncle at La Chénaine, an estate not far from Saint-Malo, which Félicité was afterwards
to make famous. At La Chénaine there was a well-
filled library in which works of piety and theological
books were mingled with the ancient classics and the
works of the eighteenth-century philosophers. Féli-
cité was not very docile at his lessons, and, to punish him, his uncle sent him to Saint-Sulpice, where he
was supposed to be shut up in the library. The child acquired a taste for the books he
found around him, and read voraciously and indis-
criminately all that came to his hands, good and bad. He even multiplied reasons for being shut up in the li-

Chénais, while his brother was called, as vicar-general, to Saint-Brieuc. There Félicité completed another work, in which also he had his brother’s collaboration, and which was to have been printed and published at Paris in 1814. In opposition to Napoleon, who wished to be free to meet the Pope in person, the brothers vindicated the pope’s exclusive claim to the canonical institution of bishops. This work marked the beginning of Lamennais’s long struggle against Gallicanism. However, the fall of Napoleon, coming some months before the book appeared, made it no longer appropriate, and it was not actually a success of the time. Lamennais next published a violent article against the imperial university; indeed, when Napoleon returned from Elba, the young writer, thinking himself insecure in France, went over to England, where he found a temporary asylum with M. Carron, a French priest who had established in London a school for the children of émigrés.

On his return to France after the Hundred Days, Lamennais made M. Carron his confidant and took up his residence near him in Paris. Under the influence of this worthy priest and on the advice of M. Beysserre, a Sulpician, he decided, though not without strong repugnance and some sharp prickings of conscience, to take the Holy orders, and was ordained a priest on 9 March, 1817.

Struggle against Infidelity and Gallicanism.
—Towards the end of the same year appeared the first volume of the “Essai sur l’indifférence en matière de religion”. From the beginning to end the book was a vigorous attack on that indifference which appears (1) among those who, seeing in religion nothing but a political institution, think it a necessity only for the masses; (2) among those who admit the necessity of a religion for all men, but reject Revelation; (3) among those who recognize the necessity of a revealed religion, but deny all the truths which that religion teaches with the exception of certain fundamental articles. While open to some criticism in regard to the development of its ideas and the force of some of the arguments employed, the “Essai” brought to Catholic apologetics a new strength and brilliancy, and at once commanded public attention. Not content with a defensive attitude in the presence of incredulity, it attacks the enemy boldly, supported by all the resources of dialectic, invective, irony, and eloquence. The clergy and all educated Catholics thrilled with joy and hope, when this champion entered the lists as one of the fathers of the Church. Indeed with Bossuet and Pascal that this priest, yesterday unknown, was now compared. In the pulpit of Notre-Dame de Paris Frayssevaux hailed Lamennais as the greatest thinker since Malebranche. Meanwhile, editions of the “Essai” came rapidly from the press; 40,000 copies were sold within a few weeks, it was translated into many foreign languages, and its perusal affected in some places notable returns, in others brilliant conversions to Catholicism. Some of these converts, such as Mme de Lacan (afterwards, by her second marriage, the Baronesse Cottu), Benoît d’Azy, Sénac, Boé, and other first-hand epistolary correspondents of Lamennais. These letters, with other published since then or about to be published (addressed to such friends as Mme Cornulier de Lucinière, de Vitrolles, Coriolis, Montalembert, Berruyer, Marion, Vaurin, David Richard), add considerably to our knowledge of his writings, and add considerably to the last knowledge of his works. With their aid we can witness the intimate workings from day to day of a mobile and impressionable mind; in them we perceive an aspect of his character which so seldom appears in his other works—his loving, kind, and tender disposition, lavish in devotion and free in outspokenness.

Lamennais was now looked upon as the most eminent personality among the French clergy; visitors flocked to see him; the press solicited his contributions. He promised his collaboration to “Le Conservateur”, a royalist paper of the Extreme Right party, for which Chateaubriand and de Bonald were writing. Lamennais, however, cared much less for politics than for religion, and continued to write for “Le Conservateur” only in defence of Catholic interests. For him it was not enough to discredit infidel philosophy: he meant to put something else in its place. He believed that the Cartesian rationalism which had recently attacked the foundations of Christian faith, and therefore necessarily of human charity, could be combated by a system which should firmly re-establish both. To this object he devoted the second volume of the “Essai”, published in 1820. The philosophic system which he expounded in this volume was based on a new theory of certitude. In the main, his theory is that certitude cannot be given by the individual reason; it belongs only to the general reason, that is to say, to the universal consent of mankind, the common sense, that it is derived from the unanimous testimony of the human race. Certitude, therefore, is not created by evidence, but by the authority of mankind; it is a matter of faith in the testimony of the human race, not the results of free inquisition. In the last chapters of the book this philosophic system supports an entirely new method of apologetics. There exists, says Lamennais, a true religion, and there exists but one, which is absolutely necessary to salvation and to social order. Only one criterion will enable us to discern the true religion from the false, and that criterion is the authority of testimony. The true religion, therefore, is that which can put forth on its own behalf the greatest number of unanswerable testimonies. Thus, for instance, it is the case with the Christian, or rather the Catholic religion. It is in reality the true, the only religion which began with the world and perpetuates itself with it. The result of a primitive revelation, this unique religion has perfected itself in the course of ages without being essentially modified; Christians now believe all that the human race has believed, and the human race has always believed what Christians believe. The last two volumes of the “Essai” (1823) were devoted to this thesis. In these attempts to prove, with the aid of history, that the chief dogmas of Christianity have been and are still upheld on an unanswerable testimony, profound throughout the world. Naturally, these last volumes failed to secure the success which the first had attained.

The philosophic system of Lamennais, like his apologetics, called forth serious objections. It was pointed out that this philosophy and apologetics favoured scepticism by denying the validity of individual evidence. For if the latter can furnish no certitude, how can we expect any from the general reason, which is itself a synthesis of individual reasons? It was also a confusion of the natural and the supernatural orders, of philosophy and theology, to base both alike on the authority of the human race: and, since according to him both alike are based on human testimony, religious faith was at once reduced to human faith. These criticisms and others irritated Lamennais without convincing him of his error; he submitted his book to
Rome, and, in reply to his critics, wrote the "Défense de l'Essai" (1821). Rome confined its intervention to giving its imprésuratur to an Italian translation of the "Défense de l'Essai". Lamennais himself soon visited the city of Vatican. He received very kindly and at one time even thought of making him a cardinal, despite his excitable character and exaggerated ideas. On his return to France, Lamennais showed a greater determination than ever to combat Gallicanism and irreligious Liberalism. On the occasion of a ministerial ordinance prescribing the teaching of the famous Declaration of 1802 (see Catholicism, VI, 384), he published his "Religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre civil et politique" (1825), in which he denounced Gallican and Liberal tendencies as the joint causes of the harm done to religion, and as equally fatal to society. Irritated by these attacks, a majority of the French bishops, who were moderate Gallicans, signed a protest against this pamphlet which accused them of leanings towards schism. Lamennais was also cited before the Tribunal of the Seine for attacking the king's government and the Four Articles of 1822 in their character of existing laws. Defended by his friends, especially Casanouze, Béning, Frayssinous, Clausel de Montale, Bishop of Chartres, and other representatives of moderate Gallican principles.

On the other hand, he derived valuable assistance from a certain number of young men, eclesiastics and laymen, who gradually formed a group of which he was the centre. Of these the best known are Gerbet, de Salinis, Lacordaire, Montalembert, Rohrbacher, Cambladet, Maurice de Guérin, Charles de Sainte-Foy, Eugène and Léon Boré, de Hézec. With them Lamennais founded the "Congrégation de St. Pierre", a religious society whose distinctive duty was to defend the Church by the study of theological and other sciences, by propagating Roman doctrines, by teaching in colleges and seminaries, by giving missions and spiritual direction. Hardly had this congregation come into existence when Mgr. Dubois, Bishop of New York, appealed to it to supply teachers to the Catholic University which it was then proposed to found in that city. The Revolution of 1830 put an end to this project. The congregation, however, was organized; one house—La Chênaie, Malestroit, and Paris—but it lived only about four years. Obliged to reckon with the demands of the Liberals, whom the elections had returned to the Chamber of Deputies, the government of Charles X had revoked (15 June, 1828) former legislative enactments against the religious congregations—particularly against the Jesuits, eight of whose colleges were closed. Although ill-disposed towards the Jesuits on account of their lack of sympathy for his philosophic system, Lamennais took up their defence in a book published in 1829 under the title "Progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Eglise". His attitude towards the King and the Church was reproached with their Gallicanism and their concessions to the enemies of religion. Here, for the first time, Lamennais openly broke with monarchy, setting his highest hopes upon political liberty and equal rights. "An immense liberty", he said, "is indispensable for the development of those truths which are to save the world." This was what he called "catholicizing liberalism". The work met with enormous success. The bishops themselves protested almost unanimously against the Government's action. Not, however, that they approved of Lamennais' violent language, but the Archbishop of Paris even condemned the work, and this drew from Lamennais two open letters in which the archbishop's Gallician ideas were unreservedly criticized.

When the Revolution broke out the next year (July, 1830), sweeping the Bourbons away and lifting the House of Orleans to the throne, Lamennais beheld without regret the departure of the one, and without enthusiasm the accession of the other dynasty. "Most people", he wrote in his letters, "would prefer a republic frankly declared: I prefer a Bourbon restored.

Thereupon he thought only of the defence of Catholicism against the triumphant party, who never forgave it the favour it had enjoyed from the fallen monarchy. While labouring to ward off the danger which menaced the Church, he hoped at the same time to ensure its survival by settling up its defence on the basis of equal rights, uniting its cause with that of public liberties. With this end in view he founded the journal "L'Avenir" (16 October, 1830) and his "General Agency for the Defence of Religious Liberty". With Lacordaire, Gerbet, Montalembert, and de Coux, he waged a grim battle in defence of Catholic ideas against the hostility of the government, of Roman ideas against the Gallicanism of the clergy, and of his system of the "common sense of mankind" against rationalistic philosophy. The force of his blows, the boldness of his ideas, his outspoken sympathy for every cause of temporal and spiritual persecution was evidence against him and gave rise to suspicion of his orthodoxy. To set himself right in the face of all this hostility, he suspended the publication of "L'Avenir" (15 November, 1831), and went to Rome to submit his cause to Gregory XVI. Though accompanied by Lacordaire and Montalembert, there the pronounced welcome of 1824. He waited a long time, but received no definite answer: then some days after his departure from Rome, appeared the Encyclical "Mirari vos" (15 August, 1832), in which the pope, without expressly designating him, condemned some of the ideas advanced in "L'Avenir"—the liberty of the press, liberty of conscience, revolt against princes, the need of regenerating Catholicism, etc. At the same time a letter from Cardinal Paccia informed Lamennais that the pope had been pained to see him discuss publicly questions which belonged to the authorities of the Church.

LAMENNAIS OUT OF THE CHURCH.—Having forthwith declared that out of deference to the pope he would not resume the publication of "L'Avenir", Lamennais suppressed the "General Agency", went back to La Chênaie, and there apparently kept silence. In his heart, however, he felt the echoes of which reached the outer world through his correspondence. Rome was stirred by this behaviour, and demanded frank and full adhesion to the Encyclical "Mirari vos". After seeming to yield, Lamennais ended by refusing to submit without reserve or qualification. Little by little, he began by declining his ecclesiastical functions (December, 1833) and ended by abandoning all outward profession of Christianity. The amelioration of humanity, devotion to the welfare of the people and of popular liberties, dominated him more and more. In May, 1834, he published the "Paradis du courant", through the apocalyptic diction of which was revealed a secret rage against the established social order: in it he denounced what he calls the conspiracy of kings and priests against the people. In this way he loudly declared his rupture with the Church, and set up the symbol of his new faith. Gregory XVI hastened to condemn in the Encyclical "Singulieres nos" (15 July, 1834) this book, "small in size, but immense in perspicacity", and at the same time censured the philosophical system of Lamennais. One after another, all his friends abandoned him, and, as if to break finally with his own past, Lamennais wrote a volume on "Les Affaires de Rome". His relations with Gregory XVI in his own favour, his relations with Gregory XVI. After this he published only works inspired by his new democratic tendencies, repeating with no great show of originality the ideas of "Les Paroles d'un croyant".
the whole foundation of which consisted of a few humanitarian commonplaces, relieved here and there with vague socialism. The Government having in 1835 caused the arrest of 121 revolutionaries in connexion with certain disturbances, Lamennais consented to undertake the defence of his new friends before the peers. In 1836, he published in the "Bibliothèque des deux Mondes", the "Revue du Progrès" and "Le Monde", he published a series of pamphlets, e.g. "Le Livre du peuple" (1839), "L'Esclavage moderne" (1839), "Discussions critiques" (1841), "Du passé et de l'avenir du peuple" (1841), "Amicisapandis et Darvandas" (1846). In these writings he expounds his vision of the future, his doctrine against society and the public authorities. One of his works, "Le Pays et le Gouvernement" (1840) brought down on him a year's imprisonment, which he served in 1841.

Mention should here be made of his "Esquisse d'une philosophie", published from 1841 to 1846. It comprises a treatise on metaphysics in which God, man, and nature are studied by the light of reason only. Many of the opinions maintained in this book remind one that it was begun when its author was a Catholic, but there are many others which betray his later evolution. These essays are burdened with anti-Christian notes and reflections. It was not the first work of piety that Lamennais had published. From 1809 he had devoted his moments of leisure to the translation of the "Spiritual Guide" of Louis de Blois. In 1824 he published a French version of the "Imitation of Christ". Lamennais, who, more than any of his contemporaries, has possessed his brilliant literary qualities, but he had a more robust constitution, and was temperamentally calmer and more equable. He shared, as we have, his brother's education, his studies, and his first labours. But an active ministry was more to Jean's taste. Leaving the tranquility of the, reclusively intellectual apostleship, he became, after the suppression of the College of St-Malo, vicar-general to the Bishop of Saint-Brieuc. Later he was also vicar-general of the Great Almoner of France, the Cardinal Prince of Troy, and of the Bishop of Rennes. Wherever he went, he did not spare himself—establishing colleges, seminaries, communities of women, and schools. He took an active part in the foundation of the Congregation of St. Peter, of which he had almost always the practical management and for a time the title of superior general. In fact, it was on account of his apostolic labours that he derived from Mgr. Dubois the title of Vicar General of New York, which, he felt, was offered him seventeen times—he devoted himself wholly to what was the great work of his life, the Institute of the Brothers of Christian Instruction. He had established it in 1817 to supply the wants of Christian teaching in country districts too poor to secure the services of the Boarding Schools of St. Jean Baptiste de la Salle, who were not allowed to work singly. When he was still vicar-general of Saint-Brieuc, he would seek in the fields and assemblage in his own home young peasants, whom he himself instructed in the ways of piety and to whom he imparted elementary knowledge. From these beginnings grew the colony of L'Antigone, which was the parent of many of a similar institution established by M. Gabriel Deshayes, Vicar-General of Vannes, soon associated themselves. In 1820 he had about 50 disciples; in 1829 he had 133; over 260 in 1831; 650 about 1837. When he died, 800 were scattered throughout Brittany, Gascony, in the colonies of L'Antigone at Cayenne, and Haiti, whither they had been sent by the French government. This great and rapid success
was due chiefly to the skilful and energetic administration of Jean de Lamennais. For forty years he was the one who attracted and trained the recruits, guided the young teachers, opened and visited the schools. He also won for them the gratitude of the public author. The approbation of his benefaction was declared under the patronage of the Bishop of Vannes. His native land has not forgotten him. At Ploërmel a statue has been raised to the memory of this man, who perhaps has done more than any other in the nineteenth century for the Christian education of the people. In the beginning of the twentieth century, before the persecution in France scattered the teaching congregations, his institute was more prosperous than ever and counted among its members about 2700 religious, giving instruction to 75,000 scholars, and distributed among 460 institutions, of which one was in Canada.


ANTOINE DEGERET.

Lamentations. See Jeremiah.

Lami, Bernard. See Lamy.

Lammas Day. See Peter's Chains, Feast of.

Lamoignon, Family of, illustrious in the history of the old magistracy, originally from Nivernais. Owing to the nearness of the University of Bourges, the Lamoignons, in the sixteenth century, had the benefit of the excellent juridical instruction given there.

Charles de Lamoignon (1614–73) was the pupil of the renowned jurisconsult Alciat.

Chrétien de Lamoignon (1667–1836), son of the preceding, was a pupil of Cujas. Both this and the foregoing were members of the Parlement of Paris.

Marie des Landes (1576–1651), wife of Chrétien de Lamoignon, was associated in work with St. Vincent de Paul, who called her the mother of the poor; and she founded an association for the deliverance of those imprisoned for debt.

Madeleine de Lamoignon (1609–87), daughter of Guy, was sent by the French East India Company for her first communion, also assisted St. Vincent de Paul. Owing to her co-operation the saint was able to found the Hotel-Dieu and establish the institution for foundlings. When she died, a contemporary said, "The poor have lost one hundred thousand crowns."

George Goyau.

Lamont, Johann von, astronomer and physician, b. 13 Dec., 1805, at Braemar in Scotland, near Ball- moral Castle; d. 6 Aug., 1879, at Bogenhausen near Munich, Bavaria. He was educated in a private school in Scotland. Fath, Julius, in his Geschichte der Astronomen, says that he was a representative of the Scotch monastery of St. Jacob at Ratisbon, accidentally met the boy after the death ofwe father in 1816 and took him to Germany as a novice. He was received into the Benedictine Order and taught mathematics and astronomy in the University of Edinburgh. In 1852 he was also appointed professor of astronomy at the University of Munich.

His scientific achievements are classified under three heads: astronomical, geodetic, and physical. His technical dexterity was such as to make the employment of a measuring instrument in his home at Bogenhausen possible. The observatory was built up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837). Memoirs of the Irland Society, XI, a room in his house was fitted up as a workshop. With the excellent one and one-half inch refractor furnished him in 1836 he studied especially nebulae and star-clusters, laying the foundation for such investigations. From observations of the moons of Uranus he calculated its mass (1837).
La Moricière, Louis-Christophe-Léon Juchault de, French general and commander-in-chief of the papal army, b. at Nantes, 5 February, 1806; d. at the château of Prouzel, near Amiens, 11 September, 1865. His father was descended from an old Breton family whose device was Spes mea Deus. His mother was Désirée de Robineau de Bouçon. He made his classical studies at the Collège d'Angers, and afterwards entered the Ecole Polytechnique, in Paris, in 1826, and two years later the École d'Application at Metz. In 1828 he left the latter school with a commission as sub-lieutenant in the engineers and was sent to Montpellier. In 1830 he joined the detachment that took possession of Algiers, and was made a captain of Zouaves as a reward for gallant conduct.

In 1833 he was despatched by the French government to organize the “Bureau Arabe,” a sort of tribunal whose mission was to serve as mediator between Frenchmen and Arabs. His authority was so great among the native tribes that he never carried any arms while travelling through the country, but only a stick with which to defend himself, and this caused him to be named Bou-Arous (father with a stick). After the capture of Vienne he was promoted major and in 1835 lieutenant-colonel of Zouaves. In that capacity he took part in many a coup de main, inspiring his troops with indomitable courage, and always placing himself at the most perilous

spot. His intrepidity at the storming of Constantine gained him the rank of colonel (1837). In 1840, after the engagement of Mousaia, he was raised to the rank of brigadier-general and was given the command of the division of Oran. In the following year he played the most prominent part in the expulsion of the hostile tribes of Lethen and Mascara. Thanks to his skilful tactics and intrepidity, he subdued the tribe of Filtaas (1843), and was created lieutenant-general. He next went to Morocco (1844), drove back the Moorish troops at Lalla-Maghnia, and contributed largely to the success of the battle at Ida-y-Sirou (1845). Toward the end of that year, he was entrusted with the temporary government of Algeria. He then crowned his military career by surrounding Abd-el-Kader, who was compelled to surrender (23 November, 1847). Algeria being pacified, the distinguished soldier thought of retiring from military life and taking an active part in politics.

In 1846, having been elected deputy by the district of Saint-Calais (Sarthe), he had opposed the Guiscot cabinet and created a stir by his speeches on Algeria and promotion in the army. On 21 April, 1847, he married Amélie d'Auberville. In February, 1848, he was arrested for a few days on the pretext of his participation in the Barrot cabinet, which he gave up when the Revolution burst out, causing the downfall of Louis Philippe. Having been elected to the Constituent Assembly (April, 1848) by the Department of Sarthe, he fought against the popular insurrection in June. On 28 June he again accepted the portion of war and the latter continued his efforts towards the organization of Algeria. When Louis Napoleon, whose ambition he was strongly opposed, entered upon the presidency of the French Republic (20 December, 1848), he left the Cabinet and continued, as a deputy or as vice-president of the Assembly, to antagonize the Government. In the Coup d'Etat (2 December, 1852), he was arrested, imprisoned, first at Mazas, then at Ham, and finally expelled from France. His political career had lasted only four years; his exile lasted nine years. This was the most distressing period of his life. He first travelled in England and Germany and then settled in Belgium, pining in his enforced idleness, and longing for active occupation. It was then that he came back to the faith of his youth. For many years, without being an infidel, he had neglected his religious duties, and even for a time had gone astray with the Saint-Simonians. Yielding to the entreaties of his friend Charles de Montesquiou-Fezensac, the great historian, he returned to the fold and, as he afterwards wrote, he renewed his religion one by one all the articles of the Credo. From that time to the day of his death he lived according to his faith as a devout Catholic.

In 1860 his cousin, Mgr. de Mérécé, induced him to take command of the papal army. It was a hazardous task. Ignoring the jealousy of his established military reputation, he went to Rome. It took only one year to convince him that the undertaking was hopeless. His 8000 men were defeated by the 50,000 men of Cialdini at Castelfidardo (18 September, 1860), and Ancona was obliged to surrender. He bore this reverse to his relations with his reputation with that nation. Deeming his services no longer useful to the papal army, he returned to France, and went to live in his château of Chaillon (Maine-et-Loire). A national subscription was collected to present him with a sword of honour, but he emphatically declined to receive it, on the ground that he was only a defeated general. The only distinction he ever accepted, under personal pressure from Pope Pius IX, was the Cross of the Order of Christ. His last years were devoted to pious works. He built a church at his own expense for the poor parish of Loroux-Beconnais, and contributed a large sum to the rebuilding of the abbey that was the foundation of which he had founded. He took pleasure in reading religious books, among which the Holy Bible, the “Summa Theologica” of Saint Thomas, and the “History of the Church” by Darras, were his favourites.
When he encyclical letter of 8 December, 1864, was published, he read it with delight, being happy to find in it an answer to many questions which distressed him. His death was sudden. His name is now extinct, as he left only daughters, having lost his only son in 1859, but his name will last forever as that of a gallant and a true Christian.

Oraciones funebres de La Mort de Lammairi, by P. Poli (Pollet, 1866) and Dupanloup (Orleans, 1863); Koller, Le Général de La Mort de Lammairi (2 vols., Paris, 1874); Houdet, Citations converses contemporanes de Lammairi (Paris, 1890); Baumard, La foi et ses victoires (Paris, 1892).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Lammairi, Wilhelm, confessor of Emperor Ferdinand II, b. 29 December, 1570, at Dochem, Lue-emburg; d. at Donchamps, 22 February, 1648. His father, Everard Germain, was a farmer and a native of La Moire Mannic; hence the name Lammairi. Lammairi studied first at the gymnasiuim of Trier, and then went to Prague, where he received his doctor's degree, and in 1590 entered the Jesuit Order. Ordained priest in 1596, he was called to the University of Graz as professor of philosophy in 1600, became professor of theology in 1606, and in 1614 was appointed prior of the Jesuit College at the same place. Between the years 1621 and 1623 he was in Rome, but he became in the latter year rector of the Jesuit College at Vienna, and in 1637 rector of the academic college in that city (the present university). From 1643 to 1645 he was provincial of the Austrian province of his order, but was compelled to relinquish this office on account of the gout, which made his visitations a task of the greatest difficulty. During the last years of his life, he established a seminary for poor students in Vienna, the "Ignatius- und Franciscus-Seminarium für Stipendien". After the death of his fellow-Jesuit Martin Becanus in 1624, he became the confessor of his, and as such was active in the political affairs of the time. He was an esteemed and influential counsellor of the emperor, so much so indeed that his enemies affirmed that it was not the emperor, but the Jesuits who ruled the empire. When the Protestants were compelled to give up all ecclesiastical property taken from the Catholics (Edict of Restitution, 1629), Lamarrini was influential in having it used for the propagation of the Catholic Faith. He also took part in the proceedings against Wallenstein (Jan., 1634). He was offered a large sum by the Senate of Hamburg in recognition of his services on the occasion of the election of Ferdinand III as King of Rome. The city of Augsburg, in gratitude for the services he had rendered to it, erected a costly altar in the church of the Viennese Novitiate. On one occasion only was he placed in an unpleasant position, namely when the Spaniards accused him of espousing the cause of their enemies, the French, and tried to have him banished from court. But Lammairi was able to vindicate himself. By advice many Jesuit institutions were established in the empire. He took a leading part in the Counter-Reform in Austria, Styria, Bohemia, and Moravia. On the biography of Ferdinand II upon which Lammairi laboured appeared, "Ferdinand II, Romanorum Imperatoris, Virtutes" (1638); this has been republished frequently, and in different languages. Lammairi was scholarly, pious, unpretentious, and upright. He was called by Urban VIII "Author of Christian Morals", a true and perfect companion of Jesus. That he was impostal, that he received hush-money, and that he stirred up his brethren to lie and deceive or to use violence against heretics, are unfounded tales that call for no mention in serious history.

Lamp and Lampadarii. — There is very little evidence that any strictly liturgical use was made of lamps in the early centuries of Christianity. The fact that many of the services took place at night, and that after the lapse of a generation or two the meetings of the Christians for purposes of worship were held, at Rome and elsewhere, in the subterranean chambers of the Catacombs (q. v.), makes it clear that lamps must have been used to provide the necessary means of illumination. Of these lamps, mostly of terra cotta and of some form, some appear to have been used in the liturgy, especially in the liturgy of the mass, where they are mentioned. They were used to light the altar, and to light the chandelier, and to light the candlestick, and to light the lamp, and to light the oil lamp, and to light the candle, and to light the candle. The lamp was used in the Church in the days of Constantine, something has already been said under the heading Candelabrum (q. v.). Such "polyvandela" (q. v.) long remained a conspicuous feature of Byzantine worship. For the connexion of lamps with the liturgy at an earlier age it may be sufficient to quote a few sentences from a recently published homily of the Syrian Narsai, who died A.D. 512, descriptive of the liturgy. "The priests," he says, "are still, and the deacons stand in silence, the whole people is quiet and still, subdued and calm. The altar stands crowned with beauty and splendour, and upon it is the Gospel of life and the adorable wood [i. e. the cross]. The mysteries are set in order, the censers are smoking, the lamps are burning, and the deacons are hovering and blandishing [fans] in likeness of watchers" (Homoleti, "Liturgical Homilies of Narsai", p. 12). It is curious that in nearly all the earliest representations of the Last Supper a lamp is indicated as hanging over the table. When we remember that the pilgrim who, about 580, wrote the so-called "Brevisarius", saw what purports to have happened in the chamber of the Last Supper, preserved there as a precious relic, it is easy to understand that the early Christians may have attached a quasi-liturgical significance to the lighting of lamps during the Holy Sacrifice. At the present time interest principally centres in the lamp which burns perpetually before the Blessed Sacrament, and it has been the custum with many
LAMPETIANS

writers (see e. g. Corbet, "Hist. du sacrement de l'Eucharistie," II, 413 sq., and Thalhofer, "Liturgik," I, 670) to represent this as a tradition of very early date. But the testimonies upon which this opinion is based are, many of them, quite illusory (see "The Month," April, 1907, pp. 380 seq.). St. Paulinus of Nola, indeed, seems to speak of a silver lamp continu- ing burning in the church—

Paulo Crucis ante decus de limine edem
Continuum scaphus est argentus aptus ad usum.

But there is no indication that this bore any reference to the Blessed Sacrament. It would seem rather to be suggested by the context that it was of the nature of a well-known and usual custom for 1st thieves. No really conclusive evidence has yet been produced which warrants us in declaring that the practice of honouring the Blessed Sacrament by burning a light continually before it is older than the latter part of the twelfth century. Still, it was undoubtedly the custom for some hundreds of years before this to burn lights before relics and shrines as a mark of honour—

the candles burnt by King Alfred the Great before his relics, and used by him to measure the hours, are a famous example—and it may be that this custom generally extended to the place where the Blessed Sacrament was kept. The constant association of burning lights with the Holy Grail in the Grail romances is suggestive of this. But the great movement for providing a perpetual lamp before the altar must undoubtedly be traced to the preaching in France and England of a certain Eustace, Abbot of Fleury, about A.D. 1100. "Eustace also laid it down," says Walter of Coventry, speaking of his visit to England, "that in London and in many other places, there should be in every church where it was practicable, a burning lamp or some other perpetual light before the Lord’s Body. Shortly after this we begin to find the practice en- joyed by the clergy and by laymen (e.g. at Durham, in 1240, at Saumur, in 1276, etc.), and this custom rule these and similar injunctions recognize that, owing to the cost of oil and wax, such requirements could hardly be complied with in the poorer churches. It was not until the sixteenth century that the maintenance of a light, wherever the Blessed Sacrament was reserved, was recognized as a matter of strict obligation. At present the official "Rituale Romanum" (Tit. IV, cap. 1) prescribes that "both by day and night two or more lamps or at least one [lampiones plures vel saltam una] must burn continually before the Blessed Sacrament," and the responsibility of seeing that this is carried out rests with the minister. This custom of lighting the lamp of the presence was extended to the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. It seems, however, that this direction of the "Ceremoniale Episcoporum" (I, xii, 17) might easily suggest that at least in the larger churches more lamps than one should be lit, but always an odd number, that is to say, three at least before the high altar, and five before the altar of the Blessed Sacrament. It seems, however, that this direction of the "Ceremoniale" is to be understood as applying only to greater festivals. During all the Middle Ages the burning of lamps, or sometimes candles, before relics, shrines, statues, and other objects of devotion was a form of piety which greatly appealed to the aims of the faithful. Almost every bishop of early English sees with delight the veneration of its lights by private beneficence was sometimes surprisingly great. It not infrequently happened that every guild and association maintained a special light of its own, and, besides these, we hear constantly of such lights at various shrines. The term "Hok-light" (which seems to have to do with a popular festival kept on the second Monday or Tuesday, 3 days after Easter Sunday), the "Rood light," the "Egg light" (probably maintained by contributions of eggs), the "Bachelors light," the "Maidsen’s light," the "Soul’s light," etc. Many of these bequests will be found conveniently illustrated and classified in Dun- can and Hussey’s "Testamenta Cantiana," Lond. 1841.

Lampadarii were slaves who carried torches before consuls, emperors, and other officials of high dignity both during the later Roman Republic and under the Empire. There seems no special reason to attribute to the lampadarii any ecclesiastical character, though their function was later taken by the acolytes and other clerics who preceded the bishop or celebrant, carrying torches in their hands, in the solemn procession to the altar and in other processions. Thalhofer, Liturgik, I (Freiburg, 1883), 668-68; Schlop in Archiv. f. Kirschen-, VII, 73-72; Rousset, Les Maigres, VI (Paris, 1885), I-33; Leclercq, Manuel d’archéologie, II (Paris, 1907), 567-70; Garbocci, Storia dell’ Arte Cristiana, VI (Rome, 1904), plates 47-72; Hottram R.V. in Dict. Christ. Antiq. (1880); De Waal, in Kraus, Realencyclopädie, II (1886), 267-79. See also Chevalier, Topolob. A full account of all that is known of the lampadari may be found in Durenborg and Segal De Dictionnaire des Antiquités, II (Paris, 1854), 900, where fuller references are given. Most other accounts are not reliable. Herber Thurston.

LAMPRECHT

LAMPIANS. See MESSALIANS.

Lamprecht, surname der Pfaffes (The Priest), German poet of the twelfth century, of whom practically nothing personal is known but his name and the fact that he was a cleric. He is the author of the "Alexandria," the first German secular epic composed on a French model. According to the poet’s own statement this model was a poem on Alexander the Great by Albéric de Besançon, of which only a portion of the beginning, 105 verses in all, is preserved (discovered and published by Paul Heyse, Berlin, 1856). The poem contains the story of the life and death of the great Macedonian conqueror as it was current in Greek and Latin versions of the early Middle Ages, such as the Greek romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes, dating from the third century A.D., the Latin translation of Julius Valerius, the epitome thereof, and especially the free Latin version made by the Neapolitan archbishop Leu in the tenth century, known as the "Historia de prelis." A comparison of Lamprecht’s opening lines with the fragment preserved of the French original shows that he followed his source with tolerable fidelity, adding, however, occasional moralizing comments or remarks of a learned nature further. He followed the model closely, and in short rhymed couplets, the rhyme being very imperfect. Besides Albéric’s poem, which, as far as we know it, is based on Valerius, Lamprecht used also the "Historia de prelis" and an "Iter ad paradisum," especially in the narration of the marvels seen by Alexander in the Far East, and in the account of the hero’s journey to Paradise. There alliteration is re- fused him, and he is made to realize the emptiness of earthly glory. Thus the close of the poem is distinctly moralizing in tone; the career of the great conqueror is but an illustration of the dictum concerning the vanity of earthly things. The poem seems to have been written in Middle Rhenish territory about 1130, at a time, therefore, when the crusades had brought the East nearer to the Western world, and when stories of its marvels were sure to find an eager audience. We possess three manuscripts of Lamprecht’s poem, one from Vorau which is not quite complete, one from Strasbourg dating from 1187, which is about five times as extensive as the preceding, and lastly a version interpolated in the manuscript of a Basle chronicle. The relationship of the manuscripts to one another is indeterminate. The "Vorau" manuscript is regarded as the oldest and most authentic; that of Strasbourg as an amplified recension. The Basle man
LAMPS

LAMPSACUS

LAMPS, EARLY CHRISTIAN.

Of the various classes of lamps that remain from Christian antiquity there is probably none so numerous as the class of small clay lamps adorned with Christian symbols. Lamps of this character have been found in all the ancient churches, but the Roman catacomb lamps are especially remarkable for their fragility and for the large numbers of these that still exist. They bear no intrinsic mark of their Christian origin. These lamps belong to two categories; the more ancient manufactured in the early imperial period, and the later in the Constantinian epoch. Even in this not very conspicuous department of arts and crafts there was a notable decline between the first and the fourth or fifth century; the clay lamps of the former period are of far superior craftsmanship to those of the latter. In form also there is a difference between the two species; lamps of the classic period are made with an ascending perforated handle, whereas the lamps typical of the Christian period somewhat resemble a boat or a shoe with an unperforated handle running to a point. In lamps of Egyptian origin the handles were soldered on after the lamp itself was moulded. The favourite symbol, though no means the only one, was the monogram of Constantine. In some instances they were adorned with a figure of a saint, occasionally accompanied by an inscription. Bronze lamps of Christian origin have also been found, and, though far rarer than the clay lamps described, they are of much greater interest. One of the most remarkable is a bronze lamp of the fifth century, now in St. Petersburg, which takes the form of an early Christian basilica. Of equal interest is a bronze lamp in the Uffizi gallery at Florence; it has the form of a ship, with inflated sails and two statues of bronze, supposed to represent St. Peter and St. Paul, at the prow. Bronze lamps also exist in the forms of a dove, a duck, a peacock, a crow, etc. The museum of Algiers contains a specimen of a lamp mounted on a pedestal, of excellent workmanship, ornamented with the apocalyptic Greek letters A and Ω, and a dolphin. Many of the gold and silver lamps presented by Constantine the Great to the Lateran Basilica were also in the form of dolphin. "G. Sol-ber Pontificis" informs us; lamps in the form of the symbolic fish were probably common, though only one of terra cotta is known. The lamps presented by Constantine to the Lateran—a truly imperial gift—were altogether 174 chandeliers and candlesticks, which furnished, it is calculated, 8730 separate lights. The most precious of these is the chandelier of pure gold, weighing fifty pounds and ornamented with fifty dolphins, which hung from the eiborium; the chains in addition weighed twenty-five pounds. Before the principal altar stood a magnificent chandelier, weighing fifty pounds, adorned with twenty dolphins. The nave was lighted by forty-five silver standards (fora candelabra), the right aisle by forty and the left by forty-five. Besides these chandeliers for lamps, the nave contained fifty silver standards for candles; before each of the seven altars of the basilica stood a candelabrum ten feet high, made of copper inlaid with reliefs in silver representing the Prophets. Gifts of precious candelabra, though fewer in number, were also presented by Constantine to the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Croce, St. Agnes, and St. Laurence ("Liber Pontificalis", ed. Duchesne, I, 172 sqq.).

BABINGTON IN SMITH AND CHEETHAM, DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES (London, 1876-80), s. v. Lamps.

MANUEL D'ARCHÉOLOGIE CHRÉTIENNE (Paris, 1907); DE WAAL IN KRAUZ, REAL ENCYCLOPÄDIA DER CHRISTLICHEN AKTHERMEN (Freiburg, 1902-06), s. v. Lamps.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

LAMPSACUS, a titular see of Hellespont, suffragan of Cyzicus. The city is situated in Asia, at the entrance to the Hellespont, opposite Callipolis, in a region known as Berysia, which seems to indicate the establishment of Berycides from Thrace. It was probably called Pitussa prior to its colonization by the Ionian cities of Phocaea and Miletus. The elder Miltiades, when he had been established in possession of Thracian Chersoneseus, declared war against the inhabitants of Lampsacus, who made him prisoner, and re-
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leased him only in submission to the threats of Crossus. During the Ionian revolt Lampscus fell into the power of the Persians. The "great king" gave its territory to Themistocles that he might supply himself with its wine, which was very famous; but the city itself continued the attacks of an army of Syriacs. After the battle of Mycal (479 B.C.), Lampscus joined the Athenians, but revolted after the unsuccessful expedition to Sicily; being unfortified, however, it was easily recaptured by the fleet of Strombichides. After the death of Alexander, it was forced to defend itself against the attacks of an army of Syriacs. It voted the golden crown to the Romans and became their ally. Its prosperity continued under the empire; gold and silver staters of Lampscus are extant, and its coins of the imperial period range from Augustus to Gaius. The city possessed a fine piece of sculpture by Lyssippus, representing a lion couchant, which was carried off by Agrippa to grace the Campus Martius at Rome. It was the home of many famous men, e.g. the historian Charon, Anaximenes the orator, Adimantus, and Metrodorus, a disciple of Epicurus who himself lived at Lampscus for three years. It must be excellent one since the highest office of the scene worship that was paid to Priapus. Its name has been conjecturally introduced into the Vulgate (I Mach., xv, 23) in place of the Greek name Sampsce, or Sampsame, in the list of the cities to which the letter of the consul Lecius was sent; and this correction is an excellent one since the city to which was known by the name of Sampsce or Sampsame.

St. Trypho, martyred at Nicea, was, according to the legend, buried at Lampscus. Its first known bishop was St. Parthenius, under Constantine. In 364 the see was occupied by Marcian, a Semi-Arian or Macedonian; in that year there was held at Lampscus a council of bishops the majority of whom belonged to that party. Marcian, summoned to the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, in 381, refused to retract. Other known bishops of Lampscus were Daniel, who assisted at the Council of Chalcedon (451); Harmonius (458); Constantine (680), present at the Council of Constantinople; John (787), at Nicea; St. Eusebemon, a correspondent of St. Theodorus the Studite, and a confessor of the Faith for the veneration of images, under Theophilos. The See of Lampscus is mentioned in the "Notitiae episcopatum" until about the twelfth century. Lampscus is now a village of about two thousand inhabitants, the chief part of a caza in the sanjak of Bigha; it is called in Greek Lampaski, and in Turkish Lepeisk.

LAMUEL, name of a king mentioned in Prov., xxxi, 1 and 4, but otherwise unknown. In the opening verse we read: "The words of king Lamuel. The vision wherewith his mother instructed him." The name occurs again in verse 4: "Give not to kings, O Lamuel, give not wine to kings..." The discourse, which contains many parables, is supposed to end with verse 9. Some modern scholars (see Revised Version, Prov., xxxi, 1, margin) render the first passage thus: "The words of Lamuel, king of Massa, whom his mother taught him." Massa is mentioned in Gen., xxv, 14 (cf. I Par., i, 30), among the sons of Ismael, and his kingdom is consequently supposed to have been in Arabia. In etymological form the name Lamuel is kindred with Lamuel (Gen., xlvi, 10) and Samuel (I Par., iv, 24). In signification it is cognate with Lacil (Numb., iii, 24) meaning (a man consecrated) "to God".

James F. Driscoll.

LAMUS, a titular see of Issauria, suffragan of Seleucia. In antiquity this village is mentioned by Strabo, XIV, 671, and Ptolemy, V, viii, 4 (and 6). It was situated at the mouth of the River Lamus which formed the boundary between Cilicia Aspera and Cilicia Propria. Lametis was the name of the whole district. To-day it is the wretched village of Adana, with existing remains of an ancient fortress. After the death of Alexander, it was forced to defend itself against the attacks of an army of Syriacs. It voted the golden crown to the Romans and became their ally. Its prosperity continued under the empire; gold and silver staters of Lampscus are extant, and its coins of the imperial period range from Augustus to Gaius. The city possessed a fine piece of sculpture by Lyssippus, representing a lion couchant, which was carried off by Agrippa to grace the Campus Martius at Rome. It was the home of many famous men, e.g. the historian Charon, Anaximenes the orator, Adimantus, and Metrodorus, a disciple of Epicurus who himself lived at Lampscus for three years. It must be excellent one since the highest office of the scene worship that was paid to Priapus. Its name has been conjecturally introduced into the Vulgate (I Mach., xv, 23) in place of the Greek name Sampsce, or Sampsame, in the list of the cities to which the letter of the consul Lecius was sent; and this correction is an excellent one since the city to which was known by the name of Sampsce or Sampsame.

St. Trypho, martyred at Nicea, was, according to the legend, buried at Lampscus. Its first known bishop was St. Parthenius, under Constantine. In 364 the see was occupied by Marcian, a Semi-Arian or Macedonian; in that year there was held at Lampscus a council of bishops the majority of whom belonged to that party. Marcian, summoned to the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, in 381, refused to retract. Other known bishops of Lampscus were Daniel, who assisted at the Council of Chalcedon (451); Harmonius (458); Constantine (680), present at the Council of Constantinople; John (787), at Nicea; St. Eusebemon, a correspondent of St. Theodorus the Studite, and a confessor of the Faith for the veneration of images, under Theophilos. The See of Lampscus is mentioned in the "Notitiae episcopatum" until about the twelfth century. Lampscus is now a village of about two thousand inhabitants, the chief part of a caza in the sanjak of Bigha; it is called in Greek Lampaski, and in Turkish Lepeisk.

LAMY, Bernard, Oratorian, b. at Le Mans, France, in June, 1640; d. at Rouen, 29 Jan., 1715. At the age of twelve he was placed under the tuition of the Oratorians of his native town, and soon evinced more than ordinary talent for the study of the humanities. He entered the congregation of the Oratory, and, after studying philosophy at Paris and at Saumur, was appointed professor in the college of Vendôme and later at Juilly. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1667, and after teaching a few years at Le Mans he was appointed to a chair of philosophy at the Universities of Angers. Here his teaching was attacked on the ground that it was too exclusively Cartesian, and Reclus the rector obtained in 1675 from the state authorities a decree forbidding him to continue his lectures. He was then sent by his superior to Grenoble, where, thanks to the protection of Cardinal Le Camus, in 1687, translated into French by order of the Bishop of Châlons under the title "Introduction à la lecture de l'Écriture Sainte" (Lyons, 1689). (2) "Harmonie, sive Concordia quatuor Evangelistarum," a harmony or concordance of the Four Gospels (Paris, 1689). In this work he contends that John the Baptist was twice called by this name, first by order of the Sanhedrin, and later by Herod in Galilee. He maintains also that the Saviour and His Apostles did not eat the paschal lamb at the Last Supper, and that the Crucifixion occurred on the day on which the Jews celebrated the Passover. He considers Mary Magdalene, Mary the sister of Lazarus, and the sinner mentioned in Luke, vii, 37 sqq. to be one and the same person. These and other opinions involved him in animated controversy with Bulteau, pastor of Rouen, Jean Pléud, Le Nain de Tillemon, and others (see "Traité historique de l'ancienne Pièce des Juifs," Paris, 1693). His "Harmonie," however, is the groundwork of his introduction (Lyons, 1696; Jena, 1709; Amsterdam, 1710). It was translated into French by Abbé de Bellegarde (Paris, 1697) and by Abbé Boyer (Lyons, 1709). In this work he calls in question the historical character of the books of Tobias and Judith, and maintains that even after the Council of Trent a difference of authority should be recognized between the proto-canonical and deutero-canonical books of the Bible. (4) "Défense de l'ancien sentiment de l'Eglise latine touchant l'office de sainte Madeleine" (Rouen, Paris, 1697). (5) A volume of commentaries on his previous works (Paris, 1699). (6) A Latin treatise on the Ark of the Covenant (Paris, 1720), a posthumous work published by Père Desmollets, who prefixed to the volume a biography of the author.
LAMY, François, an ascetical and apologetic writer of the Congregation of St-Maur, b. in 1636 at Montreuil in the Department of Eure-et-Loir; d. 11 April, 1711, at the Abbey of St-Denis near Paris. While fighting a duel he was saved from a fatal sword-thrust by a book of the Rule of St. Benedict which he carried in his pocket. Seeing the danger of God it this remarkable occurrence, he took the Benedictine habit at the monastery of St-Remi at Reims in 1658. Shortly after his elevation to the priesthood he was appointed prior of St-Faron at Meaux, but a year later resigned this position out of humility. During 1672-5 he taught philosophy at the monasteries of Mont-Saint-Quentin and St-Médard in Soissons. He was the first of the Maurists to teach the Cartesian system of philosophy. In 1676 he came to St-Germain-des-Prés near Paris where he taught theology until 1679. The general chapter of 1687 appointed him prior of Reims in the Diocese of Meaux, which was ordered by the king to resign his office in 1689. The remainder of his life he spent in literary pursuits at St-Denis. He was one of the most famous writers of his time and was an intimate friend of Bossuet. Of his twenty printed works the following are the most important: "Vérité évidente de la Religion Chrétienn.- (Paris, 1684); "Le Nouveau Calvaire", "L'Am- isme Rensevé, ou réfutation du système de Spinoza" (Paris, 1696; 2nd ed., Brussels, 1711); "Sentiments de piété sur la profession religieuse" (Paris, 1697); "De la Connaissance de soi-même" (6 vols, ibid., 1694-8; 2nd ed., 1700), which raised a controversy between the author and Malebranche concerning the disinterested love of God; "L'Incrédule amené à la Religion par la Raison" (ibid., 1710); "De la Connaissance et de l'Amour de Dieu" (ibid., 1712); "Lettre d'un théologien à un de ses amis" (ibid., 1699); "Plainte de l'apologiste des Bénédictins à MM. les prélats de France" (ibid., 1699). In the last two treatises the author defends the Maurist edition of the works of St. Augustine against the Jansenists and the Jesuits.

TASIN, Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de St-Maur (Brussels, 1770), 351-47; Le Cenre, Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la Congrégation de St-Maur (La Haye, 1726), 185-95.

MICHAEL OTT.

LAMY, Thomas Joseph, Biblical scholar and orientalist, b. at Ohey, in Belgium, 27 Jan., 1827; d. at Louvain, 30 July, 1907. Ordained priest in 1853 after completing his studies at Floreffe and at the seminary of Namur, he founded the Congregation of St-Maur in 1858 and received from his professors, Beelen (q. v.), the distinguished exegete and orientalist, and LeFebre, who was well versed in positive theology, his impulsion towards Biblical, Oriental, and patristic studies. He obtained the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1859. His career as professor at Louvain began in 1858 and continued uninterrupted till the year 1900, comprising courses in Hebrew, Syriac, introduction to Sacred Scripture, and exegesis. Lamy succeeded Beelen on the latter's retirement in 1875. His writings, though voluminous for enumeration here, are listed in the bibliography of the university down to 1905, under one hundred and fifty-eight entries. His most valuable contributions to learning took the form of editions of many previously unpublished Syriac writings, notably his collection in six volumes of St. Ephraem's hymns and discourses, under the title "Sancti Ephraemi Syri Hymnorum." The Chiericardi's "Chronicorum Ecclesiasticorum" of Bar Hebraeus. It is freely admitted that his editions of text are marred by numerous errors, chiefly typographical. He is most widely known by his "Introductio in Sacram Scripturam", in 2 vols., which ran to six editions, an erudite collection of materials valuable in their day. Of his commentaries the most noted are his Latin com-

mentary on Genesis, in 2 vols. (2nd ed., 1883-4), and his French commentary on the Apocalypse (1885-94). Neither in his introduction nor in his commentaries did Lamy grapple with the difficulties of the day; his ideas, acquired in the sixth decade of the nineteenth century, remained unmodified till the end. His "Introduction" passed almost unaltered through six editions. Lamy's numerous articles show his great devotion to the Church, to his university, and to his country, as well as a marked predilection for Biblical and patristic studies. Before his death, which occurred at the age of eighty, Lamy was engaged in the revision and annotation of a French translation of the Bible. Besides his professorial labours, he served his university for thirty years as president of the College Marie Thérèse. By his simplicity, his goodness, his piety, and kindness of heart, he won numerous friends in all ranks of society and exerted a gentle but effective and wide influence for good. Lamy received many honours from learned societies and from his country; he was made domestic prelate (1866) by Leo XIII, and member of the Biblical Commission (1903) by Pius X.

LADEVRE in Annaire de l'Université Catholique de Louvain (1901), pp. cxxvi-cxxxii, biographical notice, p. cxxxvi. Remarks by the rector, Mgr. Herbeربطية: REINHOLD in Buchboden, Kirchliche Handz., s. v. For bibliography, see Annaire Université Catholique de Louvain, Bibliographie, 1894-1900, 66-72; also Premier Suppment, 1899-1901, 8-9; Deuxièmes Suppment, 1901-1903, 11-13; Troisièmes Suppment, 1905-11.

JOHN F. FENLON.

LANA, Francesco, b. 10 Dec., 1831, at Brescia in Italy; d. in the same place, 22 Feb., 1887. Mathematician and naturalist, he was also the scientific founder of aeronautics. He belonged to the ancient family of the Counts of LenaTersi, which had come to Brescia as early as the fourteenth century from the neighbourhood of Bergamo. Trained by his teachers in his native city, he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus in Rome on 11 Nov., 1847, and in 1851 made his philosophical and theological studies in the Roman College of the Society. He later taught the humanities for a short time at Terni, where the town council through gratitude to him and his family granted him the freedom of the city. After this he was mainly engaged as professor of physical science and mathematics, principally at Ferrara, until delicate health necessitated his return to his native Brescia. He there performed the duties of confessors and was engaged at the same time on the publication of his great work on physical science, "Maugonum naturae et artis". Eliminating everything that was uncertain, this work was to treat in nine volumes the entire field of the natural sciences on strictly geometrical principles, and on this basis carefully made experiments. Unfortunately Lena himself could publish but two of these volumes (1864, 1868), but a third appeared at Parmo after his death. The work found favourable notice in the learned publications of the time, though Lena's principal achievement lay in another direction.

In 1870 he had published, as an advertisement for his chief work, a small volume entitled "Frodromo"
LANCE

The Holy. — We read in the Gospel of St. John (xix, 34), that, after our Saviour’s death, “one of the soldiers with a spear [lanced] opened his side and immediately there came out blood and water”. Of the weapon thus sanctified nothing is until the pupil of the famous military chronicler, Aeneas Silvius Pierius Valesius (a. p. 570), describing the holy places of Jerusalem, tells us that he saw in the ancient Bible of Mount Zion “the crown of thorns with which Our Lord was crowned and the lance with which He was struck in the side”. The mention of the lance at the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the so-called “Breviarium”, as M. de Mélly points out (Exuvie, III, 32), is not to be relied on. On the other hand, an old manuscript of the Laurentian Library at Florence, illuminated by one Rubalbus in the year 586, the incident of the opening of Christ’s side is given a prominence which is highly significant. Moreover, the name Longinus, if, indeed, this is not a later addition—is written in Greek characters by the scribe of the manuscript. In the face of this text, it is impossible to believe that the name Alexio is in any way connected with the lance (Αλεξιος). This is as it may, a spear believed to be identical with that which pierced our Saviour’s body in the Sainte Chapelle. During the French Revolution these relics were removed to the Bibliothèque Nationale, and, although the Crown has been happily preserved to us, the other has now disappeared.

As for the second and larger portion of the lance, Arculpus, about 670, saw it at Jerusalem, where it must have been restored by Heraclius, but it was then venerated at the church of the Holy Sepulchre. After this date we practically hear no more of it from pilgrims to the Holy Land. In particular, St. Willibald, who came to Jerusalem in 715, does not mention it. There is consequently some reason to believe that the larger relic as well as the point had been conveyed to Constantinople before the tenth century, possibly at the same time as the Crown of Thorns. At any rate its presence at Constantinople seems to be clearly attested by various pilgrims, particularly Russians, and, though it was deposited in various churches in succession, it seems possible to trace it and distinguish it from the companion relic of the point. Sir John Mandeville, whose credit as a witness has of late years been in part rehabilitated, declared, in 1357, that he had seen the blade of the Holy Lance both at Paris and at Constantinople, and that the latter was a much larger relic than the former. Whatever the Constantinople relic was, it fell into the hands of the Turks, and in 1492, under circumstances minutely described in Pastor’s “History of the Popes”, the Sultan Bajazet sent it to Innocent VIII to conciliate his
favour towards the sultan's brother Zizin, who was then the pope's prisoner. This relic has never since left Rome, where it is preserved under the dome of St. Peter's. Benedict XIV (De Beat. et Canon., IV, ii, 31) states that he obtained from Paris an exact drawing of the point of the lance, and that in comparing it with the lance in St. Peter's, the Pope saw that the two had originally formed one blade. M. Mély published for the first time in 1904, an accurate design of the Roman relic of the lance head, and the fact that it has lost its point is as conspicuous as in other, often quite fantastic, delineations of the Vatican lance. At the Pope's request, the vestrying of the Roman VIII, that doubt as to its authenticity were felt at Rome, as Burchard's "Diary" (I, 473-486, ed. Thuanus) plainly shows, on account of the rival lance known to be preserved at Nuremberg, Paris, etc., and on account of the supposed discovery of the Holy Lance at Antioch by the revelation of St. Andrew, in 1096, during the First Crusade. Raynaldi, the Hollandists, and many other authorities believed that the lance found in 1098 afterwards fell into the hands of the Turks and was that sent by Bajazet to Pope Innocent, but from M. de Mély's investigations it seems probable that it is identical with the relic now jealously preserved at Aix-la-Chapelle. This is never in any proper sense a lance, but rather the head of a standard, and it may conceivably (before its discovery under very questionable circumstances by the crusader Peter Bartholomew) have been venerated as the weapon with which certain Jews at Beirut struck a figure of Christ on the Cross; an outrage which was believed to have been followed by a miraculous discharge of blood.

Another lance claiming to be that which produced the wound in Christ's side is now preserved among the imperial insignia at Vienna and is known as the lance of St. Mauritius. This weapon was used in or near 1273 in the coronation ceremony of the Emperor of the West, and from an earlier date as an emblem of investiture. It came to Nuremberg in 1424, and it is also probably the lance, known as that of the Emperor Constantine, which enshrined a nail or some portion of a nail of the Crucifixion. The story told by William of Malmsbury of the giving of the Holy Lance to King Athelstan of England by Hugh Capet seems to be due to a misconception. One other remaining lance reputed to be that concerned in the Passion of Christ is preserved at Cracow, but, though it is also said to have been there for centuries, it is impossible to trace its earlier history.

The one work of authority which thoroughly discusses all the available evidence is that of M. F. de Mély published at Paris in 1904 as the third volume of the Erudite Sacra Constantinopolitana of the Comte de Riant. It contains authentic drawings never before published and a valuable selection of pièces justificatives. Besides this all-important work, the reader may be referred to Ronsard de Fleury, Mémorie sur les Instruments de la Passion (Paris, 1870), 272-75; Burellius, H. V. Lance in Dict. de la Bible; Schenke in Kirchenlex., VII, 1418-22; Martin, Reliques de la Passion.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Lancelotti, Giovanni Paolo, canonist, b. at Perugia in 1522; d. there, 23 September, 1590. He graduated doctor of law in 1546, and taught that science shortly afterwards (1547 or 1548) in the university of his native town. Except for two short sojourns at the seats of jurisdiction of his See in Perugia, in the study of law and belles-lettres. He owes his world-wide reputation to his "Institutiones Juris Canonici", the text of which is reproduced in most editions of the "Corpus Juris Canonici". Following the example of Emperor Justinian, who had entrusted to three professors the task of drawing up an elementary work entitled the "Institutiones", intended for use in the schools, Lancelotti conceived the plan of a like work on canon law. Paul IV charged him officially with the execution of his plan, and for this purpose he went to Rome in 1557. To his great regret, neither Paul IV nor who died in 1559, nor his successor Pius IV, gave authentic and official approbation to his work, published by Lancelotti at Perugia in 1653 as an entirely private venture. The "Institutiones" are divided into four books, and treat succinctly, and with much acuteness and erudition, judgments and crimes. This division was inspired by the principle of Roman law: "Omne jus quo utimur vel ad personas attinet, vel ad res, vel ad actiones". (All our law treats of persons, or things, or judicial procedure.) It is a small and very simple didactic work, and may be considered a convenient resume of canon law. Its divisions have been followed by broad lines by all authors of elementary treatises on canon law, and they have also borrowed its title "Institutiones". Lancelotti, however, erred when he applied to canon law the unsuitable divisions of Roman law. Having been published before the promulgation of the Council of Trent, this work had not the advantage of following its decrees; subsequent editors have remedied this defect by notes and commentaries. The best-known editions are those of Doujet (Paris, 1684; Venice, 1739), and Thomasius (Halle, 1715-17). Lancelotti's other writings are: "Institutionum Juris canonicorum commentarius" (Perugia, 1579), in which he gives the history of his aforesaid work; "De comparatione juris pontificii et caesarie et utriusque interpretandi ratione" (Lyons, 1574); "Regularum ex universo pontificio jure libri tres" (Perugia, 1587); "Questio an in cautio de non offenso praedicto comprehendatur bannici notarii temporis" (Lyons, 1587).

VERMIGNOLI, Biografia degli Scrittori Perugini, II (Perugia, 1829), 40 sqq.; SCHULTE, Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonicum Rechts (Stuttgart, 1873-80), III, 481 sqq.; SCHERER in Kirchenlex., s. v.

A. VAN HOVE.

Lanciano and Ortona, Archdiocese of (Lancianense et Ortonensis).—Lanciano is a small city in the province of Chieti, in the Abruzzi, Central Italy, between the Pescaia and the Trigno. The ancient city is S. Maria Maggiore with its Norman portal. Until 1515 Lanciano was subject to the Bishop of Chieti. In 1562 Pius IV, to end a dispute with that bishop, made it an archdiocese without suffragans. The first bishop was Angelo Maczani, who was succeeded by Cardinal Egidio Canisio (1552); the first archbishop was the Dominikan Leonardo Marini (1560). In 1818 the See of Ortona was united to that of Lanciano by Pius VII. Ortona is a very ancient city in the province of Chieti, on the Adriatic Sea, and has a small port from which it carries on commerce with Dalmatia and the Adriatic coast of Italy. Charles I, King of Sicily, assigned the revenues of this port to the Vatican. It was here that Gregory XII, fleeing from Cividale, landed on Neapolitan territory (1409), and went thence to Gaeta. Ortona was an episcopal see even in the time of Gregory the Great, who mentions the Bishop Ca-luminous and his predecessor Blandinus. Another bishop was Joannes, who in 916 was the papal legate at the Council of Altheim. There is no record of a Bishop of Ortona after the tenth century. Pius V in 1570 re-established the see, to which in 1569 that of Campi was united. When, in 1818, Ortona was united to Lanciano, Ortona was abolished. The archdiocese has 20 parishes, with 61,000 faithful, 2 religious houses of men, and 6 of women.

U. BENTINI.
Land-Tenure in the Christian Era.—The way in which land has been held or owned during the nineteen hundred years which have seen in Europe the rise and establishment of the Church is a matter for historical inquiry. Strictly speaking, the way in which such ownership or tenure of the land is not only legally established, but even owned, is a matter of historical inquiry also. But the determination from record of motive and of mental attitude is always a disputable thing, whereas the determination of legal definition and of public acts is a matter of documentary and of ascertainable record. During the last two generations concerning the nature of the State and its institutions its formation into a social and material order, were made of the ethical history of land-tenure or land owning a capital point of discussion, and, to support what was until lately the chief academic view, recorded and ascertainable history was pressed and even warped into the service of theory.

It is the object of this article to set forth what is rigidly ascertainable in the matter, to distinguish it from what is doubtful, and again from what is merely hypothetical.

The modern theory to which allusion is here made is the conception that property in all its forms has no direct relation with personality, is not an extension of nor support of human dignity and the human will (which, strictly, can only attach to persons), but is a mechanical arrangement or institution deriving its authority from the State, not from the nature of man, and not, therefore, from the purpose of his Creator.

In this aspect of property many modern apologists, apparently divergent, join. Thus, he who will assert that property is necessary in order to give the required impetus to human effort, or that its acquisition is the proper reward of the virtue (as he imagines it to be) of cunning, or that the State, in his view, is incapable of evil proceeding from the imperfections of their nature, is really at one in his general theory of the thing with his apparently irreconcilable opponent who will assert that property is robbery because its existence tends to produce an inequality in material enjoyment. Again, the philosopher who analyses what is called economic, or Ricardian, rent, and emphasizes its collective quality, however much he may privately support the laws that defend private property, betrays by his whole method of thought his conception that property is adventitious and not native to man. In general, all the modern (Christian and (in its acuteness) anti-Christian thought which the nineteenth century has suffered, regards property, among other human establishments, as a thing not having about it that quality which we call sacred. It reposes upon no ultimate moral sanction: it is a function to be expressed in terms of common or private utility. The far-reaching consequences of this philosophy it is not the purpose of these pages to discuss; it has produced, not only the insecurity and the extended poverty, but also the shameless financial spirit of our time; it has put speculation in the place of production, and removed in so far as it has both powerful the permanent economic bases of society.

The opposite philosophy bears no name; and here we have a phenomenon to be paralleled in many another case. Thus we know the modern attitude which regards matrimony as a contract, but we have no name for the view of that vast majority to which such a view is opposed. The whole continence ideal implies that the modern conception that the State has no authority over the citizen—the theory called Anarchist—but we have no name for the public and popular philosophy of the vast majority to which such a doctrine is fundamentally immoral. We must proceed, therefore, without generalization. and postulate that all modern observers will immediately admit, the contrast between those who have with regard to property in all its forms the novel attitude described, and those who continue to repose in the older conception of property as a thing connected with the ultimate ethical sense of man.

For the purposes of this article the interest of that great quarrel lies in this: that the academies and universities (from which any appeal of course, in all such novelties, long-lived or short-lived, proceed), in their determination to disestablish the sense of property as an absolute thing, have pressed into their service historical evidence; and this is especially the case in regard to property in land. Man is a land animal: without land he cannot live. All that he consumes and produces is in the condition of a material being is ultimately referable to land. Nay, the prime condition of all, mere space in which to extend his being, involves the occupation of land. Land, therefore, in all ages has been safeguarded in a peculiar manner from the perils which attach to the abuse, or even the natural process, of private property in any material. And whether those safeguards have been, or are, an assertion of the ultimate domination of the State over land, or institutions to make inheritance in land secure, or to safeguard it against the fluctuation of fortune, or to guarantee a proportion of it for what is essential to the common life of men, or to forbid the acquisition in more than certain areas by one family—no matter what the guarantees are or have been, they ultimately repose upon the prime and self-evident truth that without land man cannot be. To the truth that land is necessary for the life of man, another truth equally self-evident lends added force. But, that, whereas all other forms of property can be replaced, land cannot be replaced. A man or a group of men can, if the laws be sufficiently bad or sufficiently laxly observed, forestall the market in wheat so as to control the whole supply of wheat for a certain period, but they cannot as a necessity of life control the period unless they also control the land, for which is perishable. Perishable, also, is every other form of things subject to private property, with the exception of land. Vest all the land in the community in one family or one group of families, make their tenure of it fixed, and it is self-evident that the whole of the community will be utterly dependent upon it or them. In other words, a State must, if it is to remain a State, set up in the case of land guarantees and safeguards against the perils attaching to the institution of property which it need not set up in the case of other forms of property.

We shall, therefore, always find in the historical records of every community, however fixed and absolute its conception of the right of private property in land, some land held in common, some land the property of the State or the municipality, and even that land which in the hands of individuals or corporations treated legally in a manner different from, stricter than, and contrasting with, the manner in which other forms of property will be treated.

Seizing upon this truth, the school of philosophy alluded to above has attempted to establish a scheme of historical progress whereby it has been pretended that men in their first conception of land thought of it as mere space, heritable by none and open to all: that from this men, organized in strict communities, proceeded to give the community rights over land which it forbade to individuals, and to leave the government of the tribe or of the village absolute over the land. In this conception the private profit of frequently exercised—to determine a common tillage and a common pasture. Next (this hypothesis imagined) the mutations of allotment grew rarer, and the watching of common rights less jealous, until at last were found—what every man can now see round him in European civilization—all the elements of private property and, side by side with them a certain proportion of communal and public territory. The rights which are exercised over this last or ancient customs which
attach to it are called (in the terminology of this academic theory) "survivals from an original communism in land".

Now, before any examination of the true history of land-tenure can be attempted, it is of the first consequence to rid the mind of all such vagaries. There is not a note of fact in support of the whole hypothesis: it is but one out of many which might be framed. It corresponds to the temper, if not of our own day, at any rate of yesterday in the intellectual circle of Europe; it would, were it true, powerfully support one part of their general philosophy and of their general attitude toward human development. But, as truth is no proof, the historian must content himself with ignoring it.

Lest this statement should seem too abrupt in the ears of those who are accustomed to hear this hypothesis dogmatically affirmed as historical truth, it is but just to notice in passing the type of arguments upon which it repose.

Records are produced and contemporary evidence is given of an absolute communism. These records, as they are commonly legendary or at the best extremely vague, are more relied upon than contemporary evidence, which is in this department very scarce indeed. In spite of these admitting that legendary evidence or contemporary observation of isolated instances establishes the possibility of man's tolerating a communism in land, it in no way establishes a progress from communism towards private property. To attempt to do so is to argue in a circle. To call communism wherever it appears, even in a very imperfect form, "primitive", and to call the private property where it appears "a later development", is merely to beg the whole question. It is a process against which the student must be warned, because it is, or has been, of the greatest possible value in every development of the generation of intellectualism. It is logically vicious and often monstrously insincere. There is no single case determinable in history of a regular progression from communism in land to private property. There are cases innumerable of the domain of private property encroaching, as the years pass, upon the domain of public or communal property. And there are numerous, though less numerous, cases of communal property extending after an earlier restriction and growing at the expense of private properties. But to pretend that a regular scheme of development is ascertainable or conceivable is simply to affirm an historical truth something for which we find that no historical evidence exists.

With this preface, which, if lengthy, is necessary to any just conception of the business, let us turn to the evidence before us.

The limits of the Christian Era form not only the natural limits for an article in such an encyclopedia as this, but also an excellent historical limit wherein to frame our inquiry. For the birth of Christ was, roughly, contemporaneous with the expansion of the art of writing over the tribal civilizations of Northern and Western Europe, and roughly contemporaneous also with that organization of all the known world, and especially of the ancient Oriental states and cities under the united and simple scheme of Roman rule. In other words, one medium in which ancient records could be preserved upon the one hand and new records—established on the other, such a medium, coexisting almost from the time of the Exodus, and contemporaneous with the beginning of the Christian Era. A generation before that era opened saw Gaul occupied by Roman arms; the last limits reached by the same forces, the last independence of the North African littoral extinguished in Carthage to the West, in the Italian civilizations which lay behind the Alps, and after the founding of the Catholic Church saw the occupation of Britain at one extreme of the Roman boundaries and the complete absorption of Judea at the other.

We have, therefore, from the first century of the Christian Era, clear records, and upon the basis of such records we can establish our judgment. What we discover is roughly as follows:

The whole life of the land throughout the whole of this area, to which apply the Roman scheme of law and the Roman appetite for record, regards private property in land as a scheme native and necessary to man. But the absolute quality of this right and the extent of the area over which it is exercised differ very much with the times and the world. The civilization which Rome had superseded in Gaul and was in process of superseding in Britain, the civilization of which she took note, though she did not supersede it, in the Germanies, and which her religion was later to develop in Ireland, was not municipal, but tribal.

It is generally assumed that tribal civilization is necessarily nomadic or at any rate so far nomadic as the chase and continual warfare connote. The assumption has in it something of truth, but in its absolute form may be very much exaggerated. Thus we can be certain that the Gaulish clan called the Arverni, in spirit, if not in fact, of the warlike colonies which they threw out to the utmost limits of their world, had a fixed seat upon the Yonne, a seat which still remains in the shape of a cathedral city. We can be equally certain that the Averni were a population rooted in and conditioned by the old volcanic region of central France. Negative arguments too long to detain us here suffice to prove that the boundaries of the Basque people on the north of the Pyrenees have been much the same throughout the whole period of recorded knowledge and remain within a few miles to-day what they were during the Wars of the Romans. Yet the Roman attitude and the nomadic character of a tribal system is indefinitely elastic. The tribe may be wholly nomad or it may have settled, while yet preserving its tribal organization and morals, into a fixed set of agricultural villages. This much is certain: that wherever men build, and do not depend for shelter upon tents, the nomadic character of their communities is qualified.

Now the importance of such a consideration lies in this: that a community wholly nomad is necessarily—quite apart from any fundamental conceptions of property—communist in regard to land. Men pass much from place to place and cannot conceive of land otherwise than as a mere space over which they progress, or a mere area of soil from which they draw the sustenance of themselves and their cattle. But the converse question immediately proposes itself: Where the tribal system was not wholly nomadic, how far did settled habitation accompany the establishment of private property in land?—The answer to this question is of capital importance, and we shall return to it after dealing with the other half of the Roman scheme.

That other half, the ancient civilization of the Mediterranean, was municipal; that is, the organization of men was in the main an organization of city states. Agriculture and village settlements existed, the one as a handmaiden to, the other as satellites of, city states which summed up the life of each society. From immemorial time, beyond all record and even beyond the misty horizon of credulity and legend, men had men who claimed the right, and held the right, of the Median. Certain picturesque exceptions, numerically insignificant, by their very contrast lent relief to this fundamental character of Mediterranean life. Rare and sparse Semitic tribes wandered in the deserts beyond its south-eastern corner; Berber horsemen harried the steppes which lay beyond the Ganges, and so on. But the whole scheme of life was municipal. In that scheme we discover at the opening of the Christian
Era a certain attitude towards the tenure of land neither complicated nor difficult to define. Land was everywhere held as private property: it was bought and sold, the most absolute rights conceivable were granted over it by the Roman State. But this does not mean that once his land belonged to the City and to the imperial Government, and, secondly, a hypothesis, but existing records showed how, in the past, society throughout the Mediterranean, though it could not so much as conceive of communism, had made continual efforts to prevent the growth of a class of free men who should be dispossessed of land. The efforts to attain this ideal, now taking the form of popular outbreaks, now of aristocratic legislation, were directed, however, for the most part, towards the proper subdivision of the remaining public lands or to the establishment of a freeholding population upon land which had been acquired by conquest from an enemy.

The institution of slavery must, as the reader need hardly be reminded, be constantly kept in view in connexion with such a scheme of society. The State in the Mediterranean, at the time of which we speak, normally, though not everywhere, consisted of a minority of free men, citizens as we should call them, for whom laboured a majority of men not possessed of civic rights and technically no portion of the State at all. Even under such conditions a class was growing up which, though free, was dispossessed of any property in land. It had appeared very early in the history of Rome, and from the early Roman name for it we draw our modern technical term "the proletariat." But there was a constant instinct in favour of increasing the security of the State by the establishment of such landless men as freeholders and proprietors of the diminishing public lands. This, the object of the Gracchi and the achievement of Julius Caesar, though never finally successful, proved the strong tendency of the Roman State to repossess upon citizens who should be owners and freeholders. Whether we inherit that conception from the Roman polity alone, or whether it is due to the need of the State to maintain a habitable whole, this much is certain, that from the Roman Civil Wars to our own day, the idea of a large number of absolute owners of land forming the best and most natural basis for a state, has endured unbroken and may be called normal to the political mind of Europe.

A number of exceptions indefinitely large might be proposed to so simple a scheme. Local custom varied infinitely, and the learned can discover many a vestige of ancient tenure, but, regarding our starting-point as a whole—regarding as a whole, that is, the civil and agricultural conditions of our era—it was a civilization of freeholders, owners who could buy and sell, balanced by the retention of great areas in the hands of the community for distribution, not for common tillage.

To this conception of land tenure (which is almost identical with that of the French Republican tradition which has imposed itself to-day over the greater part of Western Europe) there was added in the succeeding seven centuries a slow process of modification which is as difficult to estimate in its nature and origins as it is essential to grasp if one is to understand the problem of land in Europe. The absolute tenure of the Roman land remained unchanged in men's minds, in the terminology of their laws, in the phrases of their conversation, and even in the major facts of their society. But there was superimposed upon so simple a conception a novel relationship between the larger and the smaller owners, between the owner and the non-owner who had merely contracted a term of tenure at a rent—nay, even between the owner and the class that had been dispossessed by the State, which transformed the society of Europe. I say this novel relationship arose most gradually during the first seven centuries; it is widely discoverable in law in the eighth century. The darkness of the ninth century, with its violent Barbarian assault, throws society into a crucible; when the chaotic mass crystallizes, we find established and henceforward dominating all the Middle Ages, from the later tenth century to modern times, that conception of land tenure to which is roughly, though somewhat inaccurately, given the title Feudalism.

It is at this point of moment to return to the thread of tribal organization in order that we may discover how far this change in the habit of the Roman mind between the absolute ownership of the early Empire and the conception of tenure in the Middle Ages proceeded from that exterior and barbarous tribal system, and how far it proceeded from some organic internal change within the structure of Roman society.

We have seen that the tribal system was not necessarily nomadic and therefore not necessarily communistic in the matter of land. Its nomadic character varied in intensity, from the purely nomadic hordes who seem to have occupied the great plains of the East of Europe to the more or less fixed clans of the Gauls, with their established central cities or strongholds, and their local ascriptions of areas and boundaries.

Upon the tribes to the east of the Roman Empire, we have very little evidence indeed. It is customary to give to this vague group of Barbarians the name Teutonic; and certainly many of its component tribes (though not all) appear to have certain religious customs, and even the names of certain gods, in common at the opening of the Christian Era. As to the homogeneity of this race, we have evidence quite as contradictory as it is slight. Tacitus, whose main object was the production of a polished literary satire, paints an ideal community, all of one highly distinguishable blood, and exactly possessed of every virtue which he desired, but failed, to find in the Roman State of his time. "Oriental" is the word he uses, not to denote, to strengthen his work, a very considerable number of notes which seem to bear the stamp of actual observation, undertaken, not of course by the writer, but by merchants or soldiers whom he may have interrogated. In the preceding century Julius Caesar, a military writer possessing a very different aim and concerned with accuracy rather than with effect, gives a picture far less favourable. Neither writer, it must be remembered, had any way of appreciating the Germanies and their mixed and floating population within any great distance from the Roman lines. But his chief interest in the nomadic character of these Barbarians. In Caesar's account, paucity of agriculture and the importance of pasture is emphasized; the land is described as held in common by a body which moves from year to year. Their habitations are but temporary huts. The account of Tacitus does not form a consistent whole, and the most important sentence is corrupt in the text that no scholar can vouch for it; but it is generally understood to mean that land (whether pasture or arable we cannot tell) was re-allotted year by year; and it is certain that, as with most Barbarians, very large areas of waste were maintained round the settlement of each tribe. There is practically no other testimony with regard to the tribal system east of the Roman Empire. An enormous mass of guesswork has been erected upon the frail basis of obsolete
customs and supposed vestiges of the past discoverable centuries later when the Germans were civilized by the Christian armies, and notably by those of Charlemagne, and when written records could first set down what had hitherto been fluctuating and perhaps recent legend.

The Western tribal system has another and a much greater importance. We know more about it; it formed the civilisation of a much larger number of men, and of men far more cultivated and therefore more instructive to the Roman mind. Of the Gallic system we know virtually nothing. At the British we can do no more than guess; but the survival of what is called "Celtic" habit in Ireland and its recrudescence (which is also a form of survival) in Wales, after the dissolution of Roman rule, instruct us. The characteristics of that of Wellingborough seems to have been an intense bond of blood and of common interest between the members of one clan. Perhaps the most startling evidence of this is that, when the Catholic Church, for all its elaborate organization, strictly kept records, and, as it were, necessary machinery, took into its unity the independent Celtic tribes, even such an institution as the episcopate was influenced by the tribal scheme, and the bishop was at first the bishop of the tribe or of its monastic institute, not the officer of a municipality, as he was throughout all the rest of the known world.

The restoration of land which could properly be regarded as private property under the tribal system of the West varied indefinitely. Records of course, only begin to exist with the advent, even after the fall of the Roman Empire, of Roman civilization, letters, religion, and law. Not until modern research was at work could the extent of communal ownership of the land be gauged. It was an alien to the earliest chroniclers who wrote in the Roman tongue and under Roman traditions. Even the Welsh written and oral traditions make it difficult to establish a proportion, and certainly the learned in the fields of Welsh, Scottish, and Irish, tribal custom are compelled, for all their learning, to present much more hypothesis than they do direct knowledge.

It is perhaps a just summary that the half of the tribal system which lay exterior to the Roman Empire in the British Isles was conditioned as to its proportion of settling, after tribal lines against the orographical circumstances in which it lived. The districts it occupied in Great Britain were mountainous; the mountain pastures, and the mountain waste, and the mountain forests were communal. The narrow alluvial belts along the valley streams were in part held co-operatively for tillage, and in some part—necessarily in the neighbourhood of habitations—particular and owned. In Ireland, where wide stretches of plain (though of moist plain, suitable chiefly for pasturage) contrasted with the mountain districts, private property in the full mode of acquiring title by purchase or by gift was not precluded; and there were nothing forming for that matter, in the small private properties of the Welsh and Scottish valleys—by a political or ethical character common to the whole tribal system, which was its intensely military character—a character which, it should be remembered, the so-called Celtic tribes of the West poured like an invigorating spiritual stream into the life of the early Middle Ages. This character involved intense loyalties to the clan and to the person of a chief. The conception of an individual owning as against the clan, or defending his particular existence and its economic basis as against his chief, was a conception for the future as it was for the past, and was odious to the spirit of that society. Ownership there was, for there was theft; and a sense of ownership in land, for there are plenty of examples of men raving against unjust spoliation of that form of property as they would rage against unjust spoliation of any other form of property. But the clan was above all military, and the private property, however absolutely felt or universally recognized, was subject to the spirit of sacrifice which is essential to the military temper.

A general appreciation of the tribal spirit of the West, though historically of the first importance, since the Middle Ages were principally inspired by it, does not greatly affect the particular history of land-tenure, because it bears, both numerically and existentially, no slight relation to the work, compact, and stable civilization of Rome, whose internal transformation can alone explain the gradual change from the Roman conception of ownership to the feudal system.

A third province of evidence which would be of the utmost importance to our inquiry is unfortunately lacking and can never be recovered: I mean, the evidence of southern and eastern Britain. There certainly took place an infiltration of tribes, and often, perhaps, of single families, from the Germans into southern and eastern Britain during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. There was no matter of doubt that, from a position originally subsidiary and perhaps insignificant under the Roman Empire, the German-speaking population of southern and eastern Britain increased enormously up to the advent of St. Augustine, just before the dawn of the seventh century. There is again no matter of doubt that the attacks of the Teutonic tribes, who were probably also mainly speakers of Teutonic dialects, from being harassing in the third, and menacing in the fourth, had become a scourge in the fifth century; and the weight of legend, though it is only legend, is too strong to be ignored where it describes their progress in the sixth. A certain number of the hitherto Roman towns in Britain were naturally taken by assault, some perhaps by the pirates alone, some by a combination of these with other Barbarians such as the Celtic Northerners beyond the Roman Wall. At any rate, although there is no direct record, and even in the way of myth only very misleading traditions, upon the worst 150 years of the business, and though southern and eastern Britain disappears from history during that period, yet we may confidently say that the society resulting from the pirate invasions, the resistance of the Roman cities, and the independent British tribes which joined in the fray, was a society in which the features of the tribal organization were very profited by, rather than determined by, a combination of these with other Barbarians. The Celtic Northerners and the British beyond the Wall, as they seemed to have been, were subject to the influence of the Church, nothing in the way of true tribal organization remains. The Roman municipalities have survived the shock, and are all, with the exception of three, upon their feet. The agricultural arrangements of the village have certain local characteristics which appear to differentiate it from its counterpart in Gaul, but these characteristics are slight and unimportant; and with the exception of the increasing change in the popular language (the German elements of which spread further and further), of a considerable admixture of new blood (how much we cannot tell), of
a necessary and obvious loosening of the bonds of society, and of an absence of such military organization as Gaul still preserved, the Roman province of Britain is, at the close of the eighth century, once more a portion of the Roman world. We cannot judge from its then social constitution what former times its institutions may have contributed to the moulding of the State.

Yet another source for the transformation in land tenure which Roman society suffered has been suggested. Some have thought that two institutions present in the Roman Empire in the time of its vigour—the system of early discovered especially in the West, the other civil and developed later in the East under Byzantine law—were the origins of feudalism.

The first of these was the military tenure granted by the Crown to veterans upon the frontiers on condition of military service to be rendered when called for. This case of tenure was exceptional so far as the number of individuals was concerned, but had a wide extension upon the long frontiers of the Empire. It bears a strong resemblance, indeed, to one characteristic of later feudalism, to wit, the connexion between tenant and lord, service in return. In the system, it quite impossible to establish a link between this exceptional, artificial, and occasional system and that whole state of mind which produced (as we shall see later) the feudal system. There is no trace of the one growing out of the other: one does not find an inherited tenure which began under this Roman military experiment and ended as a true feudal estate. The resemblance between the two is mechanical rather than organic, and the analogy is verbal. On examination we find that there is no affinity between the spirit of the one and the spirit of the other.

The second institution was the tenure called emphyteusis, under which land, the domain of the Crown (and other land as well, but especially land under the domain of the Crown), was granted, not on absolute ownership, but in tenancy for certain fixed dues, and once so granted was granted permanently. This system does indeed nearly resemble in form the beneficium, which overlapped with it, but grew later and flourished more vigorously in the West. It lacks, however, the prime character of the beneficium, to wit, the moral bond between the grantor and the grantee, the conception of a personal favour done by the grantor who expects from the grantee personal loyalty. Now this not only links the life of the tenant, but under the forms of the grant in the West were undoubtedly influenced by the strict law of the Empire, there is no organic relation discoverable in history between one and the other. A more direct, a more reasonable, and a more demonstrable process produced out of the material of Roman society, and freed within its own tradition, the structure of tenure later known as feudalism. For, while various forms of settled tenure which had for their characteristic the holding of land from another, in contradistinction to the fundamental and indestructible idea of ownership, were thus arising in the settled civilization still subject to centralized Roman government and chiefly residing in the eastern portion of Christendom, in the western portion the ideas of the time were expressing themselves in another fashion.

The conception of tenure, or holding of another person's land, distinguished from ownership (an idea as fundamental and as indestructible in the West as in the East), was developing in Gaul through the merging of two quite distinct currents of custom. To comprehend these two currents the reader must first postulate as the basis of all Roman society at the close of the Empire and a number of numbers mixing in size from many hundreds to many thousands of acres, each in the absolute possession of an owner who tilled his land with slave labour. These estates were the units of society; they were the parishes into which ecclesiastical organization was divided, the villa into which agricultural industry was divided. One family might possess many; no wealthy or important family possessed less than one. It is their grouping which we shall see building up the feudal system; it is their number which produced the nobility of Europe in the Middle Ages, their chaplains who become the parish priests, their slaves who become the peasantry. This conception once seized, we can understand the nature of the two currents whose fusion resulted in the full production of feudalism, and in the process we shall set out to examine. The two streams were as follows:—

1. The great landowners whom the Roman Empire, while it was still governed strictly from one centre, had left absolute proprietors of their estates, began to arrange themselves in a hierarchy of greater and lesser men: the lesser related to the greater by an understanding which later became a contract, and which carried with it a conception of dependence.

2. The great officers of state being identical in so many cases with the owners of large landed estates, the two ideas of office and of ownership associated together, and, welded, became hereditary as the descent of land was hereditary, it became natural, conversely, to think of ownership, however fixed and continuous, as something held from above, since political power, which was at last inseparably associated with ownership, must of its nature be held from the supreme authority of the State.

We will examine each of these developments separately. Even before the fall of the Empire and the establishment of local generals of armies (some Barbarian, some Roman, and all, soon, a mixture of the two), the tendency of the smaller man to put himself under the protection of the greater man had developed. It was the decay in public authority which produced this tendency. Property was the prime institution that survived, it had a sanction in the popular mind which survived the power of punishment vested in the laws and police of the Roman State. A man was powerful in proportion to the number of estates he owned in a district; he could exercise that power in a number of ways; he could see to it that religious endowments should go to the person or persons he wished; he could found monasteries; he could influence by the weight of his presence the course of public justice; he could give gifts to public works. Thus was the line drawn between an individual and punishment; he could be responsible for taxes. The more estates a man owned in a particular district, the more—as public authority declined, and sense of the sanctity of property remained—did such a man tend to become the real head of the district, in contradistinction to the weakening authority of political machinery. Again, the anarchic character which war was taking on—the irresponsible raids of small but fierce groups of Barbarians—created dangers against which a man best secured himself by establishing a close set of mutual duties between himself and some wealthier man of his neighbourhood. The tendency was opposed to Roman tradition, and, since it worked outside the framework of Roman law, was obviously imetical to the imperial conception; but that conception weakened from generation to generation, and as early as the third century one finds that sort of thing—a sort of thing an established custom vigorous and vital, which the dead framework of the imperial law cannot break. When the chieftains of the small invading tribes, principally German, and the generals of armies had seized upon the machinery of government, had become the new major state, and had resided in the Roman palace of the capital cities, and came to be called local "kings", all attempt to check this natural tendency ceased.
Under the Merovingian Dynasty, which saw a continued decline of central authority, the institution flourished exceedingly. It became normal and almost universal for the small man with one or two estates to be attached, he and his heirs, in a permanent fashion, to a larger man with many estates. The link between the greater and the lesser landowners of a district bore various names. Sometimes the lesser man was said to be in "feud" to the greater; the Latin word fides, i.e., "the bond of honour," was a technical word employed. Sometimes the old Latin term "patronage" was used to signify the same thing. In the tenth century men were already taking it for granted; in the seventh, though it had not yet appeared in written law, it had appeared in many a written document, and was almost universal. Towards the end of the seventh century and the beginning of the eighth a special political movement was apparent in society which not only accepted and sanctioned such arrangements, but actively and consciously favoured them. The great officers of the Crown, and notably their chief, the mayor of the palace, had become stronger than the Crown itself. Now these great officers were also the great landowners; they were the heads of this hierarchy of innumerable individual contracts or understandings or customary relationships. And as these mayors of the palace came nearer and nearer to grasping the supreme power in the State, the chief force behind them was the crowd of men who owed to them and the great officers, their followers, this "fidelity." 

The eighth century witnessed a political revolution which finally confirmed and established, brought into the region of positive law, and launched on its career through the Middle Ages, the full institution of "patronage," or, as it was now called, "seniority." The link of "fidelity" had become the nexus which bound the State together, and feudalism henceforward was the characteristic of society.

This political revolution consisted in the advent to supreme power of the old Roman family of Ferreolus. It was one of the great senatorial families of Roman Gaul established in the district of Narbonne in the fifth century. After many adventures, during which the head of the family at one moment migrated into the German-speaking limits of Gaul, and during which more than one German marriage brought into the old paternal Gallo-Roman stock a mixture of blood on the one side, the Ferreolii occupied the highest office of state in the eastern portion of the monarchy. A certain Pepin (the Gallic name is characteristic) was mayor of the palace—head, that is, of the landed hierarchy and chief officer of state in the eastern half—when, at the end of a series of confused quarrels between the great nobles, he conquered, at the battle of Tistry (687), his rival, the other mayor of the palace, the chief officer of the western half of the monarchy. No racial division is apparent in this confused business, but what is now the wealthiest landed family in all Gaul belonged, in the head of all Gaul—the master of the whole State. Pepin's son Charles broke the invasion of the Saracens; his grandson, another Pepin, was at last crowned king of the whole French State in 757, and it may be said that from that moment the new system of tenure has definitely replaced the old social organization of Rome. For, though Pepin's son Charles recovered, and in a sense made perpetual, the idea of European unity which is summed up in the word empire, yet he never permitted the centralized law, which (so far as was possible in so barbaric a society) he established, to interfere with the natural growth of feudalism. On the contrary, he fostered it, and the capitularies of Charlemagne trust the institution takes on the force of law. The monarch orders them to be observed, and himself concludes arrangements upon the basis of seniortas or feuditas at the very moment when he is attempting to revive the old, impersonal and anti-feudal idea of the Empire.

Such was the gradual growth of feudal tenure from below. A brief outline must now be given of the main branch of its development, its growth from above.

The Roman Cesar in the later times of the Empire entrusted the government of various districts to officials whose military titles sufficiently indicate their origin. A dux (the word we translate by "duke"), or leader, was one thing in one district; acomes (the word we translate by "count"), or cousin, of another. And the provinces of the sovereign, over another. And in the nature of things these offices of state were revokable and dependent upon the will of Government. But the process of society we have just described associated such offices, even towards the end of the Empire, with large estates in land. When the Empire had broken down, and the chieftains of tribes or the generals of armies had seized upon the powers of local government, this association of political power with landed estate tended to become universal; and the confusion of ideas was further aided by the institution of the beneficium. As is still the case in all modern European states with the exception of England, very large tracts of each province were public land. Nor did these tracts necessarily diminish with alienation, sale, etc., for they were recruited by conquest, confiscation, lapse for lack of heirs, and merger. Under the institution of the beneficium, a great landowner, desiring to attach to himself the services of some important person or institution, gave over to such person or institution the usufruct of a certain part of his land on condition of receiving in return services and fidelity, or, as it was later called, "vassalage." After the breakdown of the Empire, the decline in local monarchies—and notably the Frankish monarchies of the North—began to grant such beneficium on a large scale, and by the time of Charlemagne they made inroads into the greater part of the public domain. For generations it was understood that a beneficium was a purely personal contract entered into under the strict conceptions of the Roman law, and, if no term were mentioned, terminable at the latest at the death of the grantor.

It is self-evident, however, that, under the pressure of institutions round it, the beneficium would tend to become the feudal tenure; and so it did. We have, then, under the Merovingian Kings of France, thoroughly established in custom, and, under the Carolignian Dynasty, openly apparent in law, a multitude of royal acts which—whether they are a grant to a faithful servant or the appointment of a trusted man to an office, especially to a local command, or the nomination of one to such a position who is too strong to be refused—all become daily less and less the voluntary and revocable act of an absolute government, more and more the recognition of an established landed system.

But out of these two—the growth of feudalism from below by voluntary interdependence of smaller owners and greater, the growth of feudalism from above by the increasing strong analogy which makes of office and of royal grant a permanent tenure in duty and in honour—the whole feudal system had been welded when the storm of the ninth century broke upon Christendom.

In that storm our civilization nearly disappeared. Its symbol, the imperial name, wholly disappeared; for the establishment of the German Empire in the tenth century and its 300 years' quarrel with Italy was not universal: it left on one side Gaul, Britain, and the re-conquest of Spain, which was characteristic not a national, and as characterized not a European, affair. It suffered the fate of all mere names.

The violent Barbaric assault upon Christendom
LAND-TENURE

which followed the Carolingian period was calculated to make of the feudal conception a stronger thing than the political conception based upon local economic power, was absolutely necessary at such a time.

Perhaps the best example of the way in which tenure had come to be a necessity for men's minds is the grant of Normandy. The story is simple enough. The pirate invasions, though the chief one could not have brought numerous armies, yet sufficiently and continually harried the coasts of northern France. Their action dated from shortly after the death of Charlemagne and continued into the tenth century. The way out of the difficulty is a symbol of all that society then knew. The chief of the feudalized; that is, he must accept the whole body of civilization if he and his followers desire to settle within it. The pirates have come for gain, they have looted enough, and civilization will only permit them to remain within its boundaries if they regularize their position by calling themselves, and living as, Gallo-Roman lords of villages; presumably only the leaders could have such a position, their followers would be tenants under them or armed servants in their halls. Waste village estates, village estates acquired by the forced marriages of heiresses, grants from the Royal domain, would presumably form the basis of this settlement. The head chief (Rollo), for instance, must marry the emperor's daughter; and most significant of all is the limit of the territory granted and the title of the grantee. Rollo is to be a dux, and he is to be the emperor's man, to owe him fidelity, etc. The territorial limits of his jurisdiction are precisely those of an old Roman frontier which has never been allowed to fall into desuetude. Rollo, the dux, holds of the emperor, as his man, the province of the Second Lyonnaise (Gallia Lugdunensis Secunda). Custom will later give to this district the new name of Normandy; but it is based from that day to this with the exact frontier of the third social province. Such a power for absorption has the Roman world even in its worst moment at the end of the fierce Barbarian onslaught, that the new state is within two generations a model of feudalism. The few hundred chiefs are settled as estate-owners in the Roman scheme, side by side with the mere tenants of the Gallo-Roman equal. Their few thousand followers have become serfs, villeins, or armed horsemen upon their manors. The whole is arranged in a strict hierarchy under the hereditary dux, the man of his hereditary feudal lord, the king in Paris, and the Second Lyonnaise presents a perfect model for the feudal hierarchy built up. The fusion of numerous Gallo-Roman lords of estates with a few Barbaric lords of estates interspersed among them that develops the feudal theory most thoroughly and carries it furthest; for the Norman nobility—in England, in Sicily, and in Palestine—were the chief organizers of the Middle Ages.

We have just used the words villeins and serfs, and at this point in our examination of European land tenure in Christian times, the position of the mass of the people deserves our attention. The feudal development of which we have been giving a description concerned a small minority. This minority consisted of the numerous descendants of the great landowners of the Roman Empire and a certain smaller number of Barbarian adventurers who in the troubles of the fifth century (to which must be added other invasions, especially in the fifth and sixth) came with the less established and the units of the Roman scheme, and feudalism was the organization of their owners upon the system of tenure we have described. What of the great mass of the population which in Roman times had cultivated the land of these landowners as slaves?—These also had been transformed in their social condition during the Christian centuries, and the transformation, though it is most obscure in its process, is quite clear in its origin and at its end. The Church, between the fifth century and the sixth, had transformed the Roman slave into the European peasant. The word was retained, and serv was but a form of servus, while villein is but a form of villanus, the agricultural slave at work upon a villa, or Roman country estate. But the political position to which those names attached has utterly changed. Slavery, as an institution did indeed still linger in the tenth century—there are traces of it even in the eleventh—but that slavery is domestic and rare. The man who tills the soil is, at the end of the process we have been describing, not a slave at all. On the other hand his position is quite different from that of the servus; he is no longer the product of the modern European conception of the same political entity.

The Roman estate which has come down, often unchanged even in the details of its boundaries, through all these centuries, will now call a "manor" (a term probably Norman in origin), for under this name it is alluded to in most textbooks. The medie-

val, or feudal, manor had at its head a lord who might be an individual, or a corporation such as a monastery, or an office such as the Crown or the Archbishopric of Canterbury; and these lords were of course the units of which the workings of this lord, the representative of the old Roman slave-owners, was still, in legal phraseology, due the whole work of the villein. Indeed, it was the definition of a villein that he was one, who, rising in the morning, could not tell of his own will what he should have to do before night.

But even if this legal tradition (which by the tenth century was no more than a form of words) had had actual existence in social fact, the villein would have been a very different person from the Roman slave. He had land of his own, a house of his own hereditable in his family, he could be bought or sold, and it would appear that so long as he held his land there was no constraint over his person. He was subject to the common justice of the land, and not to the arbitrary will of his master, and so forth. But much more favourable than this was his actual position, for custom and common opinion had long forbidden him to give more than a fixed number of somewhat complicated dues, varying from estate to estate, to his lord. Of the old Roman estate only a portion (differing again from parish to parish) remained absolutely under the lord's control and was called his "demense," that is "lord's land," from dominium. On this the lord was free to impose what dues he pleased, subject to rules—sometimes two days a week, sometimes three, always excepting holy days. He must also give a certain amount of produce, usually quite small, at stated times, a few eggs at Easter, etc., etc., according to the industry of the place. And he must perform certain services. For the rest, his time was free, and the land apportioned to him was, in nearly every sense, his own. It was his own because it could not be taken from him even under process of debt, nor for that matter could his capital be taken from him under process of debt. It was his own because, though dues and work went with it, yet they could not be raised as, or if, he improved the value of his land: custom forbade it. What is called in modern jargon "the unearned increment" was his, and that is the test of property in land. So was the earned increment which was due to his own labour. More than this, the villein had, side by side with his feudal hierarchy, a social hierarchy of the utmost importance. The common land of the manor, which had formerly been the Roman proprietor's as much as any other part, was now used according to careful rules. The lord might only put so many cattle onto it, the villeins each so many. Similar strict communal rights accrued to him in the woods of the place, in the fisheries, the use of the water-ways.
and of water-power, etc. The village mill was commonly a monopoly of the lords, and one or two other things. To understand the decline of the village life, that is, the decline of the feudal system, it is plain that we had formerly owned and of which they were now but the seigniorial holders. The villein was not said to own, but to hold; he held of his lord in return for service, and by a bond which, though it was not military and honourable, as was fides, was yet based upon the same ethical conception of a moral debt other than a mere financial obligation. The system was complicated by other less common forms of tenure. Thus freeholders were discovered side by side with the villeins—that is, men whose little properties involved some form of service not thought service or degraded; for instance, it was a common, though not a universal, rule that if a man could prove never to have paid anything but a fixed money due for his land, he was to be deemed a freeholder. And all non-servile work for the lord came in the same category. The tenure of the priest was of another kind, and so forth. There were also numerous cases of personal property (the villein might have anything from 15 or 30 acres to as much as 120 or more), but the general frame of society when feudalism was in its vigour was as we have described it.

Caught in the general agricultural system around them were the old Roman municipalities with which this article has not to deal—Orléans, Chartres, Rouen, Limoges, to take a few Gallic names quite at random; Newcastle, London, Winchester, to take three British names equally at random. And these municipalities were, in practice, of course composed of a number of small absolute owners of the land on which their houses and gardens stood. But so strong was the feudal idea that it was extended by analogy even to the cities. A city would have a lord, very often the Crown, or some bishop, or other great officer of state. The public taxes were paid to this lord, in addition to any of feudal nature. When the development of commerce during and after the Crusades made the fiction inconvenient, the lords granted charters, that is, written acknowledgments of the town’s immemorial customs, and often added to these special immunities from interference, in return for money.

Other exceptions to the feudal system are to be found in the allodial lands, which simply means the estates, large or small, which had never got caught in the feudal development at all, but remained held in absolute ownership from an unbroken tradition of Roman institutions. These were especially common in the south of France, and it is characteristic of the organizing power of the Normans that they, in their passion for system, refused to admit so unfavourable a conception within their dominions, so that to this day in England there is technically no such absolute ownership of land possible.

Other exceptions again are to be found in the communal arrangements of the mountain valleys—notably in the Alps and Pyrenees, where the feudal system had never really taken root, and where remote and isolated villages have from time immemorial arranged, and do to this day arrange, their affairs upon an organized system of dues which corresponds to their political system. It should always be remembered that in this most ancient and unchanged of European societies private ownership in land is absolute and most strictly recognized. Communal management attaches only to wood, pasture, and here and there a public field.

The next step in our inquiry must be: How this established feudal system proceeded to its decay. To understand the decline of the feudal system, and the transformation of the feudal tenure into the land-tenure of modern Christendom, it must first be clearly understood that what I have called the indestructible idea of private property in land survived, paradoxical as it may seem, throughout the whole long reign of feudalism. It was present when the absolute owners of the Roman estates begat to group themselves in Gaul into patrons and clients, “lords” and “men,” seniors and juniors; it was present when Charlemagne, in his capitulations, gave the forms of law to the personal link of tenure—military service and loyalty as the condition of holding; it was present after the irrigation of the continent, when feudalism, in a time necessarily military, struck its most vigorous roots. It was present when the Norman lawyers, just before and during the Crusades (that is at the end of the eleventh and during the twelfth centuries), codified the feudal system and erected it into a strict machine of law.

We know that this idea of private property was present in two ways: (1) we know it as a matter of historic fact, because we find land bought and sold and mortgaged; (2) we know it as a matter of historical judgment, because we find land talked of as property, and the personal ownership over it and the right to dispose of it. To these, the conceptions of theft in regard to it, of indignation at its unrighteous occupation, the increasing wealth of it as accruing to a particular owner, etc., etc., all alluded to.

Had society remained primitive for centuries after the full statement of feudalism in the ninth and tenth centuries, the logical clash between the feudal theory of holding for service done and the intimate personal sense of property in land, which is common to all Europeans, might never have taken place. It was quite as easy for a family to go holding an estate from father to son, and to think of it as private property on the one hand and as a tenure on the other. There was a contract in theory, but no contract in fact. True, treason against the lord overlord would have involved the loss of the land just as bankruptcy involves it now, but that was a rare contingency and regarded as the more exceptional because it was disgraceful. Great lords frequently lost their overlordship, lesser lords less frequently, men with single estates or manors very rarely, monasteries and ecclesiastical bodies hardly ever, villeins, one may say, never at all. And the two conceptions, though convenient and regarded as the more exceptional, could have lived peaceably side by side, just as, in our society for the moment, the conception of free contract is living peaceably side by side with the contradictory social fact of a proletariat and a capitalist class.

What ruined the feudal system was the tendency—as society developed in activity, as values changed, as towns grew, as a landless class developed, and as all that accompanies the expansion of a society appeared.—of those who formed the units of feudal societies to define their position with exactitude. Thus, within the village community which was the microcosm of the whole, there came moments when a villein who had long ago commuted his payment in labour for a fixed payment in money was, whether by the change in the value of money or by the rise in the price of labour, more valuable to his lord as a labourer than as a moneyer of dues, and a villein would dispute in the court his right to service. Again, as between lord and overlord, service in men-at-arms, once natural and normal, might become a fixed and mechanical thing. The overlord might find it profitable to accept a redemption of the military service required. Again, the king, in the primitive
feudal conception, was simply the owner of a very large number of estates and of the royal domain (that is the forests and other public land). It was his business, above all, to collect the State's revenues and to pay the State's expenses, in particular the salaries of the State officials. The feudal tenant of a manor was the holder of servitudes, that is, the owner of the land and of the right to use it. The feudal tenant had to pay rent and dues to the lord of the manor, who was the owner of the land and the lord of the manor. The feudal tenant also had to render services to the lord of the manor, such as military service, labor service, and other services.

The development of modern Europe should fix its eyes. Outside the old limits of the Roman Empire fortunes varied. The scantly population of Scandinavia, for instance, drained the State's revenues and the wealthy private gentleman—far the wealthiest private gentleman of the whole realm. But as civilization increased in complexity he could not do this. The functions of the State increased, the king must come for aids to his underlords, who would be bound to give aids by the laws of loyalty and service. The burden of taxes would be an insupportable burden; such mere feudal aids must be supplemented by taxation falling upon all. The Crown was coming back by the mere force of things towards what it had been under Roman rule, before feudalism and tenures were heard of. Meanwhile, the link between the underlord and the lord was loosened, the link between the villein and his lord, or the king and his direct feudal tenants. It was against the interest of the royal courts to allow the overlords to grow strong; that interest would in all countries tend to support a man with one manor who might be fighting an action to prevent that manor exchequing, on some technical ground, to a wealthier local magnate who was his feudal superior. And, side by side with all this, increasing commercial activity, by making land more and more a matter of contract, barter, and sale, broke up the old personal tie upon which the ethical condition of feudalism reposed.

The dislocation of tenures, its reversion towards ownership, was only part of the universal European movement back towards the high civilization of the Empire which was undertaken in the spring of the eleventh century, and which is approaching its climax in our time—then the story of the life of Europe is like the story of the life of a comet, following its orbit; and in that metaphor one may call the ninth century the point of its course most distant from its centre of activity. The breaking-point between the fundamental and indestructible sense of ownership and the feudal conception which had overlain it for a time came, like the breaking-point of so many other strains, with the Renaissance. But the ownership of land did not go through a revolution, as did so many other institutions of that time; did not change abruptly, as did plastic art, nor suffer a catastrophe, as did religion. The forms of tenure were preserved, as they were used to mask what was now no longer tenure but ownership.

Now, from the violent action under feudal forms whereby Henry VIII acquired the land of the Church, and granted it again for ready money to a herd of adventurers, down to our own time there has been no less decided social fact of absolute ownership in land. Tenure, for all practical purposes, disappeared with the sixteenth century. Throughout the seventeenth, the eighteenth, and the nineteenth centuries land has been owned, not held, as a social fact, though in some provinces of Europe (as notably in Britain) legal and technical language has continued to draft in terms of servitudes instead of ownership. In this revolution, however, a social fact of perhaps more consequence to Christendom than any other of the material kind appeared. It did not concern the relation between the lord of the manor and his overlords; it concerned the condition of the masses of the people.

For the fate of the villein or peasant began from the sixteenth century onward to differ profoundly in two types of communities. In those communities which had broken off from the unity of civilization, and were soon to be grouped as Protestant, the lord of the manor tended to become the owner of the land, and in the cities which remained within the unity of the Catholic Church the villein tended to become the owner of the land.

This general formula is the capital historic truth upon which all those interested in the economic
growth of a proletariat therein has brought on other problems. It has produced, under the guidance of certain philosophers, many of them not European in descent, the conception of Collectivism, which, as an abstract theory, denies that old indestructible concept of ownership of the land and would treat all land as the property of the sovereign. But this academic theory has made, and can make, no progress upon the soil, and it may be confidently said that the old Roman idea of absolute and divided ownership is secure.

H. BELLLOC.

Landr, Pope (913-14), a native of the Sabina, and the son of Taiio, elected pope seemingly in July or August, 913; d. in February or March, 914, after a reign of a little over six months. Nothing more is known of him except that he was a worthy man, and granted a privilege to a church in his native Sabina. Liber Pontificale, II, 239; Kegel, Italia Pontificia, II (Berlin, 1907), 73; Mann, Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages, IV, 147 seqq.

HORACE K. MANN.

Landriot, Jean-Francois-Anne, French bishop, b. at Couches-les-Mines near Autun, 1816; d. at Reims, 1874. Ordained in 1839 from the seminary of Autun, he became, after a few years spent at the cathedral, successively: vicaire général, 1842; vicar-general, 1850; Bishop of La Rochelle, 1856, and Archbishop of Reims, 1867. During his ten years' stay at La Rochelle he restored the cathedral, organized the Propagation of the Faith and the Peter's-pence collections, and won a reputation as a pupil orator. A true bishop, he made it a rule to announce personally the Word of God in his cathedral or in the most remote diocesan parishes. At Reims, besides preaching many Advent and Lenten stations, he raised a large subscription for the pontifical army, established several educational institutions, founded an asylum for the aged, and instructed St. Walfroy to the Priests of the Mission. As a member of the Vatican Council, he seemed to have precociously foreseen the definition of papal infallibility, but, once decreed, he adhered to its promulgation and even wrote to his diocesan urging them to accept it unconditionally. Lacroix ("Mgr. Landriot pendant l'occupation allemande", Reims, 1868) shows Landriot's influence in allaying the measure of rigor resorted to by the victorious Germans during their occupation of Reims in 1870. In the question of the ancient classics Landriot refused to subscribe to the extreme views of Gaume and "L'Univers". An eloquent preacher, he was also an ascetic writer of note. Besides his pastoral works collected in the "Œuvres de Mgr. Landriot" (7 vols., Paris, 1864-74), we have from his pen, all published in Paris: "Recherches historiques sur les écoles littéraires du Christianisme" (1851); "Examен critique des lettres de l'Abbe Gaume sur le paganisme dans l'éducation" (1852); "La femme forte" (1862); "La famille chrétienne" (1863); "La famille chrétienne édifiée" (1863); "Le Christ et la tradition" (1865); "Les beautés évangéliques" (1865); "Le Symbolisme" (1866); "L'Eucharistie" (1866); "La Sainte Communion" (1872); "L'Autorité et la liberté" (1872); "L'esprit chrétien dans l'enseignement" (1873); "Institutions sur l'Église dominicaine" (1874); "L'Esprit Saint" (1879), etc.

La France ecclésiastique (Paris, 1878): L'épiscopal français depuis le concordat jusqu'à la séparation (Paris, 1907), v. v.: La Rochelle and France (Reims, 1888); Caumbrette (Reims, 1874); Abba (Reims, 1874), Redort (Autun, 1856).

J. F. SOILLIER.

Langfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, b. at Pavia, c. 1005; d. at Canterbury, 24 May, 1089. Some say his father was of senatorial rank, others accord him a somewhat humbler station. He received a liberal education according to the standard of the age, notwithstanding the death of his parents during his tender years. On reaching manhood he applied himself to the study and practice of the law with marked success, but left Pavia for the purpose of devoting himself to the pursuit of learning. He made his way to France, and attended himself to a school at Avranches, in Normandy, where he became noted as a teacher. At a later period, a vocation to the religious life developing itself in him, he quitted Avranches secretly, only taking with him one Paul, a relative. His biographer tells us he was received into the ranks of the little poverty-stricken community after the customary period of probation, and applied himself to Biblical studies. In time, he was appointed prior of the monastery by Herluin, and was then enabled to open a school there, which rapidly became famous, and attracted scholars from many parts of Europe, several of whom rose to high rank in after years, especially the future pope, Alexander II, and Anselm, who succeeded Lanfranc both as prior of Bec and as Archbishop of Canterbury.

In May, 1050, being in Rome on business, he attended the council there and opposed the heresies that had of late years been broached by Berengarius on the subject of the Sacrament of the Altar, denying the mode of the Real Presence. Through the contents of a certain letter, Lanfranc cast some doubt of the surmise of Berengarius's erroneous views, but he so ably explained his own opinions that he has stood forth ever since as the principal exponent of the doctrine which has from that date been labelled with the name of Transubstantiation. Needless to say, that doctrine did not take its rise there; or through Lanfranc; but his masterly exposition of the Faith (as always held by the Church implicitly, and merely enucleated by him) was given with a clearness and precision of definition such as has been handed down through succeeding ages to ourselves. During the same year, at the Council of Verceil, he once more upheld the orthodox belief against Berengarius, and again to Tours, in 1055, and finally secured the triumph of truth over error, of authoritative teaching over private interpretation, in the definition of the Lateran Council, held under Nicholas II in 1059. At a later date, probably about 1060, he wrote "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini", against the errors which Berengarius had continued to propound, seminise, notwithstanding various retractions and submissions.

All these activies made Lanfranc a man of such note that William, Duke of Normandy, employed him as one of his counsellors. He, however, forfeited the Duke's favour about 1052-53, on account of opposing William's union with Matilda of Flanders, on the ground of their relationship within the prohibited degrees of kindred, and was, in consequence, ordered to leave the duke's dominions. On his journey to the frontier he happened to meet Duke William, who curiously asked him why he was so obedient to that Lord. Lanfranc jestingly replied that he was obeying them as fast as a lame horse would allow him to do so. William appears to have been mollified by the answer, a reconciliation followed, and it would seem that Lanfranc undertook to forward negotiations for securing the needful dispensation from the pope. This he finally obtained in 1059, as well as the removal of the interdict which had been laid upon Normandy. In 1066 he was appointed to the Abbey of St. Stephen's at Caen, one of the two abbeys lately founded by Duke William and his wife Matilda as one of the conditions of the papal dispensation from matrimonial impediments, and the rapidity of which dispensation was scarcely uncanonical. This year is further remarkable as chronicling the defeat of Harold, King of the English, at Hastings, and the consequent conquest of
England by Duke William. It is generally supposed that Lanfranc had much to do with shaping the duke’s policy of invasion, obtaining the pope’s sanction of the expedition by a papal Bull and the gift of a blessed banner, thereby conferring on the undertaking the appearance of being a holy war against a usurper and a violator of his oath, to some extent, also, identifying it with the cause of ecclesiastics, which was advanced in well advanced in Normandy, but still very backward in England. Stigand, the Archbishop of Canterbury at that period, was in very bad odour with all parties; and in 1070, at a great council at Winchester, he was deprived of his office on charges of simony and uncanonically.

Lanfranc had been elected to the Archbishopsric of Rouen in 1067, but had declined it; now, however, the Conqueror fixed on Lanfranc as his choice of a successor to Stigand, and Lanfranc was at last prevailed upon, unwillingly enough, to yield his consent, at the solicitations of his friends, headed by his former superior, Herviu. After receiving the temporalities of the see from William, he was consecrated at Canterbury on 29 August, by the Bishop of London. He entered on the duties of his high station with advantages of name and learning and experience of the world such as few men have ever brought to a similar office. The king, the pope, the clergy, the counsellor, largely moulded, was without doubt beneficial to the kingdom; for the civil and ecclesiastical courts were separated, and regular synods were held, wherein regulations tending to better discipline were enacted and enforced. The Normanizing of the Church further tended to bring the native ecclesiastics into closer touch with the learning and practice of the Continent; and this was effected by replacing nearly all the Saxon bishops and abbots with Normans, on pretexts grave or slight. Whilst the insolvency of the native clergy was thus beneficially broken down, merrily the thieves of those forgeries, who were themselves, was swept away. Much might well have been retained, but could not stand against the prepossessions of the dominant party, and the effect generally was the destruction of local customs. In particular, the liturgy lost much of its distinctiveness. Hitherto the Saxon Church had kept in close touch with Rome. The old Itala version of the Psalms, for instance—that which is used to this day in the choir of St. Peter’s at Rome—was everywhere employed in England; but the Norman superiors supplanted that ancient version by the Gallicana, to which they were accustomed. A few prelates of Crewe or by signs to the sayings in certain codices, such as, for instance, British Museum Additional MS. 37517 (the Bosworth Psalter), which possibly may have undergone revision at the hands of Lanfranc himself.

Once, however, that Lanfranc was identified with the English Church, he espoused its cause warmly, upholding the dignity and primacy of his own see, by refusing to consecrate Thomas of Bayeux to the archiepiscopal See of York till he admitted his dependence on that of Canterbury. This dispute was carried to Rome, but was thence referred for settlement back to England, when the case was finally decided in favour of Canterbury at a national council held at Winchester, at Easter, 1072. Thomas made his submission to Lanfranc in a council held at Windsor at Pentecost of the same year. In connexion with this incident a grave charge has of recent years been brought against Archbishop Lanfranc by H. Böhmer (in “Geschichte Ers.”), who accuses him of having falsified and forged documents in order to secure the primacy of the See of Canterbury over that of York. M. Saltet (in “Revue des Sciences Écclésiastiques”), 1907, and others, have dealt with the question, exonerating Lanfranc from any personal connexion with the forgeries, if such they were.

Meanwhile Lanfranc had been to Rome in 1071 to receive the pallium from Alexander II, his former bishop at Bec. As Archbishop of Canterbury his influence was so great that he was from time to time consulted by bishops not belonging to his own province or obedience, and he helped in the work of reforming the Church in Scotland. He enforced the observance of celibacy among the clergy in accordance with the decree of the Synod of Hildesheim, which provided that no canons were to be permitted to marry, nor could married men be ordained to the diaconate or the priesthood. But it is clear that at the time a state of degenency existed, and that too drastic measures all at once had to be avoided, since clergy already married were allowed to retain their consorts. He made an attempt to oust the monks at Canterbury and Winchester in favour of secular canons, and secured papal confirmation of the existing practice which had come down from the days of St. Augustine of Canterbury. Many episcopal sees were at this period transferred from obscure villages to rising towns, as Sherborne to Salisbury, Dorchester (Oxon.) to Lincoln, Thetford to Norwich, and Selsey to Chichester. In 1076 he again visited Rome, and, on the return journey, made a tour of Normandy, during the course of which he had the satisfaction of consecrating the church of his old monastic home at Bec.

The king’s stature, as regards the Court of Rome, more than once placed Lanfranc in a situation of extreme delicacy. William refused to allow the bishops of England to leave the kingdom for the purpose of visiting the pope without his consent. For this Lanfranc appears to have incurred the blame and was reproved, being, moreover, summoned to Rome, in 1082, under pain of suspension. He did not go, but it was the inimicities of old age, not contumacy, which prevented him from undertaking the long and arduous journey. It is well, also, to remember that a purely political reason for the king’s refusal may be assigned, and Lanfranc, like, indeed, many others before him, was more at the pope than with the king. The explanation of the pope’s attitude and demand would seem to be that the tribute had come to be looked upon as a token of vassalage, whereas, in its origin, it was unmistakably a free gift. William, while refusing to render homage, promised that the demands of Peter’s pence should be forthcoming. Capital is sometimes made, too, of the fact that William and Lanfranc adopted a hesitating attitude in the case of the antipope Guibert, or Clement III, in 1084. All that can be justly inferred is that they maintained strict neutrality; till such a time as the candidates could be adjudged by proper authority. As that authority was not theirs, neither William nor Lanfranc assumed the prerogative of settling the dispute one way or another. (See Liebermann in “Engl. Hist. Rev.”, April, 1901, p. 328.) In fact, no act of theirs can be instanced as saving the most complicated and fiat submission to the Holy See. (See Martin Rule in “Dublin Rev.”, 3rd series, vol. VI, 1881, pp. 406 sqq.)

Lanfranc strenuously upheld the rights of his Church of Canterbury, when necessary, by legal action, even against the Conqueror’s half-brother, Odo of Bayeux. He also showed himself a munificent benefactor to the see, rebuilding the cathedral after its
destruction by fire in 1067, improving the archiepiscopal estates by his good management, founding hospitals for the sick and indigent of both sexes, and giving liberally to widows and to the poor. His munificence was not confined, however, for as it might be, caused Rufus to put some sort of restraint upon his own extravagant nature, on his own liking. His munificence to his engagements and promises, however, was a source of bitter sorrow to the aged archbishop, and doubtless hastened his death. It had been his accustomed prayer that he might die of some malady which would not affect his reason or his speech, and his petition was granted. An attempt on his life in July, 1089, in a few days brought him to the grave. On 24 May, the last day of his life, his physicians having ordered him a certain draught, he asked to defer it until he had confessed and received the Holy Viaticum. When this was done, he took the cup of medicine in his hand, but instead of swallowing it, calmly breathed his last. He was buried in his own cathedral. In the "Nova Legenda." Lanfranc has the title of Saint, and elsewhere he is called Blessed; but it does not appear that the public honours of sanctity were accorded to him.

When William had to leave England to attend to the affairs of his continental dominions, Lanfranc acted as his viceregent, or regent, in England, and displayed not only activity and sagacity as a temporal ruler, but a mind fit in the "order of things" in the repression of a rising against the Conqueror in 1074. It was probably by his advice, too, that, notwithstanding the violence of that young prince's character, William the Conqueror left England to his second son William Rufus, as by right of conquest, Normandy being then in a position to maintain with most of its independence, and only a large sum of money to his son Henry. The choice of Rufus was, doubtless, because, as having been Lanfranc's pupil, and as having received his knighthood from him, the archbishop's influence over him might be presumed to be of some weight. Lanfranc crowned him at Westminster less than three weeks after the Conqueror's death.

Lanfranc's name is, with that of his successor, St. Anselm, inseparably coupled with the thorny question of investitures, for the differences between king and primate, which came to a head under St. Anselm, showed their beginnings under Lanfranc. Here it is enough to say that his influence over a great ruler, such as the Conqueror, was prevented any but worthv appointments in the Church. But the root of the future evil lay in regarding see merely as portions of the temporal fiefs attached to them, instead of keeping them as a character wholly separate from their temporal adjuncts. So long as they were seen as a ruler—such as the Conqueror—was right-minded, no great harm was to be feared, but when a godless savage like William Rufus saw fit to intrigue unworthy men into sees, or keep sees vacant in order to enjoy their revenues, then great evils arose, and such men were likely to assume—as Rufus did—that spiritual power and jurisdiction derived from them by means of investiture with staff and ring, as well as tenure of the temporalities whose outward symbols were at that time, unfortunately, the same instruments.

Lanfranc saw clearly the distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical capacities in which he was regarded and might be regarded, and it is related of him that in 1082 he encouraged the Conqueror to arrest his brother, Bishop Odo. The king scurried to imprison a clerk, but Lanfranc grimly pointed out that he would not be arresting the Bishop of Bayeux (as it was not for an ecclesiastical offence), but the Earl of Kent—a title he held. Again, in 1088, when William de St. Carilef, Bishop of Durham, was being tried for his share in the rebellion of Odo and the Norman lords, that prelate endeavoured to shield himself under his episcopal character. Lanfranc reminded him, first, that he was not at the bar as a bishop, but as a tenant in chief of the king; secondly, that the bishops judging him were acting in a like temporal capacity. Had that distinction been recognized and borne in mind by William Rufus, the troubles of his reign about investitures need never have arisen.

Lanfranc endeavoured to check the extravagances of the Red King, who, however, proved deaf to his entreaties and remonstrances. Nevertheless, it is certain that, as long as Lanfranc lived, his influence, though not tit for tatt, as the last triumph of the earl, to the St. Albans, whose abbot, his relative Paul, had initiated there a vast scheme of rebuilding. His lifelong love of learning prompted him to foster studies; and even when immersed in the multidutious and anxious affairs attached to his office and to his secular position as chief counsellor to the king, his one idle, as the list of his works, which (considering the calls on his time) is a long one, testifies. His writings were published collectively by d'Archéry in 1648; they may also be consulted in Migne, P. L., CL, and Dr. Giles's edition of his works, published in 1844. Other treatises, now lost, have been attributed to him, amongst which was one that should rightly be ascribed to others.

Henry Norbert Birt.

Lanfranc, Giovanni, also known as Cavallerie Giovanni di Stefano, decorative painter, b. at Parma, 1581; d. in Rome, 1647. As a boy Lanfranc was a page at Piacenza in the service of Count Scodtli, and developing a talent for drawing was placed by the count under Agostino Carracci, with whom he remained for some years, but before he was sixteen he had painted a picture of the Virgin and Saints, which was so much admired that it was considered worthy of being placed in the church of Sant' Agostino at Piacenza. On the death of Carracci, Lanfranc went to Rome and assisted Annibale Carracci in decorative work in the Farnese Gallery, in the Vatican, and in various Roman churches, but the work of his own hand he was able to carry off a commission which had been promised to Domenichino, his great rival, who was born on the same day as himself, and exerting himself to the utmost of his ability to out-do his opponent, he
executed in the cupola of Sant' Andrea della Valle his greatest work, representing the Virgin seated in the clouds, and distinguished by grandeur, clarity, boldness of design, and masterly colouring. He was then attracted to Naples and was occupied for a couple of years in painting the cupola of San Gennaro, and in carrying out similar work in San Martino. Here again he was the rival of Domenichino, who was at work at the cupola of the treasury when he died, and Lanfranco was employed to finish the frescoes, but he destroyed almost all the work of his great rival, excepting the decorations in the angles, and these still remain to prove that with the solitary exception of the cupola in Rome, Domenichino's work was far more accomplished than that of his persistent rival. About this time he returned to Naples, where he spent the remainder of his life, and his productions pleased Urban VIII so much that he conferred upon him the honour of knighthood.

His works can be studied in Madrid, Florence, Paris, Vienna, and Dresden, as well as in the places already mentioned. His best behind him several fine etchings, and a few drawings.

Belloni. Vite de' Pintori Scultori e Architetti Moderni (Rome, 1672), also a similar work on the artist (Rome, 1731), and his description of the Vatican (1753).

George Charles Williamson.

Lang, Matthew, cardinal, Bishop of Gurk and Archbishop of Salzburg, b. at Augsburg in 1468; d. at Salzburg, 30 March, 1540. After receiving a secular education at Ingolstadt, Tbingen, and Vienna, he entered the chancery of Archbishop Berthold von Hennenberg of Mainz, became secretary of Emperor Maximilian I in 1494, imperial councillor in 1501, and chancellor in 1508. The emperor esteemed him very highly, and gave him many ecclesiastical benefices. Allowed to the nobility with the title of "von Wellenburg" in 1498, he became provost of the cathedral of Augsburg in 1500, and shortly after also of that of Constance. In 1503 he was appointed coadjutor, and on 5 October, 1503, Prince-Bishop of Gurk. Though bishop, he remained in the imperial chancery as a layman, not even once visiting his diocese as long as he was Bishop of Gurk (from 1505 to 11 March, 1522). As imperial legate he directed the emperor's negotiations with France, Venice, Hungary, and the pope from 1505 to 1515. On 10 March, 1511, Pope Julius II created him cardinal, but kept him in pello until 24 November, 1512. Despite imperial influence he was unsuccessful in his attempts to have Mainz, Magdeburg, Halberstadt, and Trent, but was finally appointed coadjutor of the See of Salzburg in 1514, against the express wish of Archbishop Leonhard Kutschach of Salzburg. After the death of the latter, on 8 June, 1518, Lang became Archbishop of Salzburg. On 24 September, 1519, he was ordained priest and on the next day consecrated bishop. Though originally a promoter of the schismatic Council of Pisa, he later effected a settlement between the pope and the emperor, and joined the Lateran Council on 3 December, 1512. It was due chiefly to his influence that Charles V was elected emperor in 1519. He also induced Charles V in 1521 to take measures against Luther, suppressed the Peasants' War in his domain between 1525 and 1526, insisted on church reform at the synods which he held in Muhldorf in 1522 and 1537, and joined the league of Catholic princes at Ratibson on 7 July, 1529, a year after the election of "Protestant Germany". Cardinal Lang was a friend of letters, but a proud and ambitious prince of the Church. His suppression of Protestantism and his ecclesiastical reforms were dictated rather by political than religious motives.

Hautzler, Kardinal Matthias Lang und die religiösen Brüder, Innsbruck, 1877-1878 (Salzburg, 1898); Schmidt, Des Kardinals u. Erzbischöfs von Salzburg (1819-40) Matthias Lang Verhalten zur Reformation (Fürth, 1887); Lieders in Michael Ott. Langen, Rudolph von, humanist and divine, b. at the village of Everwinkel, near Münster, Westphalia, 16 February or 1439; d. at Münster, 25 Dec., 1459. His family belonged to the nobility; so that when young Hermann Hamelmann, he received his schooling at Deventer, in the school of Thomas a Kempis, together with Rudolf Agricola, Alexander Regius, Anton Liber of Soest, Count Maurice von Speylenberg, and Ludwig Dringenberg. But this cannot be possible, Thomas was certainly not a teacher. Count Speylenberg and Dringenberg were much older; possibly Agricola and Liber were his schoolfellows, but there is no saying. In 1456 he entered the University of Erfurt, and received the degree of B.A. in 1459, and M.A. in 1460. But before this he was made canon of the cathedral of Münster, and provost of the old cathedral in 1462. He went to Rome in 1466 in connexion with the election of a bishop. But Hamelmann is wrong in what he has to say about his having been the scholar of the most renowned Italian humanists. He was only there a short time. Neither did Count Speylenberg go with him, as he wrote to the university of Münster in 1463, an execration of the other scientists mentioned had been dead a long time. But it is true that Langen absorbed many new ideas in Italy. At Münster he was the centre of literary life, as well as of humanistic efforts. He was surrounded by a group of men of similar tastes. He possessed a good classical library, which he liberally placed at the disposal of others. Young Hermann von dem Busche was one of his pupils, to whom he imparted a love of classical literature. Hamelmann says he went to Rome a second time, with Hermann von dem Busche (1486). But this is not very probable.

Langen's own literary work is not important. It is true that he was well read, but he lacked poetical talent. He wrote a poem about the destruction of Jerusalem, which has not been preserved; also a prose work, which was published in Deventer about 1485. In 1486 the first printing office at Münster, belonging to Johann Limburg, printed his poems. In 1493 he published the "Rosarium beatissima virginis gloriosissimae dei maris Maris"; about 1494 an epitaph on Albertus Magnus, and the "Horae de sancta cruze" in 1496. All these, as well as numerous other lesser poetical attempts, met with no better success than the other collection of 1510. In spite of his desire for his inspiration for all that was noble and good. But Langen's influence upon others was far more important. His most meritorious work was the reform which he brought about in the cathedral school, which took place in 1500. It became a humanistic institution, patterned after the one at Deventer. The course of instruction was changed, and other masters were called. But the school was more indebted to the subrector, Johannes Murrmillius, than to the rector, Timm Kemener; the former was one of the ablest German humanists, and the flourishing condition of the school and its wide influence in 1493, are due to his labours. The school consisted of 74 pupils of the lower order, and 16 of the higher order. The number of abbots and masters was 15. The rector had the title of "Professorum domicilius profecto Münsteri" (Berin, 1900); Böhmer, Das literarische Leben in Münster (Münster, 1906).

Klemens Jössler.
Langéniers, BENOÎT-MARIE, Cardinal, Archbishop of Reims, b. at Villefranche-sur-Saône, Department of Rhône, 1824; d. at Reims, 1 Jan., 1863. He studied humanities at Saint-Nizier, and afterwards at fifteen joined the Order of the Holy Ghost at Duneloup; and theology at St-Sulpice, where he was ordained, 1850. After nine years as curate at St-Roch, he became successively diocesan promoter 1859; curé of St-Ambroise, 1863; then of St-Augustin, 1868; Vicar-General of Paris, and archdeacon of Notre-Dame, 1874. Made Bishop of Tarbes, 1873, he was, the following year, translated to the archiepiscopal See of Reims. The thirty-one years of his episcopate were fruitful ones. Beside obtaining from the French legislature an appropriation of two millions of francs for the restoration of Reims cathedral, he secured for the Trappists the ancient monastery of Igny, and fought hard, at the price of Bisson's, mandamis, at Châtillon the colossal statue of Urban II, whose cultus he had promoted in Rome, built in the suburbs of his metropolis the churches of Ste-Geneviève, St-Jean-Baptiste de La Salle, St-Benoît, and Ste-Clothilde, this latter being afterwards made the seat of an arch-confraternity of prayer for France, and the place of celebration of the fourteenth centenary of Clovis's baptism. When the law of school secularization came into effect, he filled his see with Catholic schools and founded four asylums for orphans. Created cardinal in 1886, he presided as papal legate over the Eucha- ristic Congress of Jerusalem, and Louis XVI. A champion of every noble cause, he took an active part in the beatification of Joan of Arc, the panegyric which he pronounced at Orléans, 1885, being most elo- quent. He fought vigorously the anti-religious legis- lation that was being prepared against Christian education, the religious orders, and the clergy. His "Déclaration des Cardinaux et exposé de la situation faite à l'église de France" (1892), and his "Lettre au Président de la République" (1894), remain as witnesses to his truly episcopal character. However, he cherished above all the title of "Cardinal des ouvriers," given him by the gratitude of the working class, whose interests, spiritual and material, he never ceased to champion. Langénieux enjoyed the friendship of Leo XIII, who consulted him on all matters concerning the Church in France. The universal es- teem in which he was held was abundantly proved by the distinctions which the French, and the most European rulers, stowed on him and by the vast concourse of bishops, priests, and people at his two jubilees and at his funeral. His eulogy was pronounced by Bishop Latty, of Châlons, and Bishop Touchet, of Orléans. Beside the pamphlets mentioned above and a number of occasional discourses, we have from Langénieux's pen: eight pastoral letters (Paris, 1873); 251 mandamis (Reims, 1874–1905); and "Abrégé de l'Histoire de la Religion" (Paris, 1874).

FRIÈZEL: Son Eminence le Cardinal Langénieux (Reims, 1890); Vilmont, L'Épiscopat français (Paris, 1907), s. v. Tarde; and Reims: Companis, Son Eminence le Cardinal Langénieux (Reims, 1897); see also La France chrétienne à Reims in 1896 (Paris, 1896).

J. F. SOLZIER.

Langvin, LOUIS PHILIPPE ADELAIR. See St. Boniface, Archdiocese of.

Langham, Simon, cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of England, b. at Langham in Rutland; d. at Avignon, France, 22 July, 1376. Nothing is known of his early life, but in 1346 he was already a Benedictine monk of Westminster Abbey, representing his house in the triennial chapter. In April, 1351, he was made priest, and in 1355 he became sub- abbot. In this office he proved very successful, ruling well and carrying out many works, including the completion of the cloisters. He became treasurer of England on 21 Nov., 1360, and Bishop of Ely on 10 Jan., 1362. Before consecration he was also elected Bishop of London, but he refused this see, preferring Ely. On 19 Feb., 1363, he received the great seal as chancellor, and he was the first to speak in English, when opening Parliament. He was appointed Arch- bishop of Canterbury on 24 Nov., and received the pallium from the pope on 4 Nov., having previously resigned the chancellorship. As archbishop he was vigilant against false doctrine, condemned certain propositions taught at Oxford, removed one Wyche a — not the well-known heretic of that name—from the bishopric of Canterbury; and censured the demagogue-priest, John Ball. Blessed Urban V created him Cardinal of St. Sixtus, 27 Sept., 1368. His acceptance of this dignity without the king's leave offended Edward III, who seized the Canterbury revenues on the plea that Langham had by his act forfeited the see. Langham resigned the archbishopric on 27 Nov., and early in 1369 joined the papal court at Avignon, being succeeded at Canterbury by Whittlesey. Subsequently he regained the king's favour, but did not return to his native country, though he held several English preponderances in succession, such as the archdeaconery of Wells and Taunton. Greg- ory XI made him a cardinal on 12 July, 1373, and in the following year the monks at Canterbury again elected him as archbishop. The pope refused to confirm this, alleging that he could not spare the cardinal from Avignon. When the Curia was about to return to Rome in 1376, Langham was appointed papal preacher, and Louis XI. A champion of every noble cause, he took an active part in the beatification of Joan of Arc, the panegyric which he pronounced at Orléans, 1885, being most elo- quent. He fought vigorously the anti-religious legis- lation that was being prepared against Christian education, the religious orders, and the clergy. His "Déclaration des Cardinaux et exposé de la situation faite à l'église de France" (1892), and his "Lettre au Président de la République" (1894), remain as witnesses to his truly episcopal character. However, he cherished above all the title of "Cardinal des ouvriers," given him by the gratitude of the working class, whose interests, spiritual and material, he never ceased to champion. Langénieux enjoyed the friendship of Leo XIII, who consulted him on all matters concerning the Church in France. The universal es- teem in which he was held was abundantly proved by the distinctions which the French, and the most European rulers, stowed on him and by the vast concourse of bishops, priests, and people at his two jubilees and at his funeral. His eulogy was pronounced by Bishop Latty, of Châlons, and Bishop Touchet, of Orléans. Beside the pamphlets mentioned above and a number of occasional discourses, we have from Langénieux's pen: eight pastoral letters (Paris, 1873); 251 mandamis (Reims, 1874–1905); and "Abrégé de l'Histoire de la Religion" (Paris, 1874).

FRIÈZEL: Son Eminence le Cardinal Langénieux (Reims, 1890); Vilmont, L'Épiscopat français (Paris, 1907), s. v. Tarde; and Reims: Companis, Son Eminence le Cardinal Langénieux (Reims, 1897); see also La France chrétienne à Reims in 1896 (Paris, 1896).

J. F. SOLZIER.

Langheim, a celebrated Cistercian abbey situated in Upper Franconia (Bavaria), not far from Mein, in the Diocese of Bamberg. Three brothers of the city of Bamberg made a gift of the estate of Langheim to Bishop St. Otto VIII, who, in 1132, offered it to the Cistercians of the Abbey of La Varenne (now founded by Morimond), under the condition that they should establish there a monastery of their order. Encouraged by St. Bernard, Adam, Abbot of Ebrac, accepted the offer. On 1 August, 1132, he laid the corner stone of the new monastery, and in 1142 the buildings were completed. The first prior of the monastery was Abbot Adam (1141–80), who, by his wisdom and holiness, won the sympathy of the bishops of Bamberg and of the nobles of the surrounding country for the new foundation. Very soon the abbey found itself in possession of considerable revenues, and had a large number of parishes depending upon it. Pope Eugene III and the emperors granted it many privi- leges. All the ancient historians of the order agree in saying that it surpassed every other monastery in splendour and wealth, while one of its distinctive characteristics was the generous hospitality which it extended to all visitors. But this era of prosperity endured scarcely more than two centuries, for in 1385 the Bishop of Bamberg seized part of the property of the abbey, and in 1429 the Hussites destroyed the buildings by fire. After these misfortunes it arose again from its ruins, and enjoyed a return of prosper- ity, until, in 1535, the revolted peasants applied the torch, and razed it to the ground. The abbey had been rebuilt, a period of peace ensued, but in 1632 the Swedish hordes delivered it up to pillage, subjected the monks to every outrage, and left nothing but misery and desolation in their train. It was not until the following century that Abbot Stephen Müsinger (1734–51) had the monastery reconstructed.
in such proportions and with a splendour that recalled the first abbey. During this interval the bishops had again become favourable to the religious, but failed to restore either the property they had usurped or the old-time privileges. The final catastrophe occurred on 7 May, 1802, when fire destroyed the splendid buildings erected by Stephen Mösinger and put an end to Langhe- m. On 23 June, 1803, the community, at that time numbering forty-nine members, was secularised by a decree of the Prince Elector of Bavaria. The religious were dispersed to various places, and the last abbess, Candida Hemmelerin, received a pension of 5000 florins, with which he retired to the Castle of Thiebr, where he died in 1814.

This abbey gave to the Church in Germany many bishops, who distinguished themselves by their zeal in combating error, and in labouring for the conversion of heretics; it also sheltered many writers who were not without merit. We may here mention the monk Engelrich, who wrote the "Leben der hl. Mathilde, Abtissin von Ebstedt"; Simon Scheiner of the seventeenth century, who composed a treatise on the "Virtutes et Mutilita Abbatiae Langheim". The Abbot Moritz Knaue, a distinguished mathematician and astronomer, published different works on the natural sciences, also an ascetical work entitled "Tuba Coeli" (1649-64); but the most pro-

lious author was Joachim H. Jassing, who, after his seclusion, published in the same style on the history of Bamberg and the surrounding country. In 1210 Langheim founded the Abbey of Pless in the Diocese of Prague, Bohemia. In 1445 Abbot Frederick Hengelein built at Frankenthal, as a dependence of the abbey, a church in honour of the "Fourteen Holy Helpers", which became a celebrated and much frequented place of pilgrimage. The care of this church is now confided to the Franciscans.

MANRIGUE, Annales Cisterci., 1133; JONGENHUIZEN, Notitia Abbatialis, II, 1886; SANCHEZ, Cisterciens De Terre Sainte, II, xxvi: Dubois, Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier (Paris, 1852); Bieber, Die Cistercienser Abtei Kloster Langheim (Würz- burg, 1898); Wittmann in Kirchenlex., s. v.; JANUZEREC, Origine Cisterciens. I.

E. ORECHT.

Langbein, Richard, Venerable, English martyr, b. about 1635; d. at Tyburn, 14 July, 1679. He was the third son of William Langbein of the Inner Temple, Leitice, daughter of Esme Nelle, of Little Wymondley, Herts. He was admitted to the Inner Temple in November, 1646, and called to the bar in 1654. He married a Protestant lady, Dorothy, daughter of Thomas Legatt of Haverford, Essex, and lived at Shire Lane, to the right of Temple Bar. His elevation to the Temple Lane. He was arrested on 15 June, 1667, in connexion with the great fire. Arrested a second time on 7 October, 1678, and committed to Newgate without any previous examination, he was kept in solitary confinement for eight months. On 14 June, 1678, he was brought to the bar at the Old Bailey: Oates, Durdale, Beebe, and France gave evidence against him, and he was found guilty. He was offered a pardon, if he would confess his guilt and also make a disclosure of the property of the Jesuits with which he had become acquainted in his professional capacity. This last he did—probably with the consent of his fellow-prisoner, the provincial, Fr. Whitbread—but, as he persisted in declaring his ignorance of any conspiracy, he was executed. His last words were to the hangman: "I am desirous to be with my Jesus. I am ready and you need stay no longer for me."


John B. WAINWRIGHT.

Langley, Richard, layman and martyr, b. probably at Grimthorpe, Yorks, England, date unknown; d. at York, 1 Dec., 1586. From his father, Richard Langley, of Rotherham Hall, Walton, he probably inherited Rotherham, but for the greater part of his life continued to reside on his estate at Ousethorpe, in the Yorkshire Ridings. Langley gave one of his legacies and a very considerable part of his fortune to assisting the oppressed clergy; his house was freely offered as an asylum to priests. He even constructed a subterranean retreat, perhaps beneath the Grimthorpe dwelling, which afforded them sanctuary. This refuge was betrayed to the President of the North, and on 28 Oct., 1586, a strong band of military was despatched, several justices and ministers of the new religion joining in the quest, to make a domiciliary visitation of the Grimthorpe and Ousethorpe houses. Two priests were found in hiding at the former; at the latter Langley himself was arrested. All three were committed to prison, and subsequently arraigned before the President of the North, the priests because of their office and Langley for harbouring them.

During the investigation Langley was steadfast in his adherence to the Faith. He would not take the new oaths of the national supremacy, nor compromise his religious heritage by siphonizing with the lord president or Privy Council. It was feared that the jury which had first been empanelled to decide upon the case might return a verdict in accordance with the dictates of justice; it was therefore discharged and replaced by another of tried fidelity to the prosecutors. Langley was condemned to death, without any evidence being adduced to establish the fact that he had knowingly sheltered semi-nary priests, and was hanged, drawn, and quartered at York. His remains were refused honourable burial, despite the importance of his family.


P. J. MACAULEY.

Langres (Lingome), Diocese of, comprises the Department of the Haute-Marne. Suppressed by the Concordat of 1801, Langres was later united to the Diocese of Dijon. The bishop bore the title of Dijon and Langres, but the union was never quite complete; there was a pro-vicar-general for the Haute-Marne and two seminaries at Langres, the petit séminaire from 1800 and the grand séminaire from 1817. The See of Langres was re-established in 1817 by Pius VII and Louis XVIII; and Mgr de la Luserne, its pre-Revolution bishop, was to have been re-appointed; but the parliament did not ratify this agreement, and the bishops of Dijon remained administrators of the Diocese of Langres until the Bull "Paterna charitatis" definitely re-established the see. The new Bishop of Langres governed 360 parishes of the old Diocese of Langres, 70 of the old Diocese of Châlons, 13 of the old Diocese of Besançon, 13 of the old Diocese of Troyes, and 94 of the old Diocese of Toul. For the legends concerning the Apostolic origin of the See of Langres and the mission of St. Benignus see DIJON.

Mgr Duchesne considers Senator, Justus, and St. Desiderius (Didier), who was martyred during the invasion of the Vandals (about 407), as the first three bishops of Langres; the theory, therefore, must have been founded about the middle of the fourth century. Among the bishops who, till 1016, resided at Dijon, and exercised till 1731 spiritual jurisdiction over the territory of the present Diocese of Dijon we must
mention: St. Martin (411–20); St. Urban (425–40); St. Paulinus (440–50); St. Aprunculus, the friend of Sidonius Apollinaris and his successor in the See of Clermont (470–84); St. Gregory (509–39), great-grandfather of St. Gregory of Tours, who transferred the relics of St. Martin, and novel, son of St. Gregory (530–72), whose coadjutor was St. Monderic, brother of St. Arnoul, Bishop of Metz; Blessed Michelgetius (589–618); St. Herulphus (759–74), founder of the Abbey of Ellwangen; Blessed Arnoul (774–8); Betto (790–820), who helped to draw up the capitulatons of Charlemagne; Venerable Isaac (809–58); and two other Venerable menons; Venerable Agrin (889–909); Blessed Bruno of Rocay (980–1015), who lived in the monks of Cluny to reform the abbots of the diocese; Venerable Lambert (1015–30), who ceded to King Robert of France the lordship and county of Djon, in 1016; Venerable Gauthier of Burgundy (1163–79); Robert de Torote (1222–40), who became Bishop of Liège in 1240, and established the feast of the Blessed Sacrament; Bertrand de Got (1306–67), uncle of Clement V; Venerable Sebastian Zamet (1615–54), whose vicegeren, Charles de Condren, became later Superior General of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith and president of the Sacred Society of Jesus in 1630; Cézir Guillaume de la Luzerne, bishop in 1770, celebrated as an apostolate, deputy to the States General in 1789, and an émigré in 1791. He resigned in 1801, was created cardinal and again nominated Bishop of Langres in 1817, dying in 1821; Pierre Louis Paris (1815–51), celebrated for the part he took in the Assembly of 1848 in the discussions on the liberty of teaching (liberté d'enseignement) and for founding the ecclesiastical college of St. Dixier even before the Lois Falloux (see LOI S F A LLOUX O U D U COU D R AT) was definitely passed. Hugh III, Duke of Burgundy, in 1179 gave the city of Langres to his uncle, Gautier of Burgundy, then bishop; later it was made a duchy, which gave the Duke-Bishop of Langres, as the third ecclesiastical peer, the right of precedence over his metropolitan, the Archbishop of Lyons, at the consecration of the kings of France.

The chief patron of the diocese is the martyrs, Saint Mammes of Césarea (third century), to whom the cathedral, a beautiful monument of the late twelfth century, is dedicated. The Diocese of Langres honours as saints a number of martyrs who, according to the Gallican legend, in the period of Marcus Aurelius, the triplets, Saints Speusippus, Eleusippus, and Melapippus; St. Neo, the author of their Acts, himself a martyr, St. Leonilla, their grandmother, and St. Junilla, their mother. Among other saints we may cite St. Valerius (Valier), a disciple of St. Desiderius, martyred by the Vandals in the fifth century; the hermit St. Godo (Gou), nephew of St. Vandrilus, in the seventh century; St. Gengulphus, martyr, in the eighth century; Venerable Gerard Voinchet (1640–95), canon regular of the Congregation of St. Geneviève in Paris, called to that congregation; Venerable Annick and Venerable Jeanne Marce (1660–73); Venerable Matriel, a priest who died in 1704; Venerable Joseph Urban Hanipaax, a Jesuit, the latter three natives of the diocese, and celebrated for their apostolic labours in Canada.

The diocese was also the birthplace of the theologian, Nicolas de Clémenges, of fourteen centuries, coadjutor and successor of the Church of Langres; and of the Gallican canonist Edmond Richer (1560–1631); of the Jesuit, Pierre Lemoine, the author of an epic poem of St. Louis and of the work "La dévotion asée" (1602–71); of the philosopher, Diderot (1713–84). The historian, Raoul Glaber, monk of Cluny, who died in 1085, is buried in the church of St. Léger in this diocese, when he was touched by Divine grace on the occasion of an apparition. The Benedictine Abbey of Poulangey was founded in the eleventh century. The Abbey of Morimond, the fourth foundation of Citeaux, was established in 1125 by Odolric, lord of Aigremont, and Simon, Count of Bassigny. Blessed Otho, son of Leopold of Austria, Abb of Morimond, became Bishop of Freising in 1143. Henry I, Duke of Normandy, was buried in Morimond. The Augustinian priory of the Val des Ecclésiastes was founded in 1212, at Lusy, near Chaumont, by four doctors of the Paris University, who were led into this awful solitude by a love of retreat.

A religious festival, called the Ordination of the Alleluia, as Langres, never to be numbered, was first celebrated in this diocese in the Middle Ages. On the day when according to the ritual, the Alleluia was omitted from the liturgy, a top on which the word Alleluia was written was whipped out of church, to the singing of psalms, by the choirboys, who wished it bon voyage until Easter. The "Pardon of Chaumont" is very celebrated. Jean de Montmirail, a native of Chaumont, and a particular friend of Sixtus IV, obtained from him, in 1475, that each time the feast of St. John the Baptist fell on a Sunday, the faithful, who, having confessed their sins, visited the church of Chaumont, should enjoy the indulgence of the Langres Gallie. The "Pardon" of Chaumont, celebrated sixty-one times, between 1476 and 1905. At the end of the Middle Ages, this "Pardon" gave rise to certain curious festivities; on stages erected throughout the town were represented fifteen mysteries of the life of St. John the Baptist, while frolics of the devils who figured in the punishment of Herod, through the town and the country, on the Sunday preceding the "Pardon", drew multitudes to the festivities, which were finally called the "deviltries" of Chaumont. In the course of the eighteenth century the "Pardon" became a purely religious ceremony.

In the Diocese of Langres is Vassay, where in 1562 took place the riots between Catholics and Protestants that gave rise to the wars of religion (see HUGUENOTS). Numerous diocesan synods were held at Langres. The most important were those of 1404, 1421, 1621, 1628, 1679, 1723, 1733, 1741, 1753, and six successive annual synods held by Mgr Parisot, from 1841 to 1846, with a view to the re-establishment of the synodal organization and also to impose on the clergy the use of the Roman Breviary (see GÉRANGER). The principal pilgrimages are: Our Lady of Montop near Bar-sur-Seine, dating from the twelfth century; Our Lady of the Hermits at Cuves; Our Lady of Victories at Bourmont; St. Joseph, Protector of the Souls in Purgatory, at Maranville. In 1908 there were still thirteen congregations of nuns in the diocese. The Sisters of Providence, founded in 1802, with their mother-house at Langres, were, at the time of the enforcement of the Associations Law, remarkable for the work they were doing in the schools and hospitals. In 1901 the religious congregations had in the diocese 33 écoles maternelles, 1 agricultural orphanage for boys, 6 orphanages for girls, 7 workshops, 1 school of house-keeping, 2 dispensaries, 16 hospitals, hospices, and homes for the aged, 20 houses devoted for nursing of the sick at home. In 1908, three years after the separation of Church and State, the Diocese of Langres had 226,545 inhabitants, 28 canonical parishes, 416 ancillary parishes, and 49 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana (novo) IV. (1782). 506–651, instr. 125–222, DUCHENE, PLAIES ET SACREMENTS DE LA CONSTITUTION. Origines du diocèse de Langres et de Dijon (Dijon, 1888); Rogniat, Le diocèse de Langres, histoire et origines (Langres, 1879); IERM, Etudes historiques sur les premiers évêques de Langres (Langres, 1888); IERM, Nouvelle étude sur le diocèse de Langres et ses évêques (Langres, 1889); Vicomte, Breviaire diocésain de Langres, 2 vol. (Langres, 1894–96); Jolibois, La diaconie de Chaumont (Paris, 1838); Marcel, Les livres liturgiques du diocèse de Langres at the present time and supplement (ibid., 1899); Févre, Biographie contemporaine des évêques de Langres (Paris, 1899); Denys, Le diocèse de Morimond (Dijon, 1852); Ommillière, Topoédile (1862–6).

GEOFFREY GOYAU.
Langton, Stephen, Cardinal and Archbishop of Canterbury, b. in the latter half of the twelfth century; d. at Slindon Manor, Sussex, 9 July, 1228. Although the full extent of his prelateship among his illustrious predecessors, Langton’s fame is hardly equal to his achievements. Even among his own countrymen too few have an adequate knowledge of his merits and of his great services to his country and to the Catholic Church, although his labours were concerned with the two causes specially dear to Englishmen, the Church and the British Constitution. It may be that they think, every one who reads the Bible or enjoys the benefit of civic freedom owes a debt of gratitude to this Cardinal archbishop. If men may be measured by the extent of the work they accomplish, it may be safely said that Langton was the greatest Englishman who ever sat on the throne of Canterbury. It was Langton’s lot to win distinction in all three capacities, as scholar, statesman, and archbishop.

I. The Scholar.—The literary activity of Langton belongs to the earlier part of his life, and it is as a scholar that he first appears in history. Of his boyhood, probably the most remarkable is that he was, as far as we know, the first in England to observe his birth being Matters of inference and conjecture. From the circumstances attending his election to the primatial See of Canterbury it is evident that he was an Englishman. His name itself is clearly taken from some English town, but it is not certain which of the several places so-called has the honour of giving its name to the family of the cardinal, though Mark Pattison confidently asserts that he is known by the surname of Langton from the place of his birth, Langton near Spilsby in Lincolnshire” (op. cit. in bibliogr.). His father was Henry de Langton; his brother Simon de Langton—presumably his junior—seeing that he survived the archbishop twenty years—was Archdeacon of Canterbury, and took an active part in the ecclesiastical and political struggles of the time.

There does not seem to be any evidence of kinship between the archbishop and John Langton, Bishop of Ely, who died in the following century. Stephen’s birth may be fixed approximately by the known dates of his election (1205) and his death (1228). For, since he was already famous as a scholar and had become cardinal before the former date, he could hardly have been then a mere youth, while the fact that he lived for many twenty years and more, and was engaged in active work until his death, would seem to show that he was yet in the prime of life when he was elected archbishop. His birth, therefore, could not fall very much before or after 1160 or 1170. On the same grounds it may be gathered that Langton went to the University of Paris at an early age, for it was with this fame as a teacher of theology that he led the English to Rome and create his cardinal. This act of the great pope and the store he set by Langton’s learning may remind us how one of his predecessors wished in like manner to avail himself of the services of the Venerable Bede—a greater Englishman, with whom Langton had much in common in the character of his learning and in his indefatigable industry as a commentator on Holy Scripture. Thus Pattison naturally mentions the name of Bede in his graphic description of Langton as “that great prelate, who, during a twenty-three years’ occupation of the See of Canterbury, was so busily engaged in public and national affairs, and in the cloister produced more works for the instruction of his flock, than any who, before or since him, have been seated in that ‘Papal chair of the North’—who was the soul of that powerful confederation who took the crown from the head of the successor of the Conqueror.” And yet, next to Bede, the most voluminous and original commentator on the Scripture this country has produced—and who has transmitted to us a work of immortal value—is none of them different institutions, which after the lapse of six centuries are still in force and value among us—Magna Charta, the division of the Bible into chapters, and those institutions which open the series, and form the basis, of that Canon Law which is still binding in our English Courts. In this passage Pattison has incidentally touched on the chief and most enduring result of Langton’s indomitable scholarship, the division of the Bible into chapters—or, in the quaint words of an old chronicler (Trevisa’s translation of Higden’s “Polychronicon”), “he cited the Bible at Parys and marked the chapters.” This statement is true, for Anselm was not an Englishman, and his triumphs were won in fields of thought and politics of less interest to Englishmen. Some churchmen, again, have been great as writers and thinkers, others as statesmen solicitous for the welfare of the whole people, and others as zealous protectors of their flock. It was Langton’s lot to win distinction in all three capacities, as scholar, statesman, and archbishop.

II. The Statesman.—If Stephen Langton had spent the rest of his days in Rome, his great services as a scholar would give us good reason to regard him with reverence, and we might have doubted whether the studious cardinal were likely to accomplish much in the world of action and ecclesiastical administration. It was undoubtedly a severe ordeal to pass from a life
of study to the anxious responsibilities of a primatial see and that struggle with kings and princes which was too often the lot of bishops in those days. Called to fill the see of Canterbury while the memory of Anselm’s banishment and Becket’s martyrdom was yet fresh in men’s minds; Langton found himself, with the archbishop of Canterbury but to “Stephen Langton, cardinal of the Roman see,” the archbishop firmly refused to accept it. Another invitation in 1210 proved equally ineffectual, but, when John at length yielded in his hour of danger and issued letters in due form, Langton lost no time in sending them to the king’s camp at Dover in July, 1213, and was met there by the king, who received him there with feet with words of welcome and submission. John had already on 15 May, 1213, resigned his kingdom to Pandulphe, the pope’s legate, and had received it back as a gift of the Holy See. It might have seemed that the long struggle was now over; and that the archbishop, after his eight years of banishment, could at length enter on a peaceful period of pastoral labour. But it is not likely that Langton himself cherished this illusion. The king’s apparent surrender to the pope had indeed changed the issue, and had gained its object of frustrating the ambitions of the French King, simply as a vassal of the Holy See, and so appeal to the pope for protection. But it still remained to be seen whether John would fulfill his promises, and whether, by ruling with justice, he would conciliate his disaffected subjects. The course he had taken since his submission to Pandulphe gave ground for grave misgivings, and events soon showed there was as yet no room for peace.

But the conflict between John and Innocent was now to be succeeded by the momentous struggle between the king and his barons. And, though Langton’s appointment as primate had been the chief issue in the former strife, his part in the constitutional conflict, while not less conspicuous, was more active and commanding, for, in the words of Pattison, he was the “soul of the movement.” This appears from his strong action at the meeting held at St. Paul’s in London on 25 August, 1213. ‘‘Its ostensible object, says Lingard,’ was to ascertain the damages sustained by the outlaws in the late quarrel. But Langton called the barons aside, read them the charter of Henry, and commented on its provisions. They answered by loud acclamations, and the archbishop, taking advantage of their enthusiasm, administered to them an oath that they would either to conquer or die in the defence of their liberties.’’ When the king was going to wreak vengeance on the barons for their disobedience, Langton firmly insisted on their right to a lawful trial, and added that, if John refused them this justice, he would deem it his duty to communicate all, except the king himself, who took part in this impious warfare. Such was the archbishop’s vigorous line of action at the outset of the struggle which was brought to a successful issue two years later by the signing of the Great Charter at Runnymede. And, if he was the soul of the movement which led to these results, he may justly be regarded as the moral author of the Magna Charta.

It is important to observe that in this constitutional conflict Langton was labouring for the liberties of England and seeking to check the royal tyranny, which was the chief danger to the Church in that country, and which in a later age was to be one of the main factors, and perhaps the greatest, in the conflict between England and the Holy See. In this war he was a bishop fighting for the Church, as well as an Englishman fighting for the liberty of his country. It was natural, however, be remembered that many of these issues were involved in the struggle. There were dangers of excess on either side, and so, with Romans as well as kings have borne the guilt of oppression and injustice, and the common people often suffer more from many tyrants than from one. Bearing this in mind, we can understand how
some may have regarded the struggle from a different standpoint. The pope, naturally more in sympathy with authority than with the apparent rebellion against it, bound moreover by duty and interest to care for the rights of his vassal, and as a result with reports from the king’s side and misrepresentations of the archbishop, might clearly be expected to take a different course from Langton. Thus we find him remonstrating with the pope and the barons, annulling the Great Charter, and bidding the archbishop excommunicate the disturbers of the kingdom. When Langton, though consenting to one general issue of the sentence, refused to repeat the excommunication—partly on the ground that it was issued under a misapprehension, and partly because he wished first to see the pope himself—he was rebuked and suspended from his office. This sentence came to him on his way to Rome to attend the Fourth Lateran Council, and it was confirmed by the pope himself on 4 Nov., 1215. In the following spring Langton was absolved, but was required to remain in Rome until peace was restored. This gave him a brief rest after all his struggles, and in 1218, when both Innocent and John were dead and all parties in England were united under Henry III, he returned to his see.

II. THE ARCHBISHOP.—After his return from Rome in 1218 Langton devoted the closing ten years of his episcopate to peaceful and fruitful pastoral labour. It might be thought that there was little scope here for any great achievements comparable to his earlier work as a scholar and a statesman, and that there would be little to distinguish his life in this time of peace from that of other Catholic prelates. One who had already labourd and suffered so much might well have been pardoned for leaving to younger and more fortunate successors any large works of reform. Yet he has left his mark on the history of Canterbury. See by his code of forty-two canons published in a provincial synod. To quote the emphatic words of a recent biographer. “On Sunday, 17 April, 1222, Stephen opened a church council at Osney which is to the ecclesiastical history of England what the assembly at Runnymede is to her secular history” (Norgate, loc. cit., infra). To quote the words of the same writer, “Chroniclers for Langton’s history are the old English chroniclers, notably Roger de Wenvoer, Flores Historiarum, and the fourteenth century Chronicles all in Ilan (Latin); and contemporary documents in Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae; I, Letters of Innocent III; D’Aubigny, Spicilegium. See also Lisard, History of England, and especially Chapter V. For Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury in Lives of the English Saints; Norgate in Dict. Nat. Bio., s. v.; Schmid, Uber die kirchliche Geschichte, 2d ed. (1892); Peltet, Hist. de la faculté de théol. de l’Univ. de Paris, I, 278. W. H. KENT.

LANSBERG (John of Landsberg), Carthusian monk and ascetic writer, b. at Landsberg in Bavaria, 1489; d. at Cologne, 11 Aug., 1539. His family name was Gerecht, of which Justus is merely a Latin translation. The, appellation, however, by which he is generally known is John of Landsberg (of Landsberg), his birthplace. After studying philosophy at the University of Cologne, he joined the Charterhouse of St. Barbara at Cologne. He was named novice-master there in 1520, and in 1530 became prior of the Charterhouse near Juliers, where, as prior, he was known to Hertzheim, he was also preacher (consecutator) to the Court of William, Duke of Juliers, and confessor to the duke’s mother. The unhealthy climate of that country, together with the fatigue resulting from his continuous literary labours and his excessive sustenance of health, already impaired, and hastened his removal. Various internal complaints, that in 1534, he had to return to Cologne, where, a few years later, he was named sub-prior and remained in that office until his death. He was a man of saintly life, employing all the time he could spare from his duties towards others “in prayer, contemplation, and writing on ascetical and mystical subjects. His literary works comprise parables and homilies on the Epistles and Gospels of the liturgical year, sermons for Sundays and festivals, meditations and discourses on the Life and Passion of Christ, and a variety of treatises, sermons, letters, and expositions on spiritual life. He was not a polemic. Among his productions the only ones of a controversial kind are two dissertations against Lutheran errors and in defence of the monastic life. These two treatises are all that he wrote in German, his other writings being in Latin. The chief feature of his writings is his unaffected, and tender piety. The love of God for man, calling for a corresponding love of man for God, such is his usual theme treated in various ways. One thing particularly worthy of mark is the frequency with which he speaks of the Heart of Christ, and presagingly exhorts every Christian to take the Sacred Heart as an object of special love, veneration, and imitation. Indeed it may perhaps be said that no one before him had laid down and explained so clearly the principles upon which that devotion is grounded, nor had so developed their practical application. He was one of the last, and was perhaps the most precise in language, whose writings have had the greatest influence on the Blessed Margaret Mary and her mission, and helped to prepare the Catholic mind for the great devotion of modern times. To him also Catholics owe the first Latin edition (Cologne, 1536) of the “Revelations of St. Gertrude”. The best known of his treatises is the “Alloquia Jesu Christi ad animam fidelem”, which has been translated into Spanish, Italian, French, and English. The English translation, done by Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, who died in the Tower under Elisabeth, has reached its fourth edition (London, 1867). A new and revised edition of all the works of Lanspergus in Latin has been issued by the Carthusian press of Notre-Dame-des-Pres (Tournai, 1890), in five quarto volumes. The same press has published separately the treatise “Pharetra Divini Amorin” (18mo., 1892) and a French version of the “Alloquia”, bearing the title: “Entretiens de Jésus Christ avec une Fille” (16mo., 1892).

BOURJAT, Lanspergus-le-Charette et le dévouement au Sacré-Cœur (Paris, 1878); HARTZHEIM, Biblioth. Coloniens. (Cologne, 1747). EMUND GURDON.

LANTERN, in Italian or modern architecture, a small structure of the top of a dome, for the purpose of admitting light, for promoting ventilation, and for ornament. The name is also given to any such projection, even if it has no such openings and serves merely for decoration. Examples: the Karlskirche (Church of St. Charles Borromeo), Vienna; chapel of Montepulciano, Italy; St. Peter’s, Rome; St. Paul’s, London; St. Isaac’s, St. Petersburg; Sta Maria della Salute, Venice; Sta Maria del Fiore, Florence; the Frauenkirche, Dresden; church of the Val de Grace, Paris; St. Stephen’s, Wallbrook, London; Sta Maria di Monte Santo, Rome; Maddonna della Steceta, Parma; St. Augustine’s, Paris; chapel of the Little Well, Guadalupe, Mexico; church of the Oratory, London; church at Loyola, Biscay, Spain; La Superga, Turin; Sta Maria di Carignano, Genoa; Palermo cathedral.

Topical Architecture: Ecclesiastical Domes (Boston, 1904)

PARKER, Glossary of Architecture, I, 222.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

LANZI, Luigi, an Italian archaeologist, b. at Mont Olmo, near Modena, in 1732; d. at Florence, in 1810. In 1749 he joined the Society of Jesus, on the suspension of which, in 1773, the Grand-Duke of Tuscany made him assistant director of the Florentine Mu-
seum and curate (antiquario) in 1776. His tomb is in the church of S. Croce, near that of Michael Angelo. He applied himself early to the study of ancient and modern literature (Cicero, Dante, Firenzuala), filled several times chairs of rhetoric, and was elected a member of the literary society of the “Arcadians” (where he was called Argillo Celerio). He wrote in Florence his excellent “Guide to the Muse of Sevres” (1750), published in the “Giornale di Pisa” (1782). As an arch-

ecologist, particularly with regard to Etruscan subjects, Marini styles him the Varro of the eighteenth century. His “Saggio di lingua etrusca e di antiche antiche d’Italia” appeared at Rome in 1789 (3 vols.). It was followed by different treatises of the same tenor on ancient art, on sculpture, and on other antiquities. He won still more widespread reputation by his history of modern Italian painting (Storia pittorica dell’ Italia dal risorgimento delle belle arti fin presso al fine del XVIII secolo, 3 vols., Bassano, 1795–96). This work, often reprinted (lastly at Venice, 1837–39), was translated into Ger-

man, French, and English (twice in the latter tongue, by Roscoe, London, 1828, and by Evans, abridged, London, 1831). Lanzi describes the Schools of Art and their development, and opens his narration with the Florentine artists of the thirteenth century, whom he looks upon as the preservers of ancient Italy. He is remarkable for his widespread learning, his masterful grasp of his subject, his sound judgment, and the classic simplicity of his beautiful diction. He never lost his interest in Greco-Roman antiquity, and published at Florence, as late as 1808, a critical edition of Hesiod’s “Works and Days”, with a Latin and an Italian translation (the latter in three-line stanzas). His qualities as a writer matched his proficiency as a humanist, and he published at Florence (1807) three volumes of “Inscriptiones et Carmina”; he left numerous translations from Catullus, Theocritus, and others, either in prose or verse. Lanzi was always a devout and ascetic priest. A collection of his edifying works on the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary, and on St. Joseph, was published at Rome in 1809.

Laodicea, a titular see, of Asia Minor, metropolis of Phrygia Pacatians, said to have been originally called Diospolis and Rhosos; Antiochus II colonized it between 261 and 246 B.C., and gave it the name of his wife, Laodice. The city stood on a spur of Mount Salinacus, one mile from the left bank of the Lycus, between the Asopus and Mount Cadmus; its territory lay between the Lycus and the Caprus. In 220 n. c. Achaeus was its king; then it formed part of the Kingdom of Pergamus, and suffered severely during the war with Mithridates, but recovered its prosperity under Roman rule. About the end of the first century B.C. it was one of the principal cities of Asia Minor, both as to industries and commerce, being famous for its woollen fabrics and its sandals. It had received from Rome the title of free city, and it became the centre of a conventus juridicus, which dismissed twenty-four cities besides itself. Its wealthy citizens embellished it with beautiful monuments. One of the chief of them, Polemon, became King of Armenian Pontus—called after him “Polemonia” —and of the coast round Trebizon. The city had a school of medicine and gave birth to the two sects of philosophers, Sophists and Theodicians. Its coins and inscriptions show evidence of the worship of Zeus, Eusebius, Apollo, and the emperors. It is frequently mentioned by the Byzantine historians, particularly in the epoch of the Comneni, and was fortified by the Emperor Manuel. The Mongol and Turkish invasions brought on its decay, and then its complete ruin. Its magnificent remains are to be seen near the village of Denizli, formerly more extensive, but Denizli Ladik (Laodica), in the vilayet of Brousse; they consist principally of a stadium, three theatres, an aqueduct, sarcophagi, etc.

At the beginning of the Christian era, Laodicea was inhabited, besides its indigenous population of Hellenized Syrians, by Greeks, Romans, and an important Jewish colony. There is extant a letter from the authorities of the city to a Roman magistrate in which the former undertake to refrain from molesting the Jews in their religious observances and customs. These Jews sent regularly to Jerusalem a tribute of twenty pounds of gold. Christianity penetrated into the city from the earliest times: St. Paul mentions the Church of Laodicea as closely united with that of Colossians. It had probably been founded by the Colossian Epap-

phras, who shared the care of it with Nymphas, in whose house the faithful used to assemble. Paul asks the Colossians to communicate to the Church of La-

dice the letter which he sends to them, and to read publicly that which should come to them from Lao-

dice, that is, no doubt, a letter which he had written, or was to write, to the Laodicceans (Col., ii, 1 sq.). An apocryphal epistle purporting to be from Paul to the Laodicceans is extant in Latin and Arabic (see APOCYP-

HRA, i, 614, 2). It is written in Greek, and ends the First Epistle to Timothy with these words: “Written at Laodicea, metropolis of Phrygia Pacatians”. The Church of Laodicea is one of the seven (see RAMSAy, The Seven Churches of Asia Minor, London, 1908) to the bishops of which are addressed the letters at the beginning of the Apocalypse (Apo., iii, 14–21). The first bishops attributed to the See of Laodicce are very uncertain: St. Archippus (Col., iv, 17); St. Nymphas (Col., iv, 15; already indicated as bishop of Laodicea by the Apostolic Constitutions, viii, 46); Diotrephes (IV John, 9); Next comes St. Sagarias, martyr (c. 160). Sisinnius is mentioned in the Acts of the martyr Artemon, a priest of his Church. Nunechius assisted at the Council of Nicæa (325). Eugenis, known by an inscription, was probably his successor. The Arian Cercopius was transferred by Constantius to the See of Nicomedia. When Phrygia was divided into two parts, Laodice became the metropolis of Phrygia Pacatiana: it figures under this title in all the “Notitia episcopatum”. Some twenty incumbents are known besides those already enumerated; the last occupied the see in 1450.

There are extant, in Greek, sixty canons of a Council of Laodicea. That this city was virtually held, we have the testimony of Theodoret (“In Coloss.“,” ii, 18, P. L., LXXXII, 619). There has been much discussion as to the date: some have even thought that the council must have preceded that of Nicæa (323), or at least that of Constantinople (381). It seems safer to consider it as subsequent to the latter. The canons are, unfortunately, only a résumé of an older text, and indeed appear to be derived from two distinct collections. They are of great impor-

tance in the history of discipline and liturgy; Protostate authors have often, but quite without reason, invoked one of them in opposition to the other, the former LECQUER, Orienta Christiana, 1, 791–798; SMIT, Dict. Grec.


Laodicceans, Epistle to the. See Apocrypha, su-
title III, (5) Apocryphal Epistles.

Léon. See Soissons, Dioecese.

Léon, Vicariate Apostolic of, separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of Siam by decree of 4 May, 1899.
The vast extent of territory in Further India embraced within the ecclesiastical unit is politically divided. The country to the west of the Mekong River, excepting the Province of Bassak, is included in the Kingdom of Siam; that east of the river is under French rule. The vicariate embraces the whole of the Mekong Valley from the frontier of Tonkin as far as the north of China; on the west is the Mienam with tributary streams; the mountains of Anam and Tongking form the eastern boundary, excluding the district of Attopeu which is attached to the Vicariate of Eastern Cochinchina. The ranks of the missionaries have been frequently thinned owing to the unhealthy nature of the climate; epidemics of cholera morbus and bubonic plague are of constant recurrence.

The vicariate is entrusted to the Paris Society of Missions Etrangères, with residence at Nong-Seng in the province of Nakhon-Phanom. The present Apostolic vicar is Mgr Marie-Joseph Cuaz, titular Bishop of Hermopolia Minor. He was born at Lyons, France, 8 Dec., 1862; elected 30 April, 1899; preconized 22 June, 1899; and consecrated on 3 Sept. of the same year. The history of the territory previous to its formation into a separate vicariate is given in Foiot, "Les Missions", H. (Paris, s. d.), xii; cf. Neher in "Patenhexis", VI, 683. The most recent available religious statistics may be found in Indo-China (French), sub-title Present Conditions of the Catholic Church in French Indo-China.

Missions Catholiques (Rome, 1907); REYNOLDS, BUCHERER, "L'Inde Indo-Chine" (Paris, 1909); GÉRARD, "Les missions catholiques en Indo-China" (1910); HERZER, "Kommunikations- Lexikon", s. v. Laos.

P. J. MACAULEY.

LA PAZ, DIocese OF (PACENSIS), in Bolivia. The city is the capital of the department of the same name, is the most populous city of the Republic of Bolivia, and since 1859 its capital. It is about thirty miles south-east of Lake Titicaca, is connected by railway with the Peruvian harbour town of Puno, situated on the lake, and is 12,200 feet above sea-level. The city is regularly laid out, but built on very steep ground, and according to the last census (1900) has a population of 54,713, chiefly mestizos (called chojos) and Aymarás Indians. The most prominent buildings are a new cathedral built in the eighties of white marble with Corinthian columns, situated on the steep plaza, and the monastic churches of Santo Domingo, San Francisco, and San Juan de Dios. The monasteries attached to these churches, although secularized immediately after the establishment of the republic, were later restored to their respective orders. The most important monasteries of men are San Francisco, La Merced, and La Recoleta; there are also the convents of the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, and the Carmelite nuns (El Carmen), both new buildings which the city government of La Paz made an unsuccessful attempt, in 1909, to confiscate for school purposes, ostensibly, because, unlike the other orders of women in the city engaged in teaching or nursing, these two devoted themselves to the contemplative life (see the censure of Bishop Amargosa in the "Gaceta Eclesiástico", No. 8, 1909). French Sisters of Charity conduct both the city hospitals and a medical school is attached to the Loniza Hospital for women. The Academia Aymara was founded in 1900 to foster the study of history, and publishes the "Academia Aymara" (La Paz, 1901—). The Sociedad Geográfica de la Paz (seated b. 1880) and issued in 1884 with four sections, for astronomy, physics, political science, and commerce respectively, publishes the "Boletín", as well as separate works. Finally, the Institution Lejón, formed in 1908 from the Federación Encíclopédica, Sociedad Encíclopédica Filantropía and the Unión Filarmonía, for the promotion of the study of natural science, and also of philosophical and sociological studies, issues the "Revista", movement. On 16 July, 1809, citizens and soldiers rose, at first, it is true, only against the French party and in favour of Ferdinand VII, but with the ultimate object of freeing themselves from the mother country. This first uprising was suppressed by General Goyeneche, who was sent from Lima against the insurgents, and had all the chiefs executed. After the battle of Ayacucho La Paz was the head-quarters of General Sucre and since then, at intervals, has been the capital of the country.

The Diocese of La Paz was separated from that of Charcas by Paul V, 4 July, 1605 (see LA PLATA, DIocese OF). In the records of the Audiencia of Charcas, preserved in the "Archivo General de Indias" at Simancas, Diego de Zambrano y Gusmán appears to have been the first bishop, though he apparently did not take possession of his see. The first bishop vouchèd for by history was Domingo Balderrama, O.P., who assumed office in 1610 (d. 1615). He was succeeded in 1616 by Pedro de Valencia, who died in 1631, blind and an octogenarian. The next bishop, highly trained in law and literature, was Feliciano de la Vega, from 1628 Bishop of Popayán, who remained for only a year (1639) at the head of the diocese. He published the first synodal constitutions and died in 1640. Archbishop of Mexico. Among the subsequent bishops the following are prominent: Antonio de Castro y Castillo, O.F.M. (1648–53), whose detailed report on his diocese is preserved in the Archivo General de Indias at Simancas (printed in the "Boletín Eclesiástico", 1916–20, No. 5 sqq.); Juan de Quevedo y Peñalosa y Valdés (1681–95), who finished the first cathedral (1685) and was subsequently transferred to
Chacras. The eleventh bishop, Agustín Rodríguez Delgado, was made Bishop of Panama in 1725 and became bishop of La Paz in 1731, in which capacity, in 1738, he edited the constitutions of the Third Diocesan Synod of La Paz. In 1743 he was appointed Archbishop of Chacras and in 1745 Archbishop of La Paz. At the same time, he undertook the task of organizing the Franciscan monastery and dedicated it on 23 April, 1784. The twenty-sixth bishop, Juan de Dios Bosque (1784–90), published 29 November, 1883, the synodal constitutions still in force. The actual bishop was twenty-eighth Bishop Mr. Nicolas Armentia, O.F.M., has rendered distinguished services in the geographical exploration of Bolivia. He was born 5 December, 1845, at Benerdo in the Spanish province of Alava, received his early education in Biscaglia and in 1860 entered the French Franciscan province of St-Louis. In 1865 he was sent to the Franciscan college at La Paz, where he was ordained in 1869, after which he laboured from 1871 till 1880 as a missionary among the Indians in Tumupasa and Covendo. In June, 1881, he went to the Araunas and Pacificanas on business for the Government. With a knapsack on his back, a yoke, provisions, and a sextant, a breviary in one hand and a compass in the other, he traversed the broad territory between the Beni and Madre de Dios Rivers. He followed the Beni for its entire length and examined the surrounding forests, remaining until 1883. After his return to La Paz he published, in 1884, the result of his explorations under the title “Diario de sus viajes a las tribus comprendidas entre el Beni y Madre de Dios y en el arroyo de Ivón en los dos años de 1882 y 1883”. In May, 1884, Armentia navigated the Madre de Dios, pushing as far as 10° S.lat., exploring the Ortón River (Tahuamanu), and returning, and returning to La Paz in August, 1886. Here, in 1887, he published his second work: “Navegación del Madre de Dios” (in “Biblioteca Boliviana de geografía é historia”), I, translated into Italian by Marcellino da Civezza in his “Storia universale delle missioni Francescane” (VII, Florence, 1894, part IV, 503–603). In this Armentia describes, besides the fauna and flora of the countries he traversed, the customs and tongues of the tribes he visited, especially the Araunas, and laid before the Government a plan showing how the work of civilisation begun by him among these savages could be most effectively carried on. On 22 October, 1901, Armentia, Bishop of La Paz, and 24 February, 1902, was consecrated at Sucre. He published the “Regla Consuetas” of his order in 184 articles (8 Dec., 1903), and wrote a valuable history of the old Franciscan missions in Bolivia under the title “Relación histórica de las misiones Francescanas de Apolobamba, por el famoso N-Trister de Cuopoli” (La Paz, 1903).

The diocese includes the entire Department of La Paz and the Province of Magdalena in the Department of Beni. It numbers 700,000 inhabitants in 72 parishes, served by about one hundred secular priests. The religious congregations represented in the diocese are the Franciscans, with the missionary college of San José, opened at La Paz in 1837; the Franciscan Recollects with various mission schools; the Jesuits with a flourishing college (150 day scholars and 50 interns); the Mercedarians with free schools; the lay brotherhoods of La Paz, and an institute opened in 1887 (a business and trade school). The Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the Sisters of the Most Sacred Heart (Picpus Sisters), the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, and the Daughters of St. Anne devote themselves to teaching schools and run for his glory the Institute of the Immaculate Conception and the Carmelite nuns follow the contemplative life. The cathedral chapter has ten canons.
LAPLAND

Mondo", in which the results are presented without mathematical deductions, showed such linguistic excellence that it secured him a seat among the Forty of the French Academy (1816) and for a time the presidency of that body (1817). The five volumes of the "Mécanique Céleste" made him the Newton of France, and in 1817 he obtained the French Academy of Sciences, first as associate (1773) and then as member (1785), and took a prominent place in the Institute, into which the Academy developed (1796). He was one of the founders of the Bureau of Longitudes and for a while its president. The Royal Society of London and the Royal Astronomical Society of Edinburgh elected him a foreign associate.

Great scientists, like Berthollet, Cuvier, Humboldt, dedicated their works to him. The collected works of Laplace were printed twice: by the Government in seven volumes (1843-47), the Chamber granting forty thousand francs; and again, at the expense of General Laplace (who left a seventy thousand francs for the purpose) and his niece the Marquise of Colbert, in thirteen volumes (1878-1904), under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences. An English translation of the "Mécanique Céleste" by Dr. Bowditch appeared in Boston (1829-39), for five dollars.

Laplace was born and died a Catholic. It has been asserted that to Laplace the Creator was an hypothesis.

The origin of this assertion lies in the misinterpretation of a passage of the "Système du Monde" (Oeuvres, VI, 1835, p. 460), where it is evident that by "vain hypotheses" Laplace meant the Deus ex machina of Newton and the "perpetual miracle" of Leibniz's Harmony. It is true that Laplace indulges in a frivolous remark against Callistus III both in the "Theory of Probabilities" (Introduction, also separately as 'Essai Philosophique') and in the "System of the World" (IV, iv). He partly atoned for it by omitting the remark in his fourth edition of the "Essai". Death prevented him from doing the same in the sixth edition of the "Système du Monde", the correcting of which he had commenced during his last illness. He died at his home in Paris, Rue du Bac, attended by the cure of the Foreign Missions, in whose parish he was to be buried, and the cure of Arceuil, whom he had called to administer the last comforts of religion (de Joannis, p. 27).

Lapland and Lapps.—About 150,000 square miles of the most northerly regions of Europe, from the Atlantic Ocean to the White Sea, from the Pole and the Arctic Ocean to the O.C. lat., are occupied by a partly stationary, partly nomadic people of Mongolian race, usually designated as "Lapps", while their neighbours call the territory over which they migrate "Samelands" and the people themselves "Same", though many prefer the term Fjelman (mountaineers). The country is rich and varied. Radiant days and midnight sun alternate with months of night and twilight, contrasts that can scarcely be found elsewhere on earth. Deep obscure forests surround bright sheets of water; majestic rivers hurry over mighty cataracts to the sea; here ice-capped mountain peaks tower skyward; there immense fields of reigned in the French Academy. The earth conceals all kinds of treasure, thus the inexhaustible iron mines at Gellivare are well known (in 1901 output 1,200,000 tons) as among the richest in the world. The total number of Lapps (the nation as such has exerted no influence on the development of mankind and therefore the present analysis) is about 30,000, of whom 2000 live on Russo-Finnish, 8000 on Swedish, and 20,000 on Norwegian territory.

This singular race is divided into three different groups: mountain, forest, and fisher Lapps. The first two are nomadic and almost entirely dependent upon reindeer. Nearly all the needs of the Lapps are supplied by this useful creature, which closely resembles a stag. The flesh provides his food; from its hide he obtains the moccasin, the hat, the bag, the carpet, the foot and tent covering, while the antlers yield material for knife blades, vessels, etc. During the winter the mountain Lapps move down from their storm driven heights to the sheltering valleys. Here they linger until spring and while here slaughter superfluous animals. They provide themselves with a summer tent (njallas) to save them from depredation. Into the part of the cuoptes (that is sheds resting on piles) not used to dry meat, they bring tools and sledges for the summer. On the approach of spring they return to the green mountain meadows where the reindeer calve and then, having abundant food, supply milk for nourishment and for making cheese. The dwellings of these Lapps consist of an easily movable kota, or conical hut, with skins fastened over the poles and ceilings and in winter roofed over with turf. These huts are fifteen to sixteen feet in diameter at the base and from six to fifteen feet in height; they have entrances but no windows. The smoke from the fireplace in the middle escapes through an opening above. Around the hearth men and dogs, parents, with children and servants, lie on fir or birch twigs covered with skins. Less laborious than the lives of the mountain Lapps are those of the forest Lapps who have fixed places of abode and dwell in log-houses. Twice a year, in spring and autumn, they leave their hearths and devote themselves to hunting and fishing. The rest of the time they are employed, like the mountain Lapps, in breeding reindeer. The forest Lapp is in every respect more favored than the rest of his race, and enjoys such luxuries of civilization as salt, meal, coffee, and tobacco. The fisher Lapps have few resources, and at the best have only a few reindeer to dispose of. They are industrious and depend solely on the often insufficient results of their toil. Absolute pauperism is frequent among them. As to physical traits, the Lapps are usually small and slight in figure like the Scandinavians and Russians; their heads are broad, the profile sharp and the expression somewhat sad. Their complexion is yellowish and the long jaw and pointed chin develop only a scanty beard. They love gay coloured clothes adorned with rude ornaments, silver or tin and make them with much skill. They are not lacking in mental capacity and few Lapps are totally illiterate. Education is provided by means of a few established schools and the aid of travelling teachers. Kindness and gentleness form the bright side of the Lapps' character. Thieving is rare. It is natural that an isolated people, but too frequently the victim of natural forces, should be given over to superstition.

Formerly the Lapps were polytheists. Ibmel appears to have been invested with a sort of leading role among the gods, and his name is still used figuratively. To-day most of the people profess, at least outwardly, the Confession of Augsburg. There are several parishes, e.g. Kautokeins and Karajok in Norway, Karelskina and Jukkejarin in Sweden, where religious service is held in both the Scandinavian and Lapp languages, or only in the latter. It is abridged and the total attendance is slack. About four times the frequency of ever (at the so-called Heligöd), the contrary is true. The multitudes who assemble at that time combine business and pleasure, markets and popular sports with religious celebrations. A few thousand Lapps were Christianized in the sixteenth century by monks and the Russian Orthodox clergy, and were enrolled as members of the Orthodox Church. Their new "religion" was no more seriously taken than the Protestant Christianity of the Southern Lapp.
Attempts at conversion were certainly made during the Middle Ages from Upsala, the archbishop of which was the protector of the nomads of the northern provinces, tributary to Sweden; the missions, however, made no real progress, though at the time of the Cal- man the rich provinces to the south of Upsala were so lively interest in them and a priest named Tolsti was sent to preach the Gospel and erect churches for them. After the schism, Gustavus I Vasa took the matter up again and is said to have sent Brigidite monks from Vaestra to these northern missions. Charles IX has no conspicuous mission, but used the Latin language to be used by preachers, and laid the foundations for much of the work done later. In Norway, instruction in their native language was first given the Lapps in 1714 at the institution of Thomas of Westen. This brought about conversions, but in 1774 when the instructions were once more confined to Danish, the neophytes fell away. In the middle of the eighteenth century an unsuccessful mission was undertaken by the Moravian Brotherhood. Since then much has been done to Christianize and civilize these people. Numerous grammars, dictionaries, and readers have been issued. Great tractates, and portions of the Holy Scriptures translated into their language. Since the repeal of adverse legislation, the Catholic Church has likewise endeavoured to gain influence over these poor nomads. Unlike the Protestant missionaries, fathers of families, the unmarried Catholics of Sweden have chosen the secular laity for their work. The results, indeed, are yet moderate, though the future offers relatively favourable prospects.

Scheffer, *Histoire de la Laponie*, tr. from the Latin (1878); Harting and Druk, *Fahrt durch Norwegen und die Lapps- markt* (1877); Escard, *Le prince Roland Bonaparte en Laponie* (1857); *Lappisches Handbuch* (1876); Bøe, *Lappská Lappská* (1876); *Durch Sibirien nach St. Petersburg* (Freiburg, 1890); Redvik, *Lappská* (1897-8); *Skolmen* (1909-10); Schulte, *Geschichte der Franken* (1901); Vasal, *Lappmäss* (1860); Frits, *Lappiska Myologi*, *Histoire des Lapons* (Christina, 1871); Tsch, *Le traité japonicius* (1835—); Strom, *Hist. top. skrifter för fält- och tredje i Norge* (1903); Holberger, *Der nordische Böser* (1883); Svenska Turismföreningens Reisandbok, *Sweeden* (1900); Svenska Turistorföreningens årsförening (1922) gives full information on Lappland, its nature and inhabitants, as far as they concern Sweden. Each volume is furnished with an index. A systematic summary of works on Lappish subjects from 1879 appears in the *Annales* for 1891 (pp. 416, 418). See Barlow, *Meddelanden fran Nordiska Museet* (1903); Falin, *Norden och Norske Falubruk*; with the criticism of Friel, in *Abhandlungen der Mineraloge- schen* (Helsingfors, 1906), of special value for Russian Finland.

F. W. Wittmann.

La Plata, Diocese of (De Plata).—The city of La Plata, capital of the Argentine Province of Buenos Aires, is situated on the right bank of the Rio de la Plata, about 35 miles south-east of the city of Buenos Aires. In 1893 the inhabitants numbered 45,410, and 80,000 in 1907, most of them foreigners, with Italian predominating. When, in 1890, the city of Buenos Aires was ceded to the Federal Government, the national Congress resolved to build a new capital for the Province of Buenos Aires. The foundation stone of this new capital was laid 19 November, 1882; it was named La Plata, and grew rapidly in the 80's, but came to a standstill in 1890, and has not recovered yet. The far-famed artificial water-course assures the town an important future, though its nearness to Buenos Aires has temporarily checked its development. Among the important buildings belonging to the town are those of the National University of La Plata, which was developed, in 1905, out of the provincial university, and now (1909) has four faculties and a yearly budget of 1,080,000 pesos (about $440,000). Attached to the university are the library and university extension, containing 41,000 volumes, the Museo de la Plata, founded in 1877, with valuable anthropological, palaeontological, zoological, and mineral collections, and an astronomical observatory erected in 1882. The pariah church of San Ponciano, built in 1833, served as pro-cathedral until 1901, when the present large Gothic cathedral took its place.

The See of La Plata, by wish of the Argentine Gov- ernment, was granted to the See of Santa Fé and Tucuman, by Bull of Leo XIII, "In Petri Cathedra", 15 February, 1897, and canonically established 30 May, 1897, by an edict of Archbishop Udalsiio Castellano of Buenos Aires. It is a sufrag- an of Buenos Aires, with jurisdiction over the Pro- vince of Buenos Aires, and the territory of La Pampa Central, both of these formerly belonging to the Arch- diocese of Buenos Aires. The diocese and the cathe- dral are under the patronage of the Immaculate Conception, while the Province of Buenos Aires is under the patronage of St. Martin of Tours. The Arch- bishop of Buenos Aires took charge of the new diocese until the appointment, in 1898, of the first bishop, Mgr. Mariano Antonio Espinosa. The present bishop (1909), Mgr. Ngônomucoño Terrero y Escalada, was appointed in 1900. There is also an auxiliary bishop, Mgr. Francisco Albetti, titular Bishop of Sidna.

Neg. 29. Decoys of wood, the number of inhabitants, mostly Catholics; 130 parishes; 260 secular priests and 60 religious. The communi- ties of men are represented in the diocese by: Fran- ciscans, Dominicans, Fathers of the Sacred Heart from the Diocese of Bayonne, Pallottines, Community of the Divine Word, Passionists, Salesians—to whom, since 1896, the Mission of Pampa Central has been en- trusted (see PATAGONIA)—as also Brothers of the Christian Doctrine and Marists. The female communi- ties are: Daughters of Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of Mary Help of Christians, Poor Sisters of St. Joseph of Bueno Aires, Sisters of the Divine Saviour, of the Blessed Sacrament, of St. Anthony, of the Divine Master, Vincentians, Sisters of the Garden, of Our Lady of Lujar, of the Rosary (native and French), of the Child Jesus, of Mercy, of the Good Shepherd, Franciscan Tertiaries. Sisters of the Cross, of St. Cam- illus, of the Immaculate Conception, Capuchinas, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Little Sisters of the Poor, French Sisters of St. Joseph, Servants of Mary, of the Holy Union, Dominicanesses of the Annunciation, Franciscans of Charity, of Saint Martha, and Sisters of the Poor of St. Catherine of Siena.

Gregor Reinhold.

La Plata (or Charcas), Archdiocese of (de Plata).—La Plata is, besides being the metropolitan see of Bolivia, the other two are La Paz and Cochabamba. The city owes its origin to the famous sil- vamines of Potosi which are nearby. Owing to the chill climate of Potosi, which is about 1,700 feet above the level of the sea, the wealthy mine-owners conceived the idea of seeking a more pleasant habita- tion for their families, in a milder temperature about sixty miles to the north-east. The city is said to have been founded as early as 1566, under the name of Villa de la Plata (Silver City); it was also long called, from the district in which it is situated, Charcas, or popu- larly, Chuquisaca (Golden Gate). After the victory of General Sucre near Ayacucho (1824), it was named in his honour, Sucre. La Plata is built on a plateau, 4,000 feet above the level of the sea, on the Cochimayo, a tributary of the Pilcomayo, flowing into the river from the left, and is the metropolis of the department of Chu- quisaca, numbering 26,907 inhabitants (1900), chiefly Indians and Mestizos. The city is the residence of the archbishop, who has a medical institute founded in 1806,
a museum of anatomy and natural history, a Franciscan missionary college, built in 1673 by Father Herrera, O.F.M., a flourishing college of arts and industries of the Salesians of Don Bosco (connected with the Oratory), an Oratory of St. Philip Neri, also a geographical society, whose principal work has been the "Diccionario geográfico del departamento de Chuquisaca" (Sucre, 1903). The many churches of the city are for the most part unpretentious, the interiors covered with unsightly stucco work, the interiors with wretched paintings. The only one worthy of note is the Cathedral of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, a building with three naves and an imposing tower. This cathedral is remarkable for its wealth of treasures in silver, which, however, is not entirely intact, the exterior work having been halted down by President Melgarejo. The miraculous image of Our Lady of Guadalupe, about seven feet in height, and encrusted with diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and pearls, is still in the church, and is valued at about two million dollars. Of the twenty-four massive silver candelabra, there are two at present weighing each about 110 pounds. Also in the cathedral are a large number of valuable paintings, among others a "Madonna de la Paz" by Murillo, a "Martirdom of St. Bartholomew" by Ribera, a "Crucifixion of St. Andrew" by Montufar. In the adjoining chapel of San Juan de Mata are two artistic statues of St. Clement and St. Aquila, both containing relics of the saints. The spacious sala capitular, or chapter hall, contains the portraits of all the archbishops.

The Diocese of La Plata, or Charcas, was erected by Bull of Julius III, 27 June, 1552, as a suffragan of Lima. On 4 July, 1605, Paul V founded two new dioceses out of La Plata territory, La Paz and Santa Cruz de la Sierra, and on 20 July, 1609, raised La Plata to metropolitan rank. The province formerly embraced, in addition to the two above-mentioned dioceses, practically all the territory now ceded to Chile, Argentina, Panama, Paraguay, etc. To-day the boundaries of the ecclesiastical Province of La Plata coincide with those of the Republic of Bolivia, embracing only the suffragan Dioceses of La Paz, Santa Cruz de la Sierra, and Cochabamba, erected in 1847. The list of bishops of La Plata comprises thirty-six names; that of the archbishops, thirty-six, including the present incumbent of the see. Prominent among them are: Alonso de Peralta (1600–16), who died in the odour of sanctity; Fernando de Arías y Ugarte (1627–30), previously Bishop of Quito and Archbishop of Santa Fé de Bogotá; Miguel de la Torre (1632–43), a true father to the Indians, and died in, 1638, Archbishop of Lima; Gaspar de Villaroel, O.S.A. (1659–67), formerly Bishop of Santiago de Chile and Arequipa, also known as a writer on canon law and exegetics (Hutner, "Nomenclator literarius", 2nd ed., Innsbruck, II, 1893, 138); Cristóval de Castilla y Zamora (1659–82), natural son of Philip IV of Spain, who built the archiepiscopal seminary and the former archiepiscopal palace (now the president's mansion); Bartolomé Gonzales y Poveda (1683–92), who expended a hundred thousand pesos on the erection of the side aisles and the tower of the cathedral; Pedro Miguel de Aranguren (1761–76), formerly Bishop of Córdoba de Tucumán, who built the chapter hall and held the second provincial synod in 1776, during the course of which his death occurred; the Discalced Carmelites José Antonio de San Alberto (1785–1804), a very father of the church, and the founder of the local Oratory; Father Philip Neri is also worthy of mention on ascetical subjects; the Benedicnte Benito María de Moxó y Franckol (1807–16), a well-trained scholar, the author of homilies and also of some polished poems in Latin and Italian, who died at Salta, in Argentina, having been married thither by General Rondeau; Pedro Puch y Solanos (1802–55), who assisted at the Vatican Council. The present (thirty-sixth) archbishop is a Franciscan, Sebastiano Francesco Pifferi, of Italy. He entered the Franciscan Order, 9 November, 1863, made his profession 20 January, 1868, and was ordained to the priesthood, 14 May, 1871. He first worked in Bolivia as commissary general of his order, and in 1905 was appointed titular Bishop of Jericho. He was consecrated archbishop by the Bishop Miguel de los Santos Tabora (1898–1906), on whose death (30 April, 1906) he succeeded to the archiepiscopal See of La Plata.

**Statistics.**—According to a communication from Archbishop Pifferi, of January, 1910, the Archdiocese of La Plata embraces the departments of Chuquisaca, Santa Cruz, Oruro, and Tarija, an area of 165,200 sq. miles, and a population of 805,299. The archdiocese is divided into 13 deaneries (vicariates forane), and comprises 135 parishes, over 200 vice-parishes, with 172 secular priests and 99 regular priests, besides 10 regular clerics not priests, and 26 lay brothers, in 6 monasteries of men, and 159 sisters in 21 houses. There are 70 students in the seminary. The 10 mission stations among the pagan Indians, and 7 mixed stations are all attended from the missionary colleges of the Franciscans. The religious congregations represented in the archdiocese are as follows: Franciscans, with monastery at Sucre and Tarija, all in the province of San Antonio de las Carolas. Of these four monasteries, Potosí (founded 1547), Sucre (mentioned above), and Tarija (1607), have flourishing missionary colleges in charge of missions among the pagan Indians. Moreover, the Oratorians of St. Philip Neri have an oratory at Sucre; Don Bosco's Salesians a college of arts and industries (with oratory) at Sucre; the Lazarists, a house at Sucre; the Discalced Carmelites nuns, monasteries at Sucre and Potosí; the Poor Clares and the Servants of Mary, each a house at Sucre; the Augustinian nuns, a monastery at Potosí; lastly, the Daughters of St. Anne have foundations at Sucre, Potosí, Oruro, Tarija, and Tupiza. In addition to 14 religious schools, there are 2 educational institutions for boys (with 360 pupils) and one for girls (with an attendance of 1200), and 6 hospitals and hospices. Besides the Spanish language, there are Indian dialects still in use—Quichua, Aymará, and Guaraní. St. Barbara, virgin and martyr, is patroness of the diocese.


**Tahure, Un Balanço da história da Episcopia do Rio de Janeiro, list of bishops), pp. 41–51.** On the Franciscan missions of the archdiocese, cf. Fernández, "Conseptus omnium missionum Ordinis Fraarium Minorum" (Quaracchi, 1905), 175–88; also Cardia, "Las misiones Franciscanas entre los indios de Bolivia" (Barcelona, 1886); Corrado, El colegio Franciscano de Tarija e le sue missioni, Italian tr. by Villareni (Quaracchi, 1888); Martarelli, El Colegio Franciscano de Potosí y sus misiones (Potosí, 1890); de Nino, Una página a su continuación de la historia de misiones Franciscanas del colegio de Potosí (Potosí, 1906); Arminta, Relação histórica de as misiones de L’Espiritu de Apolobamba, por outros Fraerm da Congregação (official ed., La Paz, 1903). On the Salesians at Sucre, Salesiánische Nachrichten, XXV (Trent and Turin, 1903), 173–92; Greorge Reinhold.

**Lapparent, Albert Auguste de,** French geologist, b. at Bourges, 30 Dec., 1839; d. at Paris, 12 May, 1938. He made a brilliant course of studies at the Ecole Polytechnique in Paris, graduating there in 1864. He was appointed mining engineer in 1864, he was chosen by Elie de Beaumont as a member of the staff entrusted with the task of drawing the geological map of France. From 1866 to 1880 he contributed, with Delesse, articles on geology to the "Annales des Mines". In 1875 he was made a statutory of the commission on the submarine tunnel between England and
France, and conducted the soundings with such skill that his report was pronounced most valuable and served as a basis for subsequent inquiries on the question. The French Government gave him the Cross of the Legion of Honour. Towards the end of 1875 a chair of geology and mineralogy was founded for him at the Catholic University of Paris. For a few years he occupied that position without severing his connexion with the mining department, and when the leave of absence he had obtained was cancelled (1880), he preferred to give up his official position and continue to teach a science so dear to him in an atmosphere more congenial to his religious convictions. In 1880 he was elected president of the Geological Society of France. Two years later he began to write his "Traité de Géologie," published at Paris in 1884, the style of which work was as remarkable as its contents. He treated the subject in a new way, abandoning the old methods and laying the foundation of the scientific history of the earth. Instead of confining himself to a dry description and to a mere enumeration of fossils, he ventured to make hypotheses on terrestrial dynamics, as well as on the past and present evolutions of the earth. In 1885 appeared his "Cours de Mineralogie," which gained him the presidency of the French Society of Mineralogy, and a prize from the Academy of Sciences. Not long afterwards he began at the Catholic University his lectures on physical geography, a work of such merit that he was offered the chairmanship of the central committee of the Society of Geography in 1895, and was sent to represent the society at the international congress held in London. In 1896 he published his "Leccons de Géographie Physique," a work of decided originality. Lapparent was the first to treat this subject in France, and the success of his lectures at the Catholic University, the first ever given in this department, prompted the French Government to establish a similar chair at the Sorbonne. His chief qualities as teacher consisted in the clearness and method of his treatment. He saw at once the essential points of a question and showed them in a new light. Hence the enduring success of his publications, which were many times reprinted. However deep and complicated the subject, his treatment made for simplicity. In recognition of his services to science, he was elected to the Academy of Sciences in June, 1897, and in May, 1907, when Berthelot died, de Lapparent succeeded him as secretary of that academy.

De Lapparent was not only a prolific author of original scientific works, but also, in the highest sense of the term, a remarkable "popularizer". Considering that the proper rôle of the scientist, holding by his work the closest communion with truth in this world, is to spread this truth abroad, he set forth in words perfectly simple and clear, but withal perfectly exact, the great problems of contemporary science. The style in which he did this derived an added dignity from the very simplicity in which he clothed these abstract themes. He never had recourse to that pretentious pomp of style with which ignorance is wont to mystify the lay mind. De Lapparent's writings embodied the most abstract thoughts, straightway illuminated, however, by his marvellous gift of simplification. His articles in "Le Correspondant" are masterpieces. They were always cordially welcomed, not only by the laity, but also by his colleagues in the world of science. In these articles he gave to the world in popular form his tetrahedral theory of the form of the earth, a theory as simple in principle as it was pregnant in possible applications. He also made known Brückner's curious theory of meteorological periodicity, and discussed the question of the flattening of the earth, a subject to which he succeeded in imparting much new life and significance. In this same happy style de Lapparent wrote that remarkable little work, "Some Thoughts about the Nature of the Earth's Crust," which, although based upon a series of lectures delivered by him to a lay audience, shows wonderful philosophic grasp and scientific comprehension.


LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.